JURNAL KAJIAN BALI
Journal of Bali Studies
p-ISSN 2088-4443 # e-ISSN 2580-0698 Volume 16, Number 01, April 2026

Constructing Customary Citizenship: Ritual, Sanctions, and Recognition in an Old Balinese Village

I Wayan Sukabawa[1*], Pande Putu Toya Wisuda[2], I Made Wirajana[3], Ni Ketut Sri Rahayuni[4]
[1,2,3] Universitas Hindu Negeri I Gusti Bagus Sugriwa, Indonesia
[4] Udayana University, Indonesia
DOI: https://doi.org/10.24843/JKB.2026.v16.i01.p07

Abstract: Debates on community governance increasingly examine micro-practices that generate compliance without coercion. This study analyzes the *marebu agung* marriage completion ritual in an Old Balinese (Bali Aga) village, Desa Adat Binyan (Binyan Customary Village), Kintamani District, as a disciplinary mechanism that structures differentiated forms of customary citizenship. Based on a twelve-month ethnographic case study using observation, interviews, and analysis of *awig-awig* (customary regulations), the research shows that ritual choreography shapes subjects through regulated bodily action. Temporal deadlines and escalating material sanctions sustain compliance, while horizontal social visibility encourages mutual monitoring. The tripartite *krama* (customary membership categories) system withholds full recognition until ritual completion, linking marital legitimacy to community membership. Using Foucauldian analytics, the study demonstrates how sacred ritual operates as a technology of power within customary governance, contributing to global discussions on ritualized citizenship and non-state disciplinary systems.

Keywords: *marebu agung*; ritualized citizenship; distributed surveillance; customary governance; Foucauldian discipline

1. Introduction

Debates on community governance, non-state citizenship, and legal pluralism have increasingly focused on micro-level practices that guide social compliance without direct coercion. Rituals, once seen as symbolic or traditional, are now viewed as institutional acts that structure social order, recognize membership, and distribute rights and obligations (Alasuutari, 2023;

* Corresponding author's email: iwayansukabawa@uhnsugriwa.ac.id
Submitted: 22 January 2026; Accepted: 23 March 2026; Published: 5 April 2026

Jakubovská et al., 2025; Kulkarni, 2020; Whitehouse & Lanman, 2014). Recent scholarship shows ritual practices function as media of behavioral normalization by regulating time, physical action, and social consequences (Hobson et al., 2018; Jakubovská et al., 2025; Rossano, 2020; Sosiowati et al., 2025). This shifts the study of culture, power, and governance toward a more rigorous engagement with interdisciplinary ideas. Analytical perspectives developed in these debates provide a useful lens for examining contexts where customary communities continue to organize social membership and obligations through ritual procedures, including cases found in Bali, which therefore offer a relevant empirical site for further examination.

This issue has become more important in global debates on indigenous community-based governance and citizenship, especially in the Global South (Postero & Tockman, 2020; Sieder, 2005; Yashar, 2007). Studies show social recognition often depends on local procedures, not state documents, to determine participation and legitimacy (Gordillo, 2006; Kindersley, 2022; Suárez-Krabbe, 2015; Taggart & Haug, 2024; Wood, 2003). For example, marriage rituals may act as gateways to customary citizenship status (Ekman, 2023; Nhlapo, 2021; Nkuna-Mavutane & Jamneck, 2023). Yet, the disciplinary aspects of such rites are often overlooked. Interpretations focused on harmony, symbolism, or cohesion have left the mechanics of compliance underexplored (Kartal, 2025; Said et al., 2024; Wejak, 2020).

This article examines the *marebu agung* ritual in Balinese customary villages as an institutional mechanism regulating social recognition and compliance. The practice is a formal prerequisite for recognizing *krama adat* (core, customary citizens) status. Delays in the rite incur daily material sanctions after a specific period. This shows the ritual is not just symbolic marriage legitimation but also a procedural tool regulating status, time, and compliance. These mechanisms remain to be systematically analyzed as aspects of social discipline that produce compliant subjects through normalization and social visibility.

The literature review shows a conceptual gap in two main areas. Ritual and marriage studies often focus on symbolic meaning, cosmological structure, and integrative function, both in general ritual scholarship and in Balinese studies (Borneman, 1996; Connor & Rubinstein, 1999; Eiseman, 2011; H. Geertz, 2004; Hauser-Schäublin & Ardika, 2008; Moore, 1988; Palimbong et al., 2025; Rodgers, 1985; Whitehouse & Lanman, 2014).They rarely examine how ritual produces embodied compliance. Socio-legal scholarship on customary villages and legal pluralism tends to highlight norms, institutions, and jurisdictional negotiation (Khuan et al., 2025; López et al., 2025; McCarthy, 2005; Ramli et al., 2024; Suyadnya, 2021; Ubink, 2008), but does not detail how micro-sanctions, time limits, and membership status interact to create distributed surveillance.

As a result, the discussion between discipline theory and ritualization as a power practice, especially in customary citizenship, remains limited.

Building on these gaps, this article advances a critical reading of *marebu agung* as a ritual practice that can be understood as a technology of community discipline. The analysis focuses on how ritual choreography, differentiation of *krama* status, and recurrent material sanctions contribute to the production of social compliance. The study's originality lies in its formulation of the concept of distributed surveillance, which does not rely on formal architectural structures but operates through networks of social visibility, the calculation of consequences, and the internalization of norms. The scope of the analysis is deliberately limited to a single configuration of ritual and a specific set of customary regulations, without any claim to generalize across all marriage practices or Balinese customary village systems.

The study's theoretical implications expand global debates on ritualized citizenship, community-based governmentality, and non-state disciplinary mechanisms. It uses local practice as a foundation for conceptual analysis, showing how sacralized moral economies and ritual procedures, which seem religious, generate surveillance and compliance. This article aims to be analytical and reflective, rather than declarative. The empirical findings broaden our understanding of how indigenous communities manage membership, compliance, and social order within a world of diverse citizenship and governance models.

2. Literature Review

Academic discourse on ritual has undergone an important theoretical shift from predominantly symbolic interpretations toward approaches that examine ritual as a structured practice that produces social order. Earlier anthropological studies frequently interpreted ritual through functionalist perspectives emphasizing cosmological representation, cultural reproduction, and social cohesion (Moore, 1988; Rodgers, 1985; Whitehouse & Lanman, 2014). These approaches clarified the symbolic dimensions of ritual but often provided limited analytical engagement with how ritual practices participate in the production of power, discipline, and social regulation. More recent scholarship therefore approaches ritual not only as a system of meanings but also as a material practice that organizes conduct through embodied participation, temporal sequencing, and patterned repetition.

Within this perspective ritual functions as a social technology that stabilizes behavioral expectations through standardized procedures. Empirical studies demonstrate that repetitive ritual movements and patterned sequences regulate emotional orientation and behavioral dispositions among participants

(Hobson et al., 2018). Through repeated bodily engagement, ritual cultivates stable dispositions that extend beyond the immediate ceremonial moment. Marshall's analysis of ritual discipline, developed through studies of religious and cultural practices in Western institutional and ecclesiastical contexts, conceptualizes ritual as a disciplinary apparatus operating through bodily inscription. Normative orientations emerge not through abstract instruction but through repeated corporeal participation that gradually stabilizes patterned conduct (Marshall, 2002). Temporal structure further intensifies this regulatory capacity.

Predictable sequences of action organize anticipation and coordination within social interaction. Smith and Stewart's study of ritualized temporal frameworks in organizational and institutional settings in contemporary Western societies demonstrates how recurring ceremonial routines align individual conduct with institutional expectations and contribute to the stabilization of collective norms. Evidence from extreme historical circumstances further illustrates the power of ritualized temporality (Smith & Stewart, 2011).

Research on Jewish prisoners in Nazi concentration camps in Europe shows that even under conditions of radical disruption ritual practices created symbolic temporal continuity that helped preserve identity and a sense of agency. Ritual acts performed in the camps generated alternative temporal orders that linked prisoners to collective memory and sustained personal identity within the regime of death (Rachmani, 2016). These studies collectively suggest that ritual integrates bodily discipline, temporal order, and social coordination in ways that generate compliance through structured participation rather than symbolic representation alone.

A related body of scholarship examines ritual as an instrument of governance. In this literature ritual stabilizes social order by embedding normative expectations within shared participation. Lane (1979) shows that public rituals reinforce political legitimacy by integrating ideological values into collective experience, encouraging compliance without direct coercion. Similar dynamics appear in organizational contexts where ritual structures roles, responsibilities, and sequences of action that align individuals with institutional expectations (Smith & Stewart, 2011). Tan (2011) describes comparable functions in Confucian philosophy, where ritual propriety operates alongside formal law as a mechanism of moral governance. Psychological research likewise indicates that ritual shapes emotional and motivational orientations that guide individuals toward collective goals (Rossano, 2020). Across these perspectives ritual emerges as a mechanism through which communities organize membership, stabilize expectations, and maintain social boundaries through repeated participation rather than formal enforcement.

Despite these theoretical developments scholarship on marriage rituals remains largely oriented toward symbolic interpretation, kinship structures, and cosmological meaning (Borneman, 1996; Palimbong et al., 2025). Such approaches illuminate the cultural significance of marriage ceremonies but rarely examine how these rituals regulate membership or produce compliance through procedural participation. This analytical gap becomes particularly important in contexts where marriage rituals involve deadlines, sanctions, and differentiated membership categories. In such cases ritual performance may function not only as symbolic affirmation but also as a procedural requirement determining access to communal status and rights.

Research on indigenous citizenship provides additional insight into how membership systems operate outside state-centered legal frameworks. Many indigenous communities regulate belonging through locally recognized practices rather than formal state documentation. Zapotec communities in Oaxaca, Mexico, have reorganized colonial institutions to maintain territorial governance through communal labor systems and collective decision-making (Aquino Centeno, 2024). Indigenous communities in the Sierra Nevada de Santa Marta similarly assert autonomy through control over territory, legal jurisdiction, and internal governance structures (Ulloa, 2011). In Bolivia the Guarani autonomy in Charagua demonstrates how indigenous political institutions can function alongside national governance while retaining authority over internal community regulation (Postero & Tockman, 2020). These cases illustrate how indigenous citizenship often emerges from localized practices that determine membership, distribute rights, and enforce authority within community structures.

Marriage rituals frequently occupy a central position within these governance systems because they function as mechanisms through which communities confer full social membership. Failure to complete marital obligations may lead to exclusion from inheritance rights, restrictions on political participation, or loss of access to communal resources. Among the Dagaaba of northern Ghana incomplete bridewealth payments can leave women and children in uncertain positions regarding inheritance and lineage affiliation (Akurugu et al., 2022). In Batak society in Indonesia violations of marriage rules may result in exclusion from customary assemblies and restrictions on participation in traditional institutions (Taufika et al., 2025). In matrilineal communities in India marriages conducted outside lineage systems may lead to revocation of inheritance rights and dissolution of social ties that structure land ownership and welfare access (Brulé & Gaikwad, 2021). Similar patterns appear in rural China where women who marry outside their villages may lose access to collective land revenues and village benefits (Po, 2020). These cases

demonstrate how marriage institutions regulate belonging and reconfigure local forms of citizenship.

Research on Balinese customary villages further illustrates how such systems operate. Desa adat function as socio-religious institutions that regulate communal life through customary law known as *awig-awig*. Studies show that these villages possess authority to define membership categories, impose sanctions for noncompliance, and regulate participation in communal institutions (Astawa et al., 2019; Kastama et al., 2025). Membership stratification distinguishes between full members, commonly referred to as *krama ngarep* or *krama pengarep*, and limited-status residents such as *tamiu* or *krama nyungsung* (Praditha, 2024; Prasada et al., 2025; Warren, 2007; Wedawitry Wp. Ms et al., 2022). Full membership grants access to collective decision-making, temple institutions, and communal property while requiring fulfillment of ritual obligations. Through these arrangements desa adat generate differentiated forms of citizenship in which rights and responsibilities are closely linked to ritual participation and communal duties.

Earlier scholarship on Balinese society largely interpreted these systems through cultural frameworks emphasizing Hindu cosmology, reciprocal obligations, and ideals of social harmony (Brett, 2015; Eiseman, 2011; Geertz, 1980; Warren, 2007). Connor and Vickers (2003) observe that dominant cultural narratives in Bali historically integrated Balinese identity into national discourse by presenting Hindu culture as the principal marker of communal belonging. While these interpretations illuminate important symbolic dimensions, they often foreground cultural ideals rather than the procedural mechanisms through which ritual obligations regulate everyday conduct. Consequently the ways in which ritual requirements, temporal deadlines, and material sanctions interact to structure compliance have received limited analytical attention.

Socio-legal scholarship has begun to examine customary governance more critically by analyzing how local legal systems operate alongside or beyond state authority. Studies demonstrate that customary law can function as a legitimate form of governance regulating community life through locally recognized institutions (Benda-Beckmann & Benda-Beckmann, 2009; Hessbruegge, 2012; Klein, 2024; Wardana, 2015). In Bali recent regulatory reforms have reshaped relations between *desa adat* and provincial governance, generating new tensions between community autonomy and administrative oversight (Sridana et al., 2026). Nevertheless, this scholarship remains largely focused on institutional authority and legal structures rather than on the everyday practices through which compliance is produced within communities.

Taken together the literature reveals an analytical gap. Although ritual studies increasingly recognize ceremonial practices as mechanisms shaping

social order, their application to marriage rituals and membership regulation remains limited. Studies of indigenous governance likewise emphasize institutional authority but rarely examine the embodied practices through which belonging and compliance are enacted. Addressing this gap requires attention to the micro-level processes through which ritual performances regulate membership and produce disciplined subjects.

This article examines the Balinese ceremony of *marebu agung* as a site where ritual practice intersects with systems of membership and governance. The analysis investigates how ritual choreography, temporal regulation, and status differentiation combine to produce social regulation without centralized surveillance. Through repeated participation and collective visibility ritual performance structures expectations and guides conduct within the community, functioning not only as a religious ceremony but also as a procedural mechanism that regulates access to membership and social recognition.

Three conceptual lenses guide this investigation. The first concerns distributed surveillance, referring to forms of social visibility in which community members simultaneously observe and are observed within horizontal networks. The second addresses how ritual requirements generate predictable consequences that guide behavior even in the absence of explicit coercion. The third examines how indigenous communities exercise local sovereignty by regulating membership through ritualized procedures that assign differentiated rights and obligations. By situating *marebu agung* within these processes the article contributes to broader discussions on ritualized citizenship, community-based governance, and disciplinary mechanisms operating within contexts of legal pluralism.

3. Method and Theoretical Framework

This study employs an interpretive ethnographic case study to examine the *marebu agung* ceremony within the lived social context of Desa Adat Binyan, Kintamani District, Bali. Fieldwork involved prolonged engagement in village activities, observation of ritual performances, and everyday interactions through which customary obligations are negotiated and enforced. Rather than producing a comprehensive cultural description of village life, the research adopts a hermeneutic orientation that interprets ritual practices as meaningful social actions embedded in local systems of authority, morality, and membership regulation. This approach allows ritual procedures, sanctions, and membership differentiation to be analyzed as socially situated mechanisms through which compliance and recognition are produced. The case study framework provides clear analytical boundaries defined by place, activity, and institutional context, while ethnographic immersion supplies the experiential and interpretive

grounding necessary to understand how disciplinary effects emerge through customary practices.

This methodological rationale is grounded in three interrelated considerations that build on the ethnographic case study approach outlined above. First, the research objectives require sustained engagement with the local practices, meanings, and social configurations that constitute the ritual complex, thereby necessitating ethnographic techniques including participant observation, in-depth interviews, and documentary analysis (Hammersley & Atkinson, 2007). Investigating ritual as an apparatus of customary governance demands methodological sensitivity to both explicit procedural requirements and implicit normative frameworks embedded in everyday communal interactions. Second, *marebu agung* constitutes a bounded system that can be examined through a case study approach, as it exists exclusively in Desa Adat Binyan as a mandatory requirement for marriage validation and the acquisition of *krama adat* membership. This particularity renders the phenomenon an intrinsic case warranting in-depth investigation for its own sake (Stake, 2006). Third, the theoretical objective of developing the concept of distributed surveillance necessitates analytical generalization from empirical findings to theoretical propositions, a form of inference that is explicitly supported by case study methodology (Yin, 2014).

Desa Adat Binyan (Binyan Customary Village), located in Kintamani District, Bangli Regency, Bali Province, Indonesia, serves as the research site. Chosen through purposive sampling for its distinctive marriage legitimation practices, the village is notable for the *marebu agung* ceremony, a requirement for marriage validation unique to Desa Adat Binyan. While other Balinese villages recognize marital legitimacy through *makalan-kalan* (performing a series of rituals intended to remove negative qualities) and *pawidhiwedanan* (marriage-consecration ceremony officiated by a priest and witnessed by family, and invited participants) rites, Desa Adat Binyan mandates this additional step as the final determinant of both marital legitimacy and *krama adat* membership. Stake (2006) classifies Desa Adat Binyan as an intrinsic case, selected for its special interest rather than as a representative. In addition, Yin's (2014) criteria for a single-case design are met, as the village documents a phenomenon previously unexplored in ritual governance and customary citizenship research.

Fieldwork was conducted over twelve months, from January to December 2025. This period aligns with ethnographic norms, supporting engagement needed to observe full ceremonial cycles and compliance dynamics (Creswell, 2007). Prolonged involvement was key to studying disciplinary mechanisms: observing how material consequences gathered over time, and how shifts in social visibility created pressure to comply. The research period allowed

documentation of the ceremonial sequence, from initial marriage rituals to *marebu agung*, observation of sanctions for couples exceeding the three-month *awig-awig* deadline, and continual refinement of analytical categories through repeated interaction with the field.

The theoretical framework guiding this research is primarily based on Foucauldian analytics of power, discipline, and governmentality (Foucault, 1979; Foucault et al., 1991). Foucault's concept of disciplinary power offers tools for understanding how procedures regulate behavior through normalization, observation, and examination. These effects occur without relying only on coercive enforcement. The idea of governmentality extends this by focusing on the rationalities, techniques, and practices that make populations governable. This includes moral economies and cultural repertoires that direct actions through internalized habits. Foucauldian concepts have been widely used to study governance mechanisms outside formal state institutions, including those found in religious organizations, schools, and community-based regulatory systems (Dean, 2014; Rose, 1999).

Complementing the Foucauldian framework, this study uses Bell's (2009) theory of ritualization. Bell sees ritual practice as a type of strategic action that shapes people through specific social activities. Her approach moves analysis from the meanings of ritual to the act of doing it, focusing on habits and skills developed through taking part in formal ceremonies. Blending ritualization theory with analytics of governmentality creates a way to study both broad governance and individual discipline within ceremonies.

Data collection employed multiple methods consistent with ethnographic case study methodology, enabling cross-source triangulation to enhance construct validity (Yin, 2014). Participant observation constituted the foundational method, involving regular attendance at village meetings (*sangkepan*), ritual preparations, ceremonial performances at Pura Bale Agung, and informal gatherings throughout the fieldwork period. Observational data focused on procedural requirements communicated to newly married couples, verbal and non-verbal responses to compliance and non-compliance, spatial arrangements during rituals, and interactions between customary councils (*prajuru adat*) and community members concerning ritual obligations. Observation also documented the tripartite *krama* classification system operating in Desa Adat Binyan, namely *krama nilem*, *krama jongkok*, and *krama banjar*, and examined how ritual completion mediated access to these membership categories. Detailed field notes, recorded immediately after observation sessions, included both descriptive accounts and initial analytical reflections in accordance with ethnographic protocols to ensure data quality (Emerson et al., 2011).

Semi-structured interviews were conducted with participants representing diverse positions within the customary village structure. To select these participants, purposive and snowball sampling strategies, appropriate for ethnographic case study research, were used. The sample included village leaders (*bendesa adat, kelihan banjar*), ritual specialists (*pemangku*), especially the *jero pemucuk* who leads the *marebu agung* ceremony, married couples at various stages of ritual completion, and individuals who had experienced sanctions due to delayed performance, including the daily contribution of rice (one *ceeng*, a scoop of rice from coconut shells) to Pura Bale Agung.

The interview protocols explored participants' understandings of ritual requirements, perceptions of the consequences of non-compliance, experiences of social pressure and visibility, and interpretations of the relationship between the completion of *marebu agung* and the recognition of *krama adat* status. Furthermore, key informants, including I Nyoman Pada (63) (*jro kubayan tengen*, traditional leader), I Ketut Sugita (41) (*petajuh adat desa binyan*, traditional leader), I Ketut Mudita (52) (*bendesa adat desa binyan*, village leader), I Putu Eka Juli Artawan (42) (groom), Ni Wayan Surini (36) (bride), provided essential perspectives on theological, historical, sociocultural, and legal dimensions underpinning *marebu agung* as a mechanism of marriage legitimation.

Furthermore, key informants were selected because their positions and experiences allowed access to complementary perspectives on the ritual's regulation, implementation, and social consequences, combining customary authorities responsible for interpreting and enforcing ritual rules with community members who directly experienced the procedures and sanctions associated with *marebu agung* completion. Interviews were conducted in Balinese and Indonesian according to participants' preferences, and were audio-recorded with informed consent and transcribed verbatim for analysis.

Documentary analysis complemented observational and interview data. This was done through close examination of the written *awig-awig* (customary law) of Desa Adat Binyan, particularly *palet* 3 (section 3), *pawos* 25 (article 25). These stipulate marriage requirements, such as the obligation to perform *marebu agung* and a three-month completion deadline. The *awig-awig* text specifies that couples who fail to complete the *pabyakalaan* ceremony (rite of purification) within three months are classified under *lokika sanggraha* status (a customary offense that occurs when a consensual relationship leads to pregnancy, but the man denies responsibility). This indicates marital recognition based on customary practice rather than full ritual completion.

Documentary sources also included official records of sanctions imposed for ritual delays, historical documents about the development of *marebu agung* requirements, and regulatory frameworks such as Bali Provincial Regulation

Number 4 of 2019 on Customary Villages. This regulation situates local practices within broader provincial governance structures. Documentary evidence corroborated and augmented data from other sources. Together, they formed a triangulation strategy that strengthens case study validity (Yin, 2014).

Data analysis proceeded through iterative cycles of coding, categorization, and theoretical elaboration, which followed established protocols for qualitative research (Braun & Clarke, 2022). The analytical strategy combined pattern matching and explanation building. Pattern matching compares observed empirical patterns with predicted theoretical patterns, while explanation building constructs narratives to explain how and why certain phenomena occur. Such strategies are suitable for theoretical propositions in case study research (Yin, 2014). The approach also incorporated thematic analysis techniques suited to ethnographic interpretation. Initial open coding identified recurring themes across field notes, interview transcripts, and documentary materials. Once identified, focused coding organized these themes into analytical categories related to the study's theoretical concerns. The study's categories included mechanisms of visibility in the tripartite *krama* system (the threefold membership structure in Balinese village organization), temporal calibration via the three-month deadline, sanction accumulation through daily rice contributions (penalties accruing as daily rice requirements for non-compliance), status differentiation between *krama adat* (core, customary citizens) and *krama tamiu* (guest, non-core citizens), and subject formation through ceremonial choreography (the structured participation of individuals in ritual practice).

Next, theoretical coding linked these empirical categories with concepts from Foucauldian theory and ritualization studies, which developed the construct of distributed surveillance as a governance modality operating through horizontal social networks, not just centralized architectural observation. Distributed surveillance, in this analysis, refers to social monitoring enacted collectively by community members, rather than surveillance imposed solely by authorities or formal surveillance structures. Throughout the analysis, negative cases and non-confirming evidence were actively sought, which refined the analysis, prevented premature theoretical closure, and ultimately enhanced case study internal validity.

Several strategies were implemented to ensure methodological rigor consistent with quality criteria for ethnographic case study research (Côté-Boileau et al., 2020; Stake, 2006). Prolonged engagement over twelve months enabled sufficient immersion to understand the cultural context and to build trust among community members. Triangulation across multiple data sources, including observations, interviews, and documents, enhanced construct

validity by providing convergent lines of evidence. Member checking with key informants verified the accuracy of interpretations and provided opportunities for clarification. A detailed case study database was maintained to establish a clear chain of evidence linking raw data to analytical conclusions. Thick description of the research context enables readers to assess the transferability of findings to other settings. A reflexive journal maintained throughout the fieldwork period documented the researcher's positionality and its potential influence on data collection and interpretation.

Ethical approval for the research was obtained from the institutional review board prior to the commencement of fieldwork. Informed consent procedures explained the research objectives, voluntary participation, confidentiality protections, and the right to withdraw without consequence. The research team maintained ongoing dialogue with village leaders regarding appropriate conduct during ceremonial observation at Pura Bale Agung and Pura Dalem. In addition, the team respected restrictions on documenting certain sacred elements of ritual performance, including specific mantra recitations and offerings (*bakatan*) presented to Ida Bhatara.

Several limitations warrant acknowledgment. The study's focus on a single case constrains statistical generalizability to other Balinese communities or customary governance systems elsewhere. *Marebu agung* is unique, found exclusively in Desa Adat Binyan. Thus, the findings support analytical generalization to theoretical propositions on ritual governance, not empirical generalization to a population (Yin, 2014). Regional differences in *awig-awig* provisions across Bali lead to varying marriage validation requirements that may use different disciplinary mechanisms than those in Desa Adat Binyan. The researcher, as an outsider despite prolonged engagement and linguistic competence, may have had limited access to some local knowledge. This was especially true for esoteric aspects of Bali Aga traditions or where interview contexts influenced self-presentation. The team partially addressed these limitations through triangulation, extended fieldwork, member checking with key informants, and maintaining a transparent audit trail. Still, these issues call for interpretive caution about transferring findings. Despite these challenges, the study affirms the validity of analytical generalization to broader frameworks on ritual discipline and distributed governance beyond the immediate research context.

4. Result and Discussion

This section presents the findings and analysis in two stages. First, 4.1 Result outlines four key ethnographic findings from twelve months of participant observation, interviews, and documentary analysis in Desa Adat Binyan: (1)

the configuration of sacred space and ritual actors with their materiality, (2) the required choreography of newly married couples, (3) the structure and consequences of temporal obligations, and (4) the tripartite *krama* system as the basis of social visibility in the community. Second, 4.2 Discussion examines how these findings engage with the Foucauldian framework, Bell's theory of ritualization, and literature on Indigenous citizenship. It also introduces two new conceptual categories developed through theoretical inference. Together, these stages form a single trajectory: from procedural description to interpreting the disciplinary mechanisms behind differentiated customary citizenship in Desa Adat Binyan.

4.1 Result

4.1.1 Sacred Space, Ritual Actors, and the Material Assemblage of Marebu Agung

Desa Adat Binyan is located in Kintamani District, Bangli Regency, in the highland region of Bali, known as one of the enclaves of Bali Aga communities, groups that are genealogically and culturally regarded as pre-Majapahit inhabitants of the island. Bali Aga communities are generally known for maintaining social structures, ritual cycles, and governance systems that differ from those of lowland Balinese villages that have been more strongly influenced by Majapahit culture. In Binyan, these characteristics appear in the strong orientation toward ancestral regulations codified in the *awig-awig*, the ritual cycle centered on the Bale Agung temple as the highest communal authority, and the *krama* system that organizes differentiated membership based on descent and the fulfillment of ritual obligations. Within this context, *marebu agung* must be understood not as a practice isolated from community identity but as an expression of an Indigenous order that predates the modern state legal system and continues to operate with its own authority.

Standing before the *chang apit*, the narrow gate flanking the main *kori* of Pura Bale Agung in Binyan, the simple architecture carries meaning beyond its physical size. On the morning of the *marebu agung* ceremony, this threshold becomes a focal point of both social and cosmological attention. The families of the bride and groom arrive with ritual materials prepared with precision. They bring *pejati*, *lis agung*, and *banten parebuan.* These contain coconut, *pis kepeng satakan*, rice, *benang tukelan*, *coblong*, and various leaves such as *daun putih kalah*, *kayu tulak*, *paku angang*, bamboo, and *pucuk dadap.* These are all bound together according to inherited ritual knowledge. *Tepung tawar* is prepared separately as a medium of purification and neutralization. It is composed of yellow rice, fragments of *dadap* leaves, and turmeric. Sixteen *bakti pengolem* are arranged for distribution to twelve *paduluan* and four *prajuru adat.* Each contains rice, *banten ajuman*, *segehan*, *canang*, incense, and *sesari*. None of these elements is incidental.

Each holds a specific place in a logic connecting the newly married couple to the village ancestors, cosmology, and customary authorities who witness and verify procedural compliance.

The human geography of this ceremony is as thoughtful as its layout. The *paduluan*, or principal ritual officers, are the *jero kubayan*, *jero kubau*, *jero kasinggukan*, *jero penyarikan*, and *jero saing*. These leaders are more than ceremonial; they ensure the ceremony meets *awig-awig* standards. Alongside them, the *prajuru adat* and *krama adat* serve as witnesses, turning a family event into communal record-keeping. In the *tri upasaksi* system (threefold witnessing), the whole community must serve as *manusa saksi* (human witnesses); without this, the ritual is invalid. The *jero pemucuk* (officiant) presides, making sure each step follows the *awig-awig* and connecting written law to ceremony.

What gives this arrangement its existential weight is the state that precedes the ritual. Before the couple completes *marebu agung* (major purification ritual), they enter *leteh* (ritual impurity). This non-sacred impurity excludes them from entering any temple in Desa Binyan. Notably, this status does not represent an external sanction but originates cosmologically at marriage and persists until purification. The implications are concrete: couples who have not completed *marebu agung* disconnect from village religious life. Fieldwork shows this obligation persists after death. Those who die without completing *marebu agung* leave the status unresolved, and their descendants inherit the obligation. Some families report misfortune after a parent's death; only later, through consultations with spiritual advisors, do they discover that an unfulfilled ritual obligation from the previous generation caused it. This dimension shows that the regulatory scope of *marebu agung* extends beyond an individual's lifespan.

The economic dimension of this ceremony is implicit. *Marebu agung* costs about 1.2 million rupiah; *meklaci* (a marriage succession ritual required when the bride originates from Desa Adat Binyan) can reach 15 million rupiah. In the customary context, these are not mere financial burdens but symbolic investments. They reinforce the family's social standing and commitment to custom. For the *prajuru adat (*customary council*),* the *marebu agung* cost is modest, so postponement is unjustified.

What takes shape in this space, before any processional movement begins or any prayer is spoken, is a device of recognition. There is a deliberate arrangement of objects, persons, authorities, and spatial relations. This collective effect renders the ceremony an event of consequence. It is an event whose outcome will determine the couple's position within the tripartite *krama* (village membership) structure of Desa Binyan for years to come. The sacred space of Pura Bale Agung (village central temple) is not merely the location where the ritual takes place. It is the space that activates it.

4.1.2 Bodily Inscription: The Choreography Prescribed for the Bridal Couple

Once all ritual materials have been placed and the witnesses have taken their respective positions, attention shifts to the two bodies that serve as both the objects and subjects of the entire procession: the groom and the bride. At this point, the ritual no longer operates through objects or words. It operates through bodily movements that have been prescribed with precision by the *awig-awig*. What the couple will experience in the moments that follow is not merely participation in a ceremony. They are undergoing a procedure that will permanently transform their cosmological and social status, or suspend it if the procedure is not completed.

The procession begins with the offering of all ritual materials at the Bale Agung. At this stage, the couple is symbolically repositioned within the ancestral lineage of the village. They are no longer two individuals who have recently married. They are two new members seeking recognition from a genealogical line that extends far beyond the duration of their own marriage. Their bodies are physically present before the *pelinggih* (a kind of altar), in postures that express humility and submission, before the procession moves into its most decisive phase.

From the Bale Agung, the procession moves to the *jaba bale agung*, the space located directly in front of the *chang apit* (Figure 1). This is where the core of the bodily choreography unfolds. As explained by I Ketut Sugita, the vice *bendesa adat* or *petajuh* (traditional leader) of Desa Adat Binyan:

> "*marebu agung ring depan chang apit, wawu ngeranjing ke jero sane lanang ngiterin bale panjang sane istri ngiterin bale plakayu arahne murwa daksina, wawu ngeranjing ke jaba sembahyang*"
>
> (the *marebu agung* takes place in front of the *chang apit*; afterward the couple enters the inner temple, where the male circumambulates the *bale panjang* while the female circles the *bale plakayu* clockwise, before returning to the outer courtyard for prayer) (Interview, September 2025).

This explanation clarifies that the choreography is not improvised but procedurally fixed. The groom begins a circumambulatory movement around the *bale panjang*, the structure symbolically associated with *Sang Hyang Purusa*, moving clockwise (*murwa daksina*-east to south) and completing three full rotations. This direction of movement is not an aesthetic choice. *Murwa daksina* corresponds in Balinese cosmology to the correct order, a movement aligned with the sacred logic of space. The three rotations are not arbitrary; repetition produces a rhythmic condition through which bodily discipline is inscribed beyond verbal instruction.

Meanwhile, the bride performs a corresponding circumambulatory movement around the *bale plakayu*, following the same procedural pattern. This division is not merely a differentiation of roles. In Balinese cosmological logic, the union of *purusa* and *pradana*, the masculine and feminine principles as two complementary forces that sustain cosmic balance, cannot be expressed adequately through words or static symbols. It must be enacted through the movement of two bodies that proceed in parallel around two structures that are different yet equivalent. The body becomes the medium through which cosmological abstractions take concrete form, a form that can be witnessed, verified, and collectively recorded

Figure 1. *Chang apit*, the place for the *marebu agung* ritual at the Bale Agung Temple (Left); A bride and groom performing the *marebu agung* ritual at *chang apit* Bale Agung Temple (Right) (Source: Field Research, 2025).

During the circumambulation, the *jero pemucuk* is present as an overseeing authority, not as a spectator. He moves with the couple, attentive to the unfolding sequence, sprinkling *tirta* (holy water) at particular moments where one phase gives way to another (Figure 2). The water does not interrupt the movement; it travels with it, settling briefly on skin, clothing, and ground, binding bodily motion to sacred space and ancestral presence. There is no room for improvisation: the direction of rotation cannot be reversed, nor can the number of rotations be reduced due to fatigue or time. Through this careful attunement between movement, water, and supervision, the *jero pemucuk*

transforms the circumambulation from a personal act into a verified one. The body's movement is not only witnessed but gradually made legible within the customary order; only when it aligns with the standards of the *awig-awig* does the act take hold as valid.

Figure 2. The bride and groom are performing the *marebu agung* ritual and are being sprinkled with holy water by the *jero pemucuk* (Source: Field Research, 2025)

After the circumambulation, the couple undergoes the *parebuan* process. This is the core of the purification rite at the heart of *marebu agung*. The *banten parebuan*, with its full set of prepared materials, is the medium of purification and the affirmation of a new identity. This is the moment the state of *leteh* that has adhered to the couple's bodies since the marriage is ritually neutralized. The *tepung tawar*, made of yellow rice, fragments of *dadap* leaves, and turmeric, is the neutralizing agent. It works not only on the social plane but also on the non-

sacred plane of the couple's existence. Previously, the bodies were prohibited from entering any temple in Desa Binyan and disconnected from the communal religious sphere. Now, they undergo the procedure that restores their access. When the *parebuan* is declared complete, the moment is especially significant, yet words alone cannot fully capture it. Only then may the couple enter the temple for the first time and perform worship at the Bale Agung and Pura Dalem, joining the ritual circulation that was previously closed to them. Just minutes before, they were in a state of *leteh* that barred them from touching the sacred space. Now, they move in as recognized members. This transformation is not the result of an administrative decision or a simple statement but happens through a specific sequence of bodily movements, carefully repeated and verified within the sacred space.

After this procession, what remains is not just the memory of a ceremony. What remains are two bodies that have undergone a formative procedure. Their disposition toward the customary order of Desa Binyan is now fundamentally different from before the first circumambulation. Their compliance in communal life does not arise solely from rational calculations about sanctions and benefits. Part of it is embedded in the way their bodies have moved through the sacred space. The patterns are prescribed by the *awig-awig*, witnessed by the community, and made irrevocable.

4.1.3 Temporal Obligation and the Accumulation of Consequences

When the couple leaves Pura Bale Agung after their marriage is ratified through *makalan-kalan* (performing a series of rituals intended to remove negative qualities) and *pawidhiwedanan* (marriage-consecration ceremony officiated by a priest and witnessed by family, and invited participants), an unspoken countdown known to all begins. The *awig-awig* of Desa Adat Binyan, *palet* 3 (section 3), *pawos* 25 (article 25), gives them three months by the Balinese calendar to complete *marebu agung*. This deadline need not be repeated by the *prajuru adat* (village customary officers) to each newly married couple. It lives in the communal knowledge, known not through formal documents but via daily conversation, observations of earlier couples, and community vigilance. Below is the relevant section of the *awig-awig* of Desa Adat Binyan detailing the rules, sanctions, timeframe, and consequences.

1. *Nganutin yusa sekirangnia sampun munggah dahateruna utawi nganutin undang-undang perkawinan*.
2. *Sangkaning pada tresna utawi tan kepaksa, Manut kecaping agama utawi tan gamia gamana*
3. *Perade pengambilanne siyosin agama patut ngemargiang upakara sudi wadani. Pawiwahan sane patut ring Desa Adat Binyan manut kecaping*

101 ring ajeng maka cihna ipun: Pewidhi widaan sanistannia pabya-kalaan, Kesaksiang antuk prajuru adat lan dinas

4. *Patut ngaturang bakatan ring pelinggih Ida Bhatara sane malinggih ring pura Dalem, lan ngaturang utawi naur claci manut uger uger sane sampun, lantur ngelaksanayang marebu agung sane kalaksanayang ring genah chang apit kori utama Pura Bale agung. Pemarginnyane wenang sane lanang ngilehin bale panjang pinaka linggih sang Hyang purusa, murwa daksina tiga paletan, taler sane istri ngilehin bale plakayu pemarginnyane pateh*
5. *Yening nenten kawentenang pabyekalaan manut ring ajeng mewates 3 (tigang) sasih kasinanggeh lokika sanggraha* (Desa Adat Binyan Customary Law, *Palet* 3 *Pawos* 5).

Translation:

1. Marriage must be entered into by prospective spouses who have reached the age of adulthood in accordance with the provisions of the Marriage Law.
2. Marriage shall be based on mutual affection without coercion and shall be conducted in accordance with religious teachings and in a manner that does not contravene prevailing customary norms.
3. In cases of interreligious marriage, the *sudhi wadani* (an official ritual for entering the Hindu faith after previously following another religion) ceremony is mandatory. A marriage recognized as valid in Desa Adat Binyan, in accordance with the provisions of Article 101, is marked by the performance of at least the *pabyakalaan* (a sequence within the wedding ceremony performed to purify the bride and groom both physically and spiritually) marriage rite and must be witnessed by customary village officials (*prajuru adat*) and government authorities.
4. Prospective spouses are required to offer *bhakti bakatan* (offering of a small pig by the families of the bridal couple for ancestral spirits) to Ida Bhatara enshrined at Pura Dalem, fulfill the obligation to pay *claci* (a type of fine) in accordance with applicable regulations and perform the *marebu agung* ceremony in the *chang apit kori utama* area of Pura Bale Agung. In its performance, the male participant circumambulates the *bale panjang* three times as a symbol of *Sang Hyang Purusa murwa daksina* (from east to south-clockwise), completing three rotations, while the female participant circumambulates the *Bale Plakayu* following the same procedure.
5. If the *pabyakalaan* ceremony referred to in point 3 is not carried out within a maximum period of three months, the marriage is considered to be *lokika sanggraha* (a customary violation that occurs when a

consensual relationship results in pregnancy, but the man denies his responsibility).

Three months is long enough for preparation, yet short enough to create urgency. In fieldwork conversations, couples and families made it clear that this deadline is more than a date; it structures when to gather ritual materials, consult the *pemangku* for auspicious days, and inform extended family. In practice, these three months feel even shorter because the Balinese ritual calendar's complexities don't always provide suitable days within this window.

What happens when the three months end is known throughout the community and needs no further explanation. Each day after the deadline, the couple must offer one *ceeng* of rice, a small measure taken with a coconut shell, to the manifestation of God at Pura Bale Agung. This sanction is imposed automatically by *awig-awig*, not by a hearing or *prajuru adat* decision. It is enforced not by daily judgment, but because the custom was established long before the couple was born. Each morning without *marebu agung* completion adds another *ceeng* of rice to a limitless tally.

The accumulating rice penalty differs from conventional legal sanctions. Fines are typically singular and final; here, one *ceeng* per day accumulates, creating pressure distinct from a single penalty. Couples delayed by a month face growing material and psychological burdens. They are aware that delays only worsen the situation. Each day adds urgency and difficulty to completion.

Alongside the material burden, a parallel burden of status operates. Couples who exceed the three-month deadline are labeled *lokika sanggraha*, referring to a relationship in which a man delays or avoids formal responsibilities to his partner. In this context, the label applies to couples who have not completed the ritual, casting their delay in a far heavier moral light than mere administrative negligence. In Desa Binyan's visible community, this category is evident without formal announcement. It shows in the couple's absence from customary activities, inability to access the temple, and suspended position between *krama tamiu* and *krama adat*.

I Ketut Mudita, as a *bendesa* (traditional leader) of Desa Adat Binyan, explained that without completing *marebu agung*, a couple cannot be recognized as *krama adat*, a point not needing elaboration since its meaning is widely understood. I Ketut Sugita, as a *petajuh* (traditional leader), added that such couples are seen as second-class residents lacking the full rights and obligations of other villagers. These statements, delivered descriptively rather than threateningly, illustrate how social sanctions work here: not through public declarations, but through the ongoing community assessment of status in daily life.

Yet the consequences of delay extend past the couple's lives. While rare, the *prajuru adat* have seen rituals to settle obligations for descendants of villagers who died before completing *marebu agung*. These rare events still matter greatly in the community's rules. As examples seen by customs authorities, they remind everyone: obligation does not end with death. Here, descendants fulfill the duty in new ways since the original person is gone. This shifts the community's sense of obligation. The three-month deadline is a first limit; if missed, the duty can last past death and into the next generation.

Beyond the daily rice sanction, temporal obligation in *marebu agung* is further structured through differentiated material responsibilities that reinforce urgency rather than excuse delay. I Ketut Sugita, the *petajuh* (vice *bendesa adat*) of Desa Adat Binyan, explained that:

> "*sane patut nawur klaci nika nak istri manten, sane nawur nak istri sane keambil driki kemanten, yening uli luar Binyan ten nawur klaci, tuah marebu agung kemanten ten medaging klaci, yen meklaci wawu ngangge bawi, nanging yening marebu agung ten ngangge bawi*"
>
> "the obligation to pay *klaci* applies only to brides originating from within the village; if the bride comes from outside Binyan, only the *marebu agung* ritual is required without *klaci*; the use of a pig applies to *meklaci*, whereas *marebu agung* does not involve a pig (Interview, September 2025).

This distinction demonstrates that the customary system does not impose uniform penalties but calibrates obligations according to genealogical belonging and ritual sequence. Importantly, the relative affordability of *marebu agung*, precisely because it excludes costly offerings such as pigs, removes economic hardship as a legitimate reason for postponement. Temporal pressure is thus intensified rather than alleviated: the ritual is designed to be completed promptly, and any delay accumulates consequences without offering material justification. In this way, differentiated obligations operate not as exemptions but as regulatory instruments that close off excuses, ensuring that the three-month deadline functions as a real and compelling temporal boundary within the customary order.

4.1.4 Social Visibility and the Tripartite Krama System as a Regulatory Structure at the Community Level

In Desa Adat Binyan, a person's status is not documented or formally announced. It is shown by who sits where in a *sangkepan* (traditional meeting), who has roles in temple ceremonies, who enters sacred spaces, and who does not. The *krama* system, which includes *krama nilem*, *krama jongkok*, and *krama*

banjar, is a social map read daily by the community with no need for written texts. This map changes each time a married couple completes *marebu agung* and moves into a recognized *krama* layer.

Transitioning from the general description of status, the first group to consider is *krama nilem.* They occupy the highest position in this order. Membership is determined by lineage, not ritual accomplishment alone. The rights that accompany it are structural. These include the right to sit and participate in the *ulu apad*, the village's traditional organizational structure. This structure encompasses positions such as *pamuit*, *penghulu*, *jro saing*, *jro penakeh*, *jro penyarikan*, *jro sigokan*, and *jro kebayan*. In each customary meeting, the seating arrangement of *ulu apad* members is not just a physical layout. It shows an order that existed long before the current members were born and will continue after they are gone. A *krama nilem* who attends a *sangkepan* carries the full genealogical weight of their position, and their absence is felt deeply, not as a simple individual omission.

By contrast, *krama jongkok* or *krama bebas* do not hold rights within the *ulu apad* structure, yet remain visibly involved in communal life through *sekaa subak,* which manages water and rice fields, *sekaa gong*, which sustains performing arts in ceremonies, and *sekaa pesantian,* which maintains religious chanting traditions. Participation is not voluntary; expected absence signals one's position within the village's social ecology. Within this framework, *sekaa* are more than functional organizations; they are arenas where social status is confirmed through repeated, observable contributions.

The broadest layer, *krama banjar*, includes all community members who have completed *marebu agung*. This status grants the right to participate in customary activities at the *banjar* and recognition as a member of a community defined by shared responsibilities and mutual protection. Unlike *krama nilem*, membership in *krama banjar* is based on fulfilling verifiable ritual obligations, not lineage. Thus, *marebu agung* functions as a selection mechanism based on adherence to customary procedures rather than origin.

Beneath all these categories, or more precisely outside the recognized *krama* system, stand those with the status of *krama tamiu*. Couples who have not completed *marebu agung* occupy this condition. They are physically present in the village and know their neighbors. They speak the same language and live daily lives that appear indistinguishable from other community members. Yet, structurally, they remain outside the reach of full recognition. This condition does not need to be stated explicitly in every interaction to be felt. It appears in small accumulated moments: the absence of invitations to take roles in ceremonies, a place at the edge of a *sangkepan* rather than within the circle of full participants, the temple doors that are technically closed to bodies still considered *leteh*.

Building on this social structuring, I Ketut Sugita describes this condition without dramatization. Couples who have not completed *marebu agung* cannot enjoy the rights and obligations held by other village members. This simultaneous mention shows how the community understands membership: obligations and rights are two sides of the same recognition, not separate burdens and privileges. Those who lack full customary obligations also lack full customary rights. *Krama tamiu* have not yet entered this system of reciprocal recognition, which constitutes true membership.

Extending this understanding further, I Ketut Mudita explained that for the Binyan community, becoming *krama adat* signifies a form of acceptance that is total. It means being accepted by fellow humans, by ancestors, and by the deities at the same time. This statement is not an abstract theological claim. It is a description of what the community feels and understands in everyday life. This reveals that the boundary between *krama adat* and *krama tamiu* is not merely a social boundary. It is a cosmological boundary that separates those who have entered into a recognized relationship with the entire order, both visible and invisible, from those who still stand outside it.

Given this cosmological as well as social structuring, surveillance in such a system does not require a centralized structure. No single authority supervises who has completed *marebu agung*. That information is already distributed through communal knowledge. Neighbors, *sekaa* members, and relatives who attended the wedding know, and they observe if the next procession takes place within three months. Each member is both observer and observed in this horizontal network of visibility. No one stands entirely outside it, nor fully at its center. Surveillance operates because it is evenly distributed across communal life, present in every ordinary interaction without needing to declare itself.

The tripartite *krama* system, therefore, is not merely an administrative classification. It is an infrastructure of social visibility that makes each person's status readable at all times by everyone. Within this infrastructure, compliance with ritual obligations is not produced primarily by fear of formal sanctions. It is produced by the desire to move freely within the social and cosmological spaces that are fully open only to those who have completed what the customary order requires. *Marebu agung* is the key to that space, and the entire community knows who already holds it and who does not.

What must be noted in this entire system is that no procedural space for negotiation is available to couples undergoing the obligation. The deadline, the ritual sequence, and the consequences of delay were established in the *awig-awig* long before the couple existed, and they apply without exceptions that can be requested through deliberation. Compliance is not the result of an agreement reached with the community. It is the result of accepting procedures that have already been fully defined by the customary order.

4.2 Discussion: Ritual as a Disciplinary Apparatus

The findings of this study show that *marebu agung* in Desa Adat Binyan acts as a disciplinary apparatus. It integrates three layers of regulatory mechanisms: bodily inscription through ritual choreography, temporal calculation through accumulative sanctions, and distributed surveillance through a system of horizontal social visibility. These mechanisms form a governance configuration that produces compliance without centralized coercion or state authority.

The primary contribution of the study goes beyond confirming that ritual has an integrative function in communal life, a claim already established in interpretive and functionalist ritual studies (Moore, 1988; Whitehouse & Lanman, 2014). Its contribution is to correct the dominant assumption in that literature: that the regulative dimension of ritual can be understood only through symbolic meaning and social cohesion. The study shows that in an Indigenous community grounded in a sacralized moral economy, discipline operates effectively because it is distributed across the communal network and embedded in ritual procedures that appear to be purely religious.

The answer to the research question about how *marebu agung* constructs differentiated forms of customary citizenship lies in mapping how these three mechanisms reinforce each other as an integrated regulatory system.

Findings on ritual choreography as a technology of subject formation require an interpretive frame that moves beyond the symbolic readings dominating studies of marriage rituals. Bell (2009) argues ritualization is not an expression of preexisting meaning but a practice shaping the body through participation in structured action. This study's findings empirically confirm Bell's proposition within a context long examined through the lenses of cosmology and social cohesion. In *marebu agung*, the key mechanism is the regulation of embodied dispositions through standardized, repeated movements, rather than solely cognitive understanding. For instance, the groom's three circumambulatory rotations of *murwa daksina* around the *bale panjang* and the bride's parallel procession around the *bale plakayu* operate by engaging participants in prescribed bodily sequences witnessed by authorities.

This procedural observation by ritual authorities provides collective verification and reinforces habitual compliance. Hobson et al. (2018) show that repetitive ritual movements regulate participants' affective orientation and behavioral disposition. In this context, collectively verified habituation emerges as the operative mechanism: participants perform movements under scrutiny, ensuring actions are valid and internalized. While these circumambulations also have a cosmological dimension linking the couple to the wider Balinese order, this operates alongside the regulatory effects of bodily movement. Analyzing only cosmological aspects without considering the role of standardized action

yields an incomplete understanding of ritual efficacy. Marshall (2002) notes that habituation arises from repeated engagement in specific sequences, shaping stable dispositions. Thus, in *marebu agung*, ritual choreography establishes not just cosmological orientation toward village order, but also a bodily readiness to adhere to custom as essential for social legitimacy.

The findings on the system of deadlines and accumulative sanctions introduce a temporal dimension. This area has not been addressed enough in the literature on discipline and community governance. If bodily inscription operates at the moment of ritual, temporal regulation works in the period before ritual completion. The relationship between these findings is structural. The temporal system creates conditions that make the ritual a future obligation, while also increasing pressure as each day passes. Smith and Stewart (2011) show that temporal frameworks align individual behavior with institutional expectations. The one *ceeng* of rice per day has no maximum limit. Its consequences continue past the individual's death. This system is empirically distinct from temporal models discussed in organizational or ritual studies. Conventional sanction systems, as noted by Akurugu et al. (2022) in Dagaaba bridewealth and by Taufika et al. (2025) in Batak marriage, are static and categorical: consequences depend on violation status, not time. Binyan stands out because time itself becomes a regulating force, turning each delay into a measurable material burden. This creates a rational economic logic for compliance rather than postponement.

The engagement with key literature produces a map with three zones: confirmation, extension, and correction. In confirmation, these findings align with Foucault (1979): disciplinary power works by normalization and observation, producing compliant subjects without explicit coercion. In extension, these findings develop Foucault et al. (1991) on governmentality. The governance of a population operates not only through explicit regulatory techniques but also by internalizing norms in ritual procedures and a sacralized moral economy. In correction, these findings challenge the panoptic model assuming an asymmetrical gaze between a central observer and observed subjects. In Binyan Village, there is no watchtower or single authority tracking who has completed *marebu agung*. Instead, information spreads via communal knowledge and a system of horizontal visibility, involving all community members as observers and the observed. Lane (1979) and Rossano (2020) support that public ritual integrates ideological values into collective consciousness without coercion, though they do not specify the mechanism of horizontal visibility identified here.

These findings call for two new analytical categories not found in the current literature. The first is distributed surveillance, which differs from the Foucauldian panopticon. Distributed surveillance is a type of social monitoring

with no central agent or structure. Instead, it relies on horizontal visibility: each community member is both observer and observed. In the panopticon, there is a structural asymmetry between watcher and watched. In *marebu agung*, by contrast, all positions are relatively equal; nobody is fully outside the community's view, and nobody controls observation.

The second category is procedural suspension. This condition withholds full recognition until a ritual is performed; the delay becomes the regulatory device. Procedural suspension differs structurally from two other models: (1) deliberative inclusion, as identified by Aquino Centeno (2024) for Zapotec communities, where membership is restored through participation and negotiation, and (2) institutional autonomy, described by Postero and Tockman (2020) for Guarani Charagua, where Indigenous institutions regulate membership apart from the state. In contrast, procedural suspension avoids definitive inclusion or exclusion. It creates a liminal state in which waiting for recognition enforces compliance.

The claim of originality for the concept of distributed surveillance must be explicitly positioned within surveillance studies. Mathiesen (1997) introduced the synopticon to complement the Foucauldian panopticon: the panopticon describes surveillance by the few over the many; the synopticon, surveillance by the many over the few, exemplified in societies of spectacle such as television and mass media. Andrejevic (2002) introduced lateral surveillance, referring to horizontal monitoring among citizens via digital technologies, enabling daily mutual observation. Both offer relevant points of comparison, yet neither explains the specific mechanisms in Desa Binyan, which differ for two structural reasons.

First, the synopticon and lateral surveillance require technological or institutional mediation as their infrastructure. In contrast, distributed surveillance in *marebu agung* operates entirely without such mediation; it depends on communal co-presence and a shared knowledge of ritual obligations, inferred from participation in customary activities. Second, lateral surveillance and the synopticon do not presuppose that observers are invested in the observed compliance. Conversely, in the tripartite *krama* system of Binyan Village, every member has a substantive interest in others' compliance, as the integrity of recognition relies on collectively maintained ritual obligations. Thus, surveillance is not driven by technology or spectacle, but by shared stakeholdership. Therefore, distributed surveillance is better seen as a form of governmentality shaped by a sacralized moral economy, rather than merely as a type of horizontal surveillance in contemporary studies.

The study demonstrates the limitations of current approaches to marriage rituals and Indigenous citizenship research. These methods often focus on texts, meanings, or informants' narratives, but they overlook procedural, material,

and temporal dimensions of the practice. Relying mainly on interviews about ritual meaning risks reproducing narratives that communities prefer to project, rather than revealing how compliance is generated. This research used a twelve-month, field-based ethnography. It allowed observation of how disciplinary mechanisms work in daily life, not just at ceremonies. Future studies can test improving by integrating procedural analysis of *awig-awig* texts, observing real-time compliance dynamics, and conducting interviews that distinguish normative explanations from lived experiences. Without such methodological differentiation, studies risk producing culturally rich but analytically blunt accounts that obscure the mechanisms of power behind symbolic narratives.

The validity of these findings is limited by specific, non-universal conditions. First, distributed surveillance works only in dense social communities, where people can notice an individual's absence from customary activities and interpret it as a status signal. In urban or highly mobile communities, different patterns emerge, as horizontal visibility networks cannot function the same way. Second, procedural suspension works only where customary citizenship still holds enough value, making the hope of status restoration an effective motivator. If citizenship loses practical relevance due to urbanization or economic changes, this mechanism weakens. Third, the idea that consequences extend beyond death depends on cosmological beliefs linking individual actions to descendants' fate. Researchers must verify these conditions before applying this analytical framework to new contexts.

This study has policy implications for customary governance and legal pluralism in Indonesia. It shows how customary villages create compliance and differentiated citizenship separately from state law. Bali Provincial Regulation Number 4 of 2019 puts local practices into a broader provincial regulatory framework. This creates tension between communal autonomy and state-imposed governance standards. The findings show that systems like *marebu agung* are not just cultural traditions; they are governance systems with coherent logic and effective regulation. Policies that ignore this logic, or assess customary systems only by formal rights and procedural equality, risk misunderstanding these communities. Such approaches can lead to interventions that undermine their regulatory capacity.

This study has some limitations. It looks at one specific community, making it hard to compare differences in how rules are enforced across other Indigenous groups. This is not just about statistics, but also about understanding the limits of the findings more clearly. Some steps, like using different sources, spending twelve months in the field, and checking findings with key people, help make the results more reliable. Still, there are things that outside researchers cannot

fully know, especially secret parts of rituals that cannot be described for ethical reasons. Instead of being just a weakness, this limit shows where more study should start in the future.

Overall, this study demonstrates that customary ritual practices that appear religious in nature embed sophisticated governance mechanisms and deserve to be studied as serious objects of social science analysis, not merely as cultural heritage that needs protection. By illuminating these distinct pathways of compliance, citizenship, and social order in Indigenous communities of the Global South, this contribution not only enriches scholarly understanding but also calls for a re-evaluation of dominant models in Western social science, placing Indigenous practices at the forefront of future theory-building and policy consideration.

5. Conclusion

This study examines how the *marebu agung* ritual constructs differentiated customary citizenship through disciplinary mechanisms that do not depend on a centralized authority in an Old Balinese (Bali Aga) village, Desa Binyan, Kintamani District. These mechanisms include three mutually reinforcing regulatory layers: bodily inscription via verified choreography, temporal consequences that create anticipatory pressure, and horizontal social visibility that spreads surveillance throughout the community. These findings challenge dominant assumptions in ritual and Indigenous citizenship studies, which often reduce the regulatory function of ritual to symbolic meaning or social cohesion. This study shows that in Indigenous communities grounded in a sacralized moral economy, discipline operates effectively because it is dispersed throughout communal life and embedded in ritual practices that may appear purely religious.

This study introduces two interrelated layers of novelty. The first is conceptual: distributed surveillance works as a modality of governmentality without technological or institutional mediation. It differs structurally from Mathiesen's synopticon and Andrejevic's lateral surveillance because its effectiveness rests on the real stakes each community member has in others' compliance. The concept of procedural suspension describes a condition where full recognition is withheld until ritual procedures are completed. Anticipation of status restoration then drives compliance. At the methodological layer, this study combines procedural analysis of the *awig-awig* text, a year-long observation of compliance dynamics, and interviews distinguishing normative explanations from lived experience. This mode of reading ritual avoids simply reproducing community narratives. Together, these layers extend Foucauldian analytics beyond formal institutions toward ritual-based governance in legal pluralism contexts.

The validity of these findings depends on specific conditions that are not universal. Distributed surveillance needs dense social ties, so a person's absence from rituals stands out as a status signal. Procedural suspension requires that customary citizenship is valuable enough for anticipated recognition to motivate compliance. The long temporal horizon relies on cosmological beliefs that link actions to descendants' fate. Outside these conditions, the mechanisms may work differently or weaken. Using a single case limits the ability to identify boundaries and restricts the precision of generalizations. Policy implications for customary governance demand caution. Systems like *marebu agung* must be treated as mechanisms with internal logic, not just as cultural heritage needing symbolic protection, before interventions using state legal frameworks are applied.

The most urgent direction for future research is a comparative study across customary communities, within and beyond the Bali Aga context. This would test the transferability of distributed surveillance and procedural suspension to different ritual and membership configurations. Another urgent agenda is research on how descendants settle ritual obligations after the original subject's death. This phenomenon shapes a regulatory system that extends beyond individual life and lacks analytical precedent in work on governmentality or ritual studies. This study provides the conceptual and methodological foundation for such comparative work.

Acknowledgements

I express my sincere appreciation to all interlocutors in Desa Binyan who generously shared their time, experiences, and insights throughout this research. I am especially grateful to Prof. Dr. Drs. I Nyoman Suarka, M.Hum., whose guidance, critical reflections, and willingness to provide continuous support greatly strengthened the conceptual and ethnographic development of this study. Their contributions were essential to the completion of this work.

This manuscript used generative AI tools (Gemini AI) solely to support language editing, including improving clarity, grammar, and readability. All empirical data and interpretations derive from the authors' ethnographic fieldwork and documentary analysis. The authors take full responsibility for the accuracy, integrity, and originality of the manuscript's content, including all claims, analyses, and citations.

Bibliography

Akurugu, C. A., Dery, I., & Domanban, P. B. (2022). Marriage, bridewealth and power: Critical reflections on women's autonomy across settings in Africa. *Evolutionary Human Sciences*, *4*, e30. https://doi.org/10.1017/ehs.2022.27

Alasuutari, P. (2023). Conversation analysis, institutions, and rituals. *Frontiers in Sociology*, *8*, 1146448. https://doi.org/10.3389/fsoc.2023.1146448

Andrejevic, M. (2002). The Work of Watching One Another: Lateral Surveillance, Risk, and Governance. *Surveillance & Society*, *2*(4), 479–497. https://doi.org/10.24908/ss.v2i4.3359

Aquino Centeno, S. (2024). Autonomies and the Construction of Communal Economies in Zapotec Villages in Oaxaca, Mexico. *Latin American Perspectives*, *51*(5), 81–100. https://doi.org/10.1177/0094582X241297919

Astawa, I. G., Budiarsa, M., & Simpen, I. W. (2019). The Representation of The Tri Hita Karana Ecosophy in The Awig-awig (Customary Law) Text of Tenganan Pegringsingan Village: Critical Ecolinguistics Perspective. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, *10*(2), 396–401. https://doi.org/10.17507/jltr.1002.23

Bell, C. M. (2009). *Ritual theory, ritual practice*. Oxford University Press.

Benda-Beckmann, F. von, & Benda-Beckmann, K. von. (2009). Contested Spaces of Authority in Indonesia. In *Spatializing Law* (pp. 115–136). Routledge.

Borneman, J. (1996). Until death do us part: Marriage/death in anthropological discourse. *American Ethnologist*, *23*(2), 215–235. https://doi.org/10.1525/ae.1996.23.2.02a00010

Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2022). *Thematic Analysis: A Practical Guide*. SAGE Publications Ltd.

Brett, H. (2015). Performing Contemporary Indonesia: Celebrating Identity, Constructing Community. In B. Hatley (Ed.), *Performing Contemporary Indonesia*. BRILL. https://doi.org/10.1163/9789004284937

Brulé, R., & Gaikwad, N. (2021). Culture, Capital, and the Political Economy Gender Gap: Evidence from Meghalaya's Matrilineal Tribes. *The Journal of Politics*, *83*(3), 834–850. https://doi.org/10.1086/711176

Connor, L., & Rubinstein, R. (Eds.). (1999). *Staying Local in the Global Village: Bali in the Twentieth Century*. University of Hawaii Press. https://doi.org/10.21313/9780824864460

Connor, L., & Vickers, A. (2003). Crisis, Citizenship, and Cosmopolitanism: Living in a Local and Global Risk Society in Bali. *Indonesia*, (75), 153–180. https://www.jstor.org/stable/3351311

Côté-Boileau, É., Gaboury, I., Breton, M., & Denis, J.-L. (2020). Organizational Ethnographic Case Studies: Toward a New Generative In-Depth Qualitative Methodology for Health Care Research? *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, *19*, 1609406920926904. https://doi.org/10.1177/1609406920926904

Creswell, J. W. (2007). *Qualitative inquiry & research design: Choosing among five approaches* (2nd ed). Sage Publications.

Dean, M. (2014). *Governmentality: Power and rule in modern society* (2. ed., reprint). Sage.

Eiseman, F. B. (2011). *Bali: Sekala & niskala: Essays on religion, ritual, and art*. Tuttle Publishing.

Ekman, A.-B. (2023). Marriage as a pathway for justice for the Gabooye of Somaliland. *Journal of Eastern African Studies*, *17*(4), 557–574. https://doi.org/10.1080/17531055.2023.2328969

Emerson, R. M., Fretz, R. I., & Shaw, L. L. (2011). *Writing ethnographic fieldnotes* (2nd ed). The University of Chicago Press.

Foucault, M. (1979). *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*. Vintage Books.

Foucault, M., Burchell, G., Gordon, C., & Miller, P. (Eds.). (1991). *The Foucault effect: Studies in governmentality: with two lectures by and an interview with Michel Foucault*. University of Chicago Press.

Geertz, C. (1980). *Negara: The Theatre State in Nineteeth-Century Bali*. Princeton University Press.

Geertz, H. (2004). *The Life of a Balinese Temple: Artistry, Imagination, and History in a Peasant Village*. University of Hawaii Press.

Gordillo, G. (2006). The crucible of citizenship: ID-paper fetishism in the Argentinean Chaco. *American Ethnologist*, *33*(2), 162–176. https://doi.org/10.1525/ae.2006.33.2.162

Hammersley, M., & Atkinson, P. (2007). *Ethnography: Principles in practice* (3rd ed). Routledge.

Hauser-Schäublin, B., & Ardika, I. W. (Eds.). (2008). *Burials, texts and rituals: Ethnoarchaeological investigations in North Bali, Indonesia*. Univ.-Verl. Göttingen.

Hessbruegge, J. A. (2012). Customary Law and Authority in a State under Construction: The Case of South Sudan. *African Journal of Legal Studies*, *5*(3), 295–311. https://doi.org/10.1163/17087384-12342014

Hobson, N. M., Schroeder, J., Risen, J. L., Xygalatas, D., & Inzlicht, M. (2018). The Psychology of Rituals: An Integrative Review and Process-Based Framework. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, *22*(3), 260–284. https://doi.org/10.1177/1088868317734944

Jakubovská, V., Jakubovská, K., & Moravčíková, E. (2025). Philosophical Reflection on Selected Contemporary Rituals of the Everyday. *Journal of Education Culture and Society*, *16*(2), 133–146. https://doi.org/10.15503/jecs2025.3.133.146

Kartal, A. (2025). Cultural Codes of Marriage Rituals in Anatolia: From Ritual to Word in the Context of Oral Culture. *Religions*, *16*(6), 716. https://doi.org/10.3390/rel16060716

Kastama, I. M., Saka, P. A., Salendra, I. W., & Derson, D. (2025). Social Transformation in the Adaptation of Awig-Awig Customary Norms Within the Balinese Migrant Community in Basarang, Central Kalimantan. *The International Journal of Interdisciplinary Cultural Studies*, *21*(1), 217–236. https://doi.org/10.18848/2327-008X/CGP/v21i01/217-236

Khuan, H., Muhtar, M. H., Ahmad, Putri, V. S., & Arief, S. A. (2025). Customary Law in Modern Legal Systems: Lessons from Indonesia and South Africa. *Novum Jus*, *19*(2), 77–103. https://doi.org/10.14718/NovumJus.2025.19.2.3

Kindersley, N. (2022). Dodgy Paperwork and Theories of Citizenship on the Uganda, Democratic Republic of Congo, and South Sudan Borders. *Diaspora*, *22*(1), 103–122. https://doi.org/10.3138/diaspora.22.1.2022.11.12

Klein, B. I. (2024). Dina , domination, and resistance: Indigenous institutions, local politics, and resource governance in Madagascar. *The Journal of Peasant Studies*, *51*(1), 81–110. https://doi.org/10.1080/03066150.2023.2174854

Kulkarni, M. (2020). Rituals and Institutional Maintenance: The Case of the Beating Retreat Ceremony. *Journal of Management Inquiry*, *29*(2), 159–173. https://doi.org/10.1177/1056492618789995

Lane, C. (1979). Ritual and Ceremony in Contemporary Soviet Society. *The Sociological Review*, *27*(2), 251–278. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-954X.1979.tb00334.x

López, J. R., Gomez, J. R. P., & Orellana, F. R. (2025). Legal Pluralism and customary law in Andean communities: The case of the Casaorcco community, Ayacucho, 2020. *Edelweiss Applied Science and Technology*, *9*(3), 651–659. https://doi.org/10.55214/25768484.v9i3.5278

Marshall, D. A. (2002). Behavior, Belonging, and Belief: A Theory of Ritual Practice. *Sociological Theory*, *20*(3), 360–380. https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-9558.00168

Mathiesen, T. (1997). The Viewer Society: Michel Foucault's `Panopticon' Revisited. *Theoretical Criminology*, *1*(2), 215–234. https://doi.org/10.1177/1362480697001002003

McCarthy, J. F. (2005). Between Adat and State: Institutional Arrangements on Sumatra?s Forest Frontier. *Human Ecology*, *33*(1), 57–82. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10745-005-2426-8

Moore, H. L. (1988). *Feminism and Anthropology*. University of Minnesota Press.

Nhlapo, T. (2021). Customary Marriage: Missteps Threaten the Constitutional Ideal of Common Citizenship. *Journal of Southern African Studies*, *47*(2), 273–289. https://doi.org/10.1080/03057070.2021.1880750

Nkuna-Mavutane, M. E., & Jamneck, J. (2023). An Appraisal of the Requirements for the Validity of a Customary Marriage in South Africa, Before and After the Recognition of Customary Marriages Act 120 of 1998. *Potchefstroom Electronic Law Journal*, *26*. https://doi.org/10.17159/1727-3781/2023/v26i0a15298

Palimbong, D. R., Maknun, T., Lukman, L., & Bandung, A. T. (2025). Symbols in the ritual of Rampanan Kapa' in Tana Toraja Regency: A study of semiotics. *Edelweiss Applied Science and Technology*, *9*(4), 2939–2953. https://doi.org/10.55214/25768484.v9i4.6700

Po, L. (2020). Women's land activism and gendered citizenship in the urbanising Pearl River Delta. *Urban Studies*, *57*(3), 602–617. https://doi.org/10.1177/0042098019890769

Postero, N., & Tockman, J. (2020). Self-Governance in Bolivia's First Indigenous Autonomy: Charagua. *Latin American Research Review*, *55*(1), 1–15. https://doi.org/10.25222/larr.213

Praditha, D. G. E. (2024). The Role of Balinese Customary Law as a Social Institution for Immigrants and Tourists: Sanctions in Awig-Awig Against Krama Adat, Krama Tamiyu, and Tamiyu. *Istinbath : Jurnal Hukum*, *21*(1), 176–187. https://doi.org/10.32332/istinbath.v21i1.9895

Prasada, D. K., Ni Putu Sawitri Nandari, Kadek Julia Mahadewi, & Komang Satria Wibawa Putra. (2025). Sacred Justice: The Autonomy of Traditional Villages in Resolving Customary Disputes in Bali. *JUSTISI*, *11*(3), 796–814. https://doi.org/10.33506/js.v11i3.4326

Rachmani, M. (2016). Ritual Existence and the Preservation of Self-Identity in the Concentration Camps: Time, Body, and Objects. *American Imago*, *73*(1), 25–49. https://doi.org/10.1353/aim.2016.0006

Ramli, M., Rijal, S., Surya, R., & Malika, I. (2024). State, Custom, and Islamic Law in Aceh: Minor Dispute Resolution in the Perspective of Legal Pluralism. *Samarah: Jurnal Hukum Keluarga Dan Hukum Islam*, *8*(2), 872. https://doi.org/10.22373/sjhk.v8i2.15924

Rodgers, S. (1985). Symbolic Patterning in Angkola Batak Adat Ritual. *The Journal of Asian Studies*, *44*(4), 765–778. https://doi.org/10.2307/2056447

Rose, N. S. (Ed.). (1999). *Powers of freedom: Reframing political thought*. Cambridge University Press.

Rossano, M. J. (2020). Ritual as resource management. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*, *375*(1805), 20190429. https://doi.org/10.1098/rstb.2019.0429

Said, W., Hukmiah, H., Nur, S., Wahyuni, S., & Akbar, R. (2024). Marriage Traditions and Family Resilience in Bugis Bone Society: A Study of Islamic Law and Islamic Education. *Samarah: Jurnal Hukum Keluarga Dan Hukum Islam*, *8*(3), 1372. https://doi.org/10.22373/sjhk.v8i3.23227

Sieder, R. (2005). Challenging Citizenship, Neo-liberalism and Democracy: Indigenous Movements and the State in Latin America. *Social Movement Studies*, *4*(3), 301–307. https://doi.org/10.1080/14742830500330091

Smith, A. C. T., & Stewart, B. (2011). Organizational Rituals: Features, Functions and Mechanisms: Organizational Rituals. *International Journal of Management Reviews*, *13*(2), 113–133. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2370.2010.00288.x

Sosiowati, I. G. A. G., Malini, N. L. N. S., Widiatmika, P. W., Norvik, M., & Adni, N. P. (2025). The Role of Burdah and Ngelenggang Religious Rituals in Preserving the Loloan Malay Language in West Bali. *Jurnal Kajian Bali (Journal of Bali Studies)*, *15*(1), 345. https://doi.org/10.24843/JKB.2025.v15.i01.p13

Sridana, I. P. G., Windia, I. W. P., Suarka, I. N., & Beratha, N. L. S. (2026). Conflict and Harmony Between Desa Adat and the Bali Provincial Government Following the Enactment of the Regional Regulation on Customary Village 2019. *Jurnal Kajian Bali (Journal of Bali Studies)*, *14*(2), 567–586. https://doi.org/10.24843/JKB.2024.v14.i02.p12

Stake, R. E. (2006). *Multiple Case Study Analysis*. The Guilford Press.

Suárez-Krabbe, J. (2015). Race, Social Struggles and "Human" Rights: Contributions from the Global South. In E. A. Andersen & E. M. Lassen (Eds.), *Europe and the Americas* (pp. 41–72). Brill | Nijhoff. https://doi.org/10.1163/9789004279247_004

Suyadnya, I. W. (2021). Interaksi Kekuasaan Adat dan Negara dalam Perspektif Masyarakat Bali Kuno Tenganan Pegringsingan. *Jurnal Kajian Bali (Journal of Bali Studies)*, *11*(2), 517. https://doi.org/10.24843/JKB.2021.v11.i02.p15

Taggart, J., & Haug, S. (2024). De jure and de facto inclusivity in global governance. *Review of International Studies*, 1–25. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0260210524000627

Tan, S. (2011). The Dao of Politics: Li (Rituals/Rites) and Laws as Pragmatic Tools of Government. *Philosophy East and West*, *61*(3), 468–491. https://doi.org/10.1353/pew.2011.0043

Taufika, R., Ritonga, A. R., Arianto, & Ohorella, N. R. (2025). Consistency of Dalihan na Tolu vs. Same-Clan Marriage: The Intersection of Customary Law and Islamic Theological Doctrine. *Pharos Journal of Theology*, (106.2 (Special Issue)), 1–18. https://doi.org/10.46222/pharosjot.106.208

Ubink, J. M. (2008). Negotiated or Negated? The Rhetoric and Reality of Customary Tenure in an Ashanti Village in Ghana. *Africa*, *78*(2), 264–287. https://doi.org/10.3366/E0001972008000168

Ulloa, A. (2011). The Politics of Autonomy of Indigenous Peoples of the Sierra Nevada de Santa Marta, Colombia: A Process of Relational Indigenous Autonomy. *Latin American and Caribbean Ethnic Studies*, *6*(1), 79–107. https://doi.org/10.1080/17442222.2011.543874

Wardana, A. (2015). Debating Spatial Governance in the Pluralistic Institutional and Legal Setting of Bali. *The Asia Pacific Journal of Anthropology*, *16*(2), 106–122. https://doi.org/10.1080/14442213.2014.997276

Warren, C. (2007). Adat in Balinese discourse and practice: Locating citizenship and the commonweal. In *The Revival of Tradition in Indonesian Politics* (pp. 170–202). Routledge.

Wedawitry Wp. Ms, S. I. G. N. W., Gelgel, I. P., Windia, I. W. P., & Dwijendra, N. K. A. (2022). Philosophical Meanings Behind Differences in Population Status Domiciled in Traditional Villages (Desa Adat) in Bali, Indonesia. *Law and Humanities Quarterly Reviews*, *1*(3). https://doi.org/10.31014/aior.1996.01.03.21

Wejak, J. L. (2020). Marriage and ritual among the Ata Baolangu of Lembata, Eastern Indonesia: Meanings, practices and contexts. *International Journal of Asia Pacific Studies*, *16*(2), 29–57. https://doi.org/10.21315/ijaps2020.16.2.3

Whitehouse, H., & Lanman, J. A. (2014). The Ties That Bind Us: Ritual, Fusion, and Identification. *Current Anthropology*, *55*(6), 674–695. https://doi.org/10.1086/678698

Wood, P. K. (2003). Aboriginal/indigenous citizenship: An introduction. *Citizenship Studies*, *7*(4), 371–378. https://doi.org/10.1080/1362102032000134930

Yashar, D. J. (2007). *Contesting citizenship in Latin America: The rise of indigenous movements and the postliberal challenge* (Repr). Cambridge Univ. Press.

Yin, R. K. (2014). *Case Study Research: Design and Methods*. SAGE Publications, Inc.

Author Profiles

I Wayan Sukabawa is a lecturer and researcher at the State Hindu University I Gusti Bagus Sugriwa Denpasar. His scholarly expertise encompasses Hindu ritual studies and religious moderation. His research examines the integration of Hindu religious values into educational settings, character formation, and the broader dynamics of community life. He contributes actively to academic discourse through peer reviewed publications and sustained engagement in

research and community based programs. His scholarly work advances the development of contextual and globally relevant Hindu ritual practices. Email: iwayansukabawa@uhnsugriwa.ac.id

Pande Putu Toya Wisuda is a lecturer at the State Hindu University I Gusti Bagus Sugriwa Denpasar. His academic interests encompass Hindu philosophy, religious studies, ethics, and Hindu cultural traditions grounded in spiritual values. His scholarly work examines Hindu theological thought, local wisdom, and the application of religious philosophy within social and educational contexts. He has contributed to national academic journals in the field of Hindu studies with particular attention to the interrelation of spirituality, culture, and contemporary social issues. Through his research he aims to strengthen religious understanding, cultural identity, and ethical awareness in modern society. Email: toyawisuda@uhnsugriwa.ac.id

I Made Wirajana is a lecturer and researcher at the State Hindu University I Gusti Bagus Sugriwa Denpasar. His academic expertise includes Hindu philosophy, socio religious studies, and contemporary religious thought. His research focuses on the development of Hindu values within social, cultural, educational, and modern societal contexts. He is actively engaged in academic activities, collaborative research initiatives, and scientific publications at both national and international levels. His scholarly contributions strengthen the study of Hindu philosophy and religion in ways that remain relevant to global challenges. Email: imadewirajana@gmail.com

Ni Ketut Sri Rahayuni was born in Negara, Bali, Indonesia, on 4 February 1984. She is a lecturer in the English Department at Udayana University. Rahayuni teaches a range of linguistics and communication-based courses, including Pragmatics, Public Speaking, English Performing Arts, English for Hospitality, and Advanced Writing. Her teaching practice integrates linguistic theory with applied communication skills, preparing students for both academic and professional contexts. Her academic and research interests focus on pragmatics, discourse analysis, digital communication, and contextual meaning in social media interactions. Her current research explores pragmatic phenomena in digital and political discourse. Email: sri_rahayuni@unud.ac.id