

ADDRESS TERMS AND ADDRESSER-ADDRESSEE RELATIONS IN JAVANESE MORNING GREETINGS

¹Muhammad Ali Pawiro, ^{2*}Risnawaty, ³Annim Hasibuan, ⁴Dedy Suhery,
⁵Mohd Hamid Raza

¹English Literature, Faculty of Literature, Universitas Islam Sumatera Utara, Indonesia

²English Language Education, Universitas Muslim Nusantara Al-Washliyah, Indonesia

³Indonesian Language and Literacy Education, Faculty of Teacher's Training and Pedagogy,
Universitas Islam Labuhanbatu, Indonesia

⁴Department of Islamic Counselling and Education, Institut Agama Islam Negeri Langsa,
Jalan Meurandeh, Meurandeh, Kota Langsa, Aceh, Indonesia

⁵Department of English, Institute of Applied Sciences & Humanities, GLA University,
Mathura, Uttar Pradesh, India

*Corresponding Author Email: risnawati@umnaw.ac.id

Article Info	Abstract
Article History Received: July 2025 Revised: August 2025 Accepted: September 2025 Published: October 2025	<i>Greetings are always discussed in terms of sociolinguistics, semantics, pragmatics, and communication separately; however, this paper attempts to examine holistic perspectives. The research is especially aimed at discussing Javanese morning greetings which remain important and crucial in the modern era and technology that any Javanese speakers do not switch to using Indonesian or other international languages in communication. This research is qualitative in which data were retrieved from four online websites and four contributors. The population was 130 written utterances, and of that amount, 39 ones were taken as samples using purposive sampling. Data collection was carried out from November 2 to 10, 2022 involving online observation and data were analyzed descriptively. The research shows that, referring to social interactions, morning greetings keep Javanese away from individualism or individualist characteristics and the addressers assume the addressees understand Javanese. Morning greetings have high speech level or high Javanese (kromo inggil) and are not influenced by weather and routine. Only harmony and respect play a role since greetings are written in high speech level. All addressers also assume they feel "at homes" by the use of native language. Kinship titles and names are unavailable or Φ and do not relate to region difference, and sex and race variation. About mode of communication, all greetings use visual channel and involve anonymous addressers and addressees. The addressees' reception cannot be measured and the greetings fall under linguistic, but not interactional, routines and consist of 'recounting of one's mission' (without apology, gratitude, and thanksgiving as well as non-verbal behavior). It is concluded morning greetings symbolize the honor and do not always specify words concerning the attributes of participants, except the occupation and socioeconomic status, and are not preceded by God's blessing or shouts.</i>
Keywords Address terms; Language relations; Javanese morning greeting; Sociolinguistics; Communication modes;	
How to cite: Pawiro, M.A., Risnawaty, R., Hasibuan, A., Suhery, D., & Raza, M.H. (2025). Address Terms and Addresser-Addressee Relations in Javanese Morning Greetings. <i>JOLLT Journal of Languages and Language Teaching</i> , 13(4), 1631-1647. Doi: https://doi.org/10.33394/joltt.v13i4.16882	

INTRODUCTION

Social media platforms have attracted users worldwide and supported them in building connections and networks (Yao et al., 2025; Statista, 2023; Thoits, 2011), and web-based researches (Yao et al., 2025, Yao et al. (2025), Pelucio et al., 2025; Fekete and Gyorffy, 2025) have also fascinated researchers all around the world. Current linguistic web-based researches (Kupietz et al., 2024; Ru, 2024) have become linguists' interest and the up-to-date works on

greetings can also be found in several papers, for instance, Haq et al. (2023: 71-84) on Indonesian greetings, Rahayu et al. (2018: 516-526) on French and Indonesian greetings, Lasan (2025: 174-198) on English greetings, and House et al. (2023: 189-216) on English and Chinese greetings. “Greeting someone is what you do when you first see them... basically saying ‘Hello’” (Gerber, 2014: no page) in English. “Indonesian greetings can range from a passing yell to a lengthy and formulaic exchange” (SOLT-I, n.d.: 53). The SOLT-I noted four aspects, such as, age, marital status, religion, time and situation in greetings; therefore Indonesian greetings depend on the time of day, weather, and routine.

Modern Javanese (henceforth MJ) is spoken by about 80 million people mostly living in Java, Peninsular Malaysia, Suriname, and New Caledonia. Therefore, Javanese sits on the 11th rank of world languages by number of speakers (Laksono in Setiawan, 2013: 58). Before the existence of MJ, the previous language is Old Javanese (henceforth OJ) which “... is one of the Austronesian group of languages ...” (Zurbuchen, 1976a, b; see also van der Molen, 2015: 1). Meanwhile, the MJ has the ISO 639-3: jav with EGIDS Level 4= Educational (Klok, 2019: 300-313) for language vitality (see Figure 1 and for analysis of UNESCO’s nine factors concerning MJ status, consider Setiawan, 2013: 313) and becomes one of three languages indigenous to Java (Suharno, 1982: no page). The MJ covers a subgroup of five languages, for instance, Javanese [jav], New Caledonian Javanese [jas], Suriname Javanese [jvn], Osing [osi], and Tengger [tes] (Eberhard, Simons, and Fennig (2025) and MJ here belongs to jav.

Researches on linguistic aspects of Javanese show significant increases by linguists, for instance, Tho et al. (2020); Klok (2019); Wardani & Suwartono (2019); Yannuar (2019); Kraube (2018); Villerius (2018); Nurani (2015); Saddhono & Rohmadi (2014); Rahayu (2014); Quinn (2011); Widhyasmaramurti (2008); Sato (2010); Subroto et al. (2008); Nadar (2007); Kurniasih (2006); Ewing (2005); Wibawa (2005); Robson (1992); Irvine (1992); Suharno (1982); Alatas (1977); Zurbuchen (1976); Uhlenbeck (1970); Echols (1971); Poedjosoedarmo (1979; *ibid* no date); and Developed for United States Special Operations Command (1908).

Uttering Javanese morning greetings (JMG) in MJ indicate to preserve basic principles, such as, “harmony, respect, social conformity, good neighbourhood, and outlook” (Suryadi et al., 2020: 1-3; Pratama, 2018: 52). The “harmony”, as Magnis-Suseno (2013) argues, can be achieved by ignoring three aspects, and one of them is “respect” consisting of two main levels, namely *krama* and *ngoko* languages (Magnis-Suseno in Panggelo, 2023). The paper discusses Magnis-Suseno’s respect. When studying impoliteness in Javanese, Wijayanto (2025: 405) noted “impoliteness in Javanese can be either unintentional or intentional.” The first happens when “etiquette is violated” while the second is dominantly caused by a condition “when speakers intentionally attack others’ self-worth and feelings or emotional well-being through derogatory language and insults.” From her current research Farihaini (2025: 5) proved that “modern Javanese incorporates Indonesian ... within traditional speech level systems, demonstrating how communities maintain cultural frameworks while adapting to contemporary communication needs.”

Based on the time of day four formal greetings exist in MJ, such as, *sugeng énjing* or *sugeng enjang* ‘good morning,’ *sugeng siang* ‘good noon or good afternoon,’ *sugeng sonten* ‘good evening,’ and *sugeng dalu* or *sugeng dhalu* ‘good evening or good night’ (Suryadi et al. 2020: 4; see also Omniglot.com: Useful Javanese phrases). They belong to *kromo inggil* and Suryadi terms them as vertical but not horizontal greetings. Klok (2019: 302) translated *kromo inggil* as ‘high speech level or High Javanese’ and *ngoko* as ‘low speech level or low Javanese’ in English. Five variants of JMG include *sugeng énjing*, *sugeng injing*, *sugeng enjang*, *wilujeng enjing*, *wilujeng enjang*. When two Javanese communicate, they do not always greet each other with formal or vertical greetings, but other words might be used instead. For instance, the number of uses of kinship titles and names as greetings has a higher frequency compared to other types of greetings. Kinship titles and names might include *Pak/Bapak* + name, *Bu/Ibu* +

name, *Mas* + name, *Mbak* + name, or *Bang* + name; or, in short, just *Pak*, *Bu*, *Mas*, *Mbak*, *Kang*, or *Bang* with no names are indicated (Gusdian, 2016: 213-14).

Address terms (henceforth AT) is sometimes called forms of address or terms of address. In his review on Braun's AT, Marrelli (1990: 272) argued that AT is "invaluable as a bibliographical source" but Clayman (2010: 163) thought it "can be employed in the service of a variety of other actions beyond addressing per se," Research carried out by Ozcan (2016: 1001) indicated that "bilingual participants have a lot in common with the monolingual peers and although they were born and are brought up in a bilingual setting." Concerning AT practiced by British or Americans, Yang (2010: 743) noted four addresses, such as, the use of name, title, title plus name, or of nothing (no-naming form or Φ) and found three kinds of AT in her research, for example, region difference, sex variation, and race variation (pp. 744-45). Having compared the AT in Korean and American cultures, Hwang (1991: 131) found "different terms of address."

Previous studies on social interaction or communication—it is good to discuss AT—have been carried out by linguists, such as Cruse, Akmajian et al., and Lyons. Cruse (2000: 6) argued that "every mode of communication has a channel" for instance, the use of the visual. The AT is part of human social interaction and Akmajian et al. (1995: 344) proposed three parties in which one of them—the particular persons—is discussed. You can note Lyons' (1977: 34) notion of "successful communication" as shown in Figure 2 (he interpreted that "X is the source and Y is the destination" (Lyons, 1977: 36); he then elaborated that "the message originated by X is encoded by the transmitter into a signal. The signal is sent over a particular communication channel to the receiver" (Lyons, 1977: 37)).

The authors hypothesize that JMG might have (non)addressees or consist of expressive variants. In her Javanese basic concepts, Geerts (1961) argued that respect can be practiced by "postures, gestures and tone of voice, term of address, and, above all, by the language-level spoken," like, "respect" (*krama*) and "familiarity" (*ngoko*), as well as "high respect" (*krama inggil*) and "respectful familiarity" (*ngoko madya*) ... (see also Poedjosoedarmo 1979: 59; Nurani 2015: 17). About greetings Agyekum (2008) found that greetings, for example, good morning (*maakye*), among the Akan of Ghana is considered "informal and casual." Peters and Boggs (1986) argued greetings as interactional linguistic routines consist of apology, gratitude, thanksgiving, recounting of one's mission and are accompanied by appropriate non-verbal behaviour.

Caton (1986) noted several formulas of Yemeni greeting which literally invokes God's blessing on the addressee, for instance, *sabah-tu* 'May your morning be blessed' engaging a religious act (calling on God to bestow his favour on the addressee) and signals the honour and piety. Waldvogel (2022) opined greetings performs important social role and Youssouf, Grimshaw, and Bird (1976) found greetings in the dessert among Tuareg (northern Mali) have rules for distant encounters (*salaams* will be changed as shouts). They noted three sorts of considerations about participants in greeting production: 1) the attributes of participants: age, sex, social class, occupation, education, religion, and other general socioeconomic status attributes and special characteristics (e.g., haji), and 2) relations between participants: (a) history of relations between the groups, (b) history of interpersonal relations (e.g., power) among others, and 3) the audience characteristics and relations to participants. Firth (1972) characterizes greetings as "the recognition of encounter with another person as socially acceptable".

With respect to AT, several literatures by Dunkling (1988), Clyne et al. (2009), Dickey (1996), Dickey (2002), and Jucker & Taavitsainen (2000) need to note. The AT include names, words, and phrases and the most important of these is 'name' (first, middle, last, nick-, collective, place names), as well as titles, second-person pronouns, kinship terms, terms of affection and esteem. The AT refers to words or linguistic expressions that speakers use to

appeal directly to their addressees (readers or listeners) and hence, the AT is a speaker's linguistic reference to his/her collocutors or listeners (Hudecek & Mihaljevic, 2021, Hasegwa et al., 2013, Krapivkina et al., 2019, and Yeshchenko, 2020. About AT, Abduganievna (2021) argued about the first and second semiological systems in which the first is called addressee and the second addressee. He noted in the greeting *assalamu'alaikum*, two characters are found in the utterance: the addresser who pronounces the greeting and the addressee who hears such utterance. However, in case of JMG, after the addresser sends his messages, the addressee can not involve directly to respond since the relations of both parties are not bound by a condition where the two see each other. A gap in condition is available here.

This paper has six research questions: what social interactions and mode of communication are the greetings referred to?, what speech level of language are the greetings classified to?, what positions do the greetings occupy in the place of occurrence?, what greetings are frequently used?, how does similarity exist among source of data? and how to measure harmony and respect, addressees' reception, and to record the availability of kinship titles and names? The questions are aimed at comprehending how the addressers foster social interaction and communication, use language speech levels, posit the frequently used greetings and salutations, understand similarities between data sources, measure harmony and respect, and recipient acceptance, and note the availability of titles and kinship names. In contrast to previous studies that focused on JMG broadly, this study only identifies JMG to see the addressers' specific speech patterns to their addressees who significantly cannot provide any comments because both parties are hampered by circumstances.

RESEARCH METHOD

Research Design

This research is qualitative (see Creswell and Creswell, 2018: 254-293) in its approach and tries to understand social phenomena (see Aziz in Bungin, 2003: 18-33) of JMG from online sources and, hence, it is categorized as a case study (consider Stake in Denzin and Lincoln, 2009: 299-315; Creswell, 2009: 13) in which data case were retrieved from the Bola.com, Jakarta (the individuals or contributors were Faozan T. Nugroho for issue in September 2020 and the Anonym for June 2021), Kapanlagi Plus (the penman was Nurul Wahida for release in February 2021), and Merdeka.com (the writer was Addina Z. Fa'izah for publication in March 2021). Specifically, the method employed total population sampling (Etikan et al., 2016) because of small amount of data. Since the research problems were classified as contemporary utterances, the method exploited key contributors which were considered then as informants, and the population sampled involved addressers. In data collection procedures, the data collection type is document or specifically it is online public document (Creswell, 2009: 178-181). Moreover, the online observation (Tongco, 2007) is also involved and the type of data referred to the written utterances concerning Javanese morning greetings which were analysed descriptively.

Population and Sample

In this paper, the population is finite meaning that it is not too large. In a qualitative study, a relatively small and purposively selected sample may be employed (Miles and Huberman, 1994). The total population was 130 utterances, and of that amount, 39 were taken as samples using purposive sampling; with respect to research involving multiple cases, the most popular forms of purposive sampling are stratified, cell, quota and theoretical sampling (Campbell et al., 2020: 654). In this case, theoretical sampling is chosen and Campbell et al (2020: 654) argued its process involves either identifying cases from new groups, which might amount to being a comparison or a contrast with other groups, but the authors employ cases from four individuals. This involved identification and selection of individuals (see Creswell and Clark, 2011); the purposive sampling was 'used to select respondents that are most likely to yield

appropriate and useful information' (Kelly, 2010) and was a way of identifying and selecting cases that used limited research resources effectively (Palinkas et al., 2015). Meanwhile, the sampling parameters are influenced by four aspects, such as, background, actors, events and processes (Miles and Huberman, 1992: 56). The first was related to four different websites, the second involved four individuals or contributors, the next was concerned with Javanese morning greetings, and the last was about the utterances that the four individuals create and that were blocked from the online sources and moved to Word.

Instruments

The research is carried out by qualitative approach, so, in case of research instrument, the researchers become the main instruments. The research involved deductive, using pre-existing theories to guide the coding process, which guarantees a conclusion's truth if the general premises are true although Riazi (2025: 153) ever quoted Gilgun (2004) arguing "the deductive qualitative thematic analysis is less common." Riazi (2025: 155) added the deductive approach to qualitative data analysis and inference making, on the other hand, uses an already available coding framework and uses the components or categories of the framework to code the data. The researchers, thus, decided to use Deci and Ryan's (1985; 2000) self-determination theory (SDT) as a guide to code the data. The main components of Deci and Ryan's (1985; 2000) work include intrinsic and extrinsic motivation, supported by the needs for autonomy, relatedness, and competence; however, Riazi (2025: 155) applied SDT to code an interview. Qualitative research has limitations as it (1) is prone to researcher's subjectivity; (2) involves complex data analysis; and (3) has limited scope in its generalizability. First, a qualitative approach is interpretive (Candrakirana: 214). Theme development involves organizing codes into meaningful groups to identify patterns and relationships, thereby offering insights into the research question. In this step, the researcher transitions from a detailed analysis of codes and categories to a more abstract interpretation by creating themes (Naeem, 2023; Naeem, 2025). Themes may include patterns, trends, or relationships between different codes in thematic analysis and provide insight into the research questions or phenomena being studied (Creswell, 2013).

Creswell (2016, 409) defined validity in qualitative research as the extent to which findings are accurate or credible. Yin (2011: 78) stated that validity relies on the appropriate collection and interpretation of data so that findings can accurately reflect and represent the real world being studied. Lincoln and Guba (in Arslan, 2025: 386-389) introduced the widely accepted concepts of credibility and transferability as conceptual equivalents to validity in quantitative research. Accordingly, credibility corresponds to internal validity (such as, prolonged engagement, persistent observation, triangulation, peer debriefing, negative case analysis, referential adequacy, member checking, and reflective journal), while transferability reflects the external validity (for instance, thick description, purposeful sampling, and reflective journal).

Data Analysis

The data analysis procedures begin from data gathering of Javanese utterances up to polarized results. The first step consisted of data collection (gathering) from three websites starting from November 2nd up to 5th, 2022. The dataset was translated into English by using Google Translate and human translator. Pre-processing data aimed to record greetings with terms of address and addressee, and the ones without addressee and from these two stages, polarized results could be obtained. Creswell (2009: 185) proposed "a linear, hierarchical approach building from the bottom to the top" which is especially carried out through three steps: firstly, organize and prepare, read through all the data, and, lastly, begin detailed analysis with a coding process.

RESEARCH FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

Research Findings

Four general findings concerning general terms of address, greetings with and/or without addressee, and the similarity of ideas in the utterance are described here. The findings can be learned from Tables 1 to 5. In case of general AT Tables 1 to 4 have different data sources and the contributors and each table here is constructed into four slots in general; meanwhile, Table 3 refers to grand total which is arranged into three slots in general. Table 1 shows that all utterances do not include names, and titles, but in case of second person singular and plural, and affection/esteem, only utterances 2 and 6 do not mention.

Table 1
The Distribution of Address Terms

No	Javanese morning greetings with Addressee*	Terms of Address				Data Source
		Names	Titles	2SG & PL	Affection / Esteem	
1	<i>Sugeng enjing rencang-rencang sedoyo</i>	0	0	✓	✓	Contributor 1
2	<i>Sugeng enjing sedulur</i>	0	0	0	✓	
3	<i>Sugeng enjing wong sing gaweane sambat</i>	0	0	✓	✓	
4	<i>Sugeng enjing para pencari cinta sejati</i>	0	0	✓	✓	
5	<i>Sugeng enjing sayang</i>	0	0	✓	✓	
6	<i>Sugeng enjing sedoyo</i>	0	0	✓	0	
7	<i>Sugeng enjing wahai tresnaku</i>	0	0	0	✓	
8	<i>Wilujeng enjing sedulur</i>	0	0	0	✓	
	Sub-total	0	0	4	7	
9	<i>Sugeng enjing sedulur</i>	0	0	0	✓	Contributor 2
10	<i>Sugeng enjing sedulurku</i>	0	0	0	✓	
11	<i>Sugeng enjing wahai tresnaku</i>	0	0	0	✓	
12	<i>Sugeng enjing kanggeh tiang sedoyo</i>	0	0	✓	✓	
13	<i>Sugeng enjing wong sing gaweane sambat</i>	0	0	✓	✓	
14	<i>Sugeng enjing kanggo kowe sek paling ayu dewe</i>	0	0	✓	✓	
15	<i>Sugeng enjing sedoyo</i>	0	0	✓	0	
16	<i>Sugeng enjing sedoyo</i>	0	0	✓	0	
17	<i>Sugeng enjing para pencari cinta sejati</i>	0	0	✓	✓	Contributor 3
18	<i>Sugeng enjing sayang</i>	0	0	0	✓	
19	<i>Sugeng enjing wahai tresnaku</i>	0	0	0	✓	
20	<i>Sugeng enjing dulur</i>	0	0	0	✓	
21	<i>Wilujeng enjing sedulur</i>	0	0	0	✓	
	Sub-total	0	0	6	11	
22	<i>Sugeng enjing rencang-rencang sedoyo</i>	0	0	0	0	Contributor 4
23	<i>Sugeng enjing sedulur</i>	0	0	0	✓	
24	<i>Sugeng enjing sedoyo</i>	0	0	✓	0	
25	<i>Sugeng enjing wahai tresnaku</i>	0	0	✓	✓	
26	<i>Sugeng enjing kanggo kowe sek paling ayu dewe</i>	0	0	✓	✓	
27	<i>Sugeng enjing para pencari cinta sejati</i>	0	0	✓	✓	
28	<i>Sugeng enjing sayang</i>	0	0	0	✓	
29	<i>Wilujeng enjing sedulur</i>	0	0	0	✓	
	Sub-total	0	0	4	6	
30	<i>Sugeng enjing sedulur</i>	0	0	0	✓	Contributor 4
31	<i>Sugeng enjing sedulurku</i>	0	0	0	✓	
32	<i>Sugeng enjing sedulur</i>	0	0	0	✓	
33	<i>Sugeng enjing wahai tresnaku</i>	0	0	✓	✓	
34	<i>Sugeng enjing sayang</i>	0	0	0	✓	
35	<i>Sugeng enjing para pencari cinta sejati</i>	0	0	✓	✓	
36	<i>Sugeng enjing rencang-rencang sedoyo</i>	0	0	0	✓	
37	<i>Sugeng enjing wong sing gaweane sambat</i>	0	0	0	✓	
38	<i>Wilujeng enjing sedulur</i>	0	0	0	✓	

No	Javanese morning greetings with Addressee*	Terms of Address				Data Source
		Names	Titles	2SG & PL	Affection / Esteem	
39	<i>Sugeng enjang poro sedulur</i>	0	0	√	√	
	Sub-total	0	0	5	10	
	Grand Total	0	0	21	34	

Source: Personal

The asterisk (*) shows you to consider the English translation for the utterances written in (1) to (39) in Table 2. Table 3 summarizes the total number of second person singular and plural which are noted to appear 19 times, and the use of affection/esteem with 34 times. Wahida is noted to produce eleven utterances using second person singular and plural, followed respectively by Anonymous (10), Nugroho (7), and Fa'izah (6).

Table 2
The English Translation of the Utterances

No	English Meaning of Utterance
1, 22, 36	'good morning, all brothers (and sisters)'
2, 9, 20, 21, 23, 30, 32	'good morning, brothers'
3, 13, 37	'good morning, those who make complaint'
4, 17, 27, 35	'good morning, true love seekers'
5, 18, 28, 34	'good morning, babe'
6, 15, 16, 24	'good morning, all'
7, 11, 19, 25, 33	'good morning, my love'
8, 29, 38	'good morning, brothers'
10	'good morning, my brothers'
12	'good morning, all brothers'
14, 26	'good morning for you who is solely beautiful'
31	'good morning, my brothers.'
39	'good morning, all brothers'

Source: Personal

Table 3
The Total of Address Terms

	Names, Titles, and Pronouns				Place of Occurrence			Data source
	Names	Titles	2SG / PL	Affection / esteem	Initial	Middle	Final	
Javanese morning greetings plus Addressee	0	0	4	7	8	0	0	Contributor 1
	0	0	6	11	13	0	0	Contributor 2
	0	0	4	6	8	0	0	Contributor 3
	0	0	5	10	10	0	0	Contributor 4
Grand total	0	0	19	34	39	0	0	

Source: Personal

The analysis reveals that all Javanese Morning Greetings (JMG) consistently appear in the initial position of utterances, indicating their primary function as opening markers in conversational exchanges rather than as elements within or at the end of speech. This pattern emphasizes the sociolinguistic importance of greetings in establishing politeness, respect, and social connection at the beginning of interaction. Among the contributors, Wahida and Anonym demonstrate a higher frequency of greeting usage compared to Nugroho and Fa'izah, as reflected in Table 3. Furthermore, Table 4 indicates that *sugeng enjing* is the most dominant greeting form across all participants, appearing in 100% of contributor 3's utterances, followed by contributor 2 (86.6%), contributor 4 (83.3%), and contributor 1 (75%). Interestingly, none of the participants employed *sugeng enjang*, suggesting a shift or preference toward *sugeng enjing* as the standardized or more commonly accepted form in contemporary usage.

Meanwhile, *wilujeng enjing* appears less frequently but remains significant, being predominantly used by contributors 1 and 4, with moderate use by contributors 2 and 3. This variation may reflect individual linguistic choices influenced by dialectal background, exposure, or the degree of adherence to traditional Javanese speech norms in everyday interactions.

Table 4
Frequency and Percentage of JMG with and without addressee

Frequency and Percentage of SMSG with and without addressee									
No	Greetings	Frequency and Percentage							
		With addressees				Without addressees			
		Data from Contributors							
		1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
1	<i>Sugeng enjing</i>	7 (17,5%)	11 (27,5%)	7 (17,5%)	8 (20%)	9 (75%)	13 (86,6%)	13 (100%)	15 (83,3%)
2	<i>Sugeng enjang</i>	0 (0%)	1 (2,5%)	0 (0%)	1 (2,5%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
3	<i>Wilujeng enjing</i>	1 (2,5%)	1 (2,5%)	1 (2,5%)	1 (2,5%)	3- (25%)	2 (13,4%)	0 (0%)	3 (16,7%)
	Total	8 (20%)	14 (35%)	8 (20%)	10 (25%)	12 (100%)	15 (100%)	13 (100%)	18 (100%)

From Table 5, all utterances are dominantly rooted from the same ideas; contributor 1 writes eight utterances which are almost the same as what contributors 2, 3, and 4 do.

Table 5
Number of Similar Utterances

No	Morning Greetings and Addressee	Similarity of Ideas			
		Data from Contributors			
		1	2	3	4
1	<i>Sugeng enjing rencang-rencang sedoyo</i>	√	0	√	√
2	<i>Sugeng enjing sedulur</i>	√	√	√	√
3	<i>Sugeng enjing wong sing gaweane sambat</i>	√	√	0	√
4	<i>Sugeng enjing para pencari cinta sejati</i>	√	√	√	√
5	<i>Sugeng enjing sayang</i>	√	√	√	√
6	<i>Sugeng enjing sedoyo</i>	√	√	√	0
7	<i>Sugeng enjing tresnaku</i>	√	√	√	√
8	<i>Wilujeng enjing sedulur</i>	√	√	√	√
9	<i>Sugeng enjing sedulurku</i>	0	√	0	√
10	<i>Sugeng enjing kanggeh tiang sedoyo</i>	0	√	0	0
11	<i>Sugeng enjing kanggo kowe sek paling ayu dewe</i>	0	√	√	0
12	<i>Sugeng enjang dular</i>	0	√	0	0
13	<i>Sugeng enjang poro sedulur</i>	0	0	0	√

Discussion

All data consist of greetings in *sugeng enjing*, or *sugeng enjang*, or *wilujeng enjing* ‘good morning’ which are classified as *kromo inggil* (high speech level or high Javanese) utterance (Klok, 2019) and termed as formal (or vertical) greetings (Suryadi et al., 2020). Since *sugeng enjing* and its other variants is written in high Javanese, they can be interpreted as formal and not casual; it is different than what Agyekum (2008) reported that good morning in Akan is considered informal and casual. However, such greetings—it seems to me—are not influenced by weather and routine and these are contrary to what Indonesian SOLT-I has noted. The two aspects—weather and routine—do not prove to influence the addressees when the addressers

wrote their greetings; in this case, the addressers do not consider such aspects as their greeting materials.

With reference to harmony, conformity, and good neighbourhood (see Suryadi et al., 2020 and Pratama, 2018), we argue that only harmony as well as respect (Suseno in Panggelo, 2023) plays a role since the greetings are written in *kromo inggil* with a purpose to create the state of freedom from contention within social networks and to establish the balanced and stable relationships between the addressers and the addressees. Since all the addressers wrote in MJ, they imagined that they used their native language as if they were “at homes among the family members” therefore they “definitely provided native language input and opportunity to use the language in a communicative setting” (see Ozcan, 2016).

Kinship titles and names (see Gusdian, 2016) are specifically unavailable, regardless of the use of *rencang-rencang sedoyo* (see utterance 1), *sedulur* (2), *wong sing gaweane sambat* (3), *para pencari cinta sejati* (4), *sayang* (5), *sedoyo* (6), *wahai tresnaku* (7), *sedulurku* (10), *kanggeh tiang sedoyo* (12), and *poro sedulur* (39). All the utterances in 1 up to 39 do not indicate kinship titles and names since the greetings are neither followed by the combination of *Pak/Bapak* ‘Mr’ + name, *Bu/Ibu* ‘Mrs’ + name, *Mas* ‘elder brother’ + name, *Mbak* ‘elder sister’ + name, nor by *Bang* ‘elder brother’ + name, and neither by *Pak*, *Bu*, *Mas*, *Mbak*, *Kang*, nor by *Bang* only. In short, the addressees are addressed by “no-naming form or Φ ” or by no “region difference, sex variation, and race variation” (see Yang, 2010).

For mode of communication, the greetings which are shown in normal writing involved “visual channel” but not “auditory channel” (see Cruse, 2000) in which the addresses can be seen and read through specific websites. Akmajian et al. (1995) argued that three parties, namely particular persons, anyone who will listen, and ourselves, might involve in the interaction but data from the research can be classified as “the first and the second” since the addressers do not address directly, but write to anonymous hearers or readers although the addresses are dominantly and hopefully read by “anyone who will listen.” Hence, there are no specific targets the addressers make in their addresses. However, Lyons (1977) has different ideas on “successful communication.” He argued that successful communication can be influenced by “receiver’s reception of the signal and his appreciation” which cannot be measured easily in this case although, it seems to me, several addressers intend to speak to special addressees (see utterances 3, 4, 5, 7, and 14) rather than for others, which are indicated by the use of addresses like *wong sing gaweane sambat*, *para pencari cinta sejati*, *saying*, *wahai tresnaku*, and *kanggo kowe sek paling ayu dewe*.

From the addressers’ communicative intention, they seem, they need no cognitive responses from the addressees. Thus, the addresses meet Lyons’ (1977) proposal on model of communication in which “X is the source* and Y is the destination*” and “the message originated by X is encoded* by the transmitter* into a signal*. The signal is sent over a particular communication channel* to the receiver*.” The X and Y refer to the addresser and addressee respectively and the websites are considered as the particular communication channels and the Y is also meant as receiver.

Peters and Boggs (1986) argued greetings are interactional linguistic routines such as apology, gratitude, thanksgiving, recounting of one’s mission, but, from the data, Javanese greetings are only classified as linguistic routines but no interactional routines are recorded. However, greetings in MJ do not consist of apology, gratitude, and thanksgiving except recounting of one’s mission (see utterances 3, 4, 5, 7, and 14). The addressers’ missions are a little bit clear although they receive no set of responses from the addressees. In addition, they do not perform non-verbal behaviour. Greetings in MJ do not “literally invoke God’s blessing” (compare Caton (1986) for the use of expression like ‘May your morning be blessed’ when he did his research in Yemen) on the addressees. When greeting their addressees, the addressers do not involve their “very real sense engaging in a religious act” (see also Caton (1986)), in

which they “call on God to bestow their favors on the addressees.” Their greetings only signal the “concept of honor” but not “piety”; the concept of honor is shown by the use of high Javanese.

Waldvogel (2022) opined greetings ... “perform as important a social role in email as in other forms of interactions” and we can also argue that morning greetings are classified as forms interactions among Javanese and consist of importantly social role when the addressers think that they have to say something to the addressees at the first time of meeting in one occasion. Since morning greetings are a type of interactions, they symbolize the interactions of honor and play the harmoniously social role in the society although, most likely, among Javanese Muslims, such greetings are always preceded by *salaam* as the signal of “piety”. The combination of *salaam* and greetings might indicate “a call to Allah to shower His grace” on the addressees as well as on the addressers. Hence, for Javanese Muslims, such combination is considered the most important practice among other greetings which are only preceded by *sugeng enjing*, *sugeng enjang*, or *wilujeng enjing*.

The Javanese morning greetings have no other variants and the variety of language is fixed and is marked by the use of high Javanese symbolizing the upper-class ethics. So, the possibility to replace such greetings, for instance by the use of shouts, is impossible and this is different from what Youssouf, Grimshaw, and Bird (1976) argue that “among Tuareg (northern Mali), there are rules for distant encounters (*salaams* will be changed as shouts)”. In addition, it seems to me, the use of the English *hi*, *hello*, among others is very impossible for Javanese because the English words cannot be classified as high language. Hence, morning greetings are still considered to have aspects of “importance, form, or function” by Javanese social groups and the aspects are relevant to what Youssouf, Grimshaw, and Bird (1976) argued. Morning greetings remain important for today since they form social interactions so that Javanese will keep far away from individualism or from other individualist characteristics. They also function to have social role since they can glue Javanese society to think of harmony among them. This is also relevant to Firth (1972) who characterizes greetings as “the recognition of encounter with another person as socially acceptable”.

Firth (1972) proposed three sorts of considerations about participants in greeting production, such as the attributes of participants, relation between participants, and the audience characteristics and relations to participants. The first consideration has seven aspects (or attributes), for instance, age, sex, social class, occupation, education, religion, and other general socioeconomic status attributes and special characteristics (e.g., *haji*). Data from Javanese morning greetings indicate that the addressers do not specify any words concerning the attributes, except the occupation and socioeconomic status as seen in bold words in utterance 3 (*sugeng enjing wong sing gaweane sambat*). The words indicate that the addressers believe that some addressees are in the difficult socioeconomic status, or, even perhaps, do not have occupation or jobs. The word *sambat* ‘complaint’ can characterize the people in poor socioeconomic condition or in short of money.

The second consideration consists of attributes such as history of relations between the groups and history of interpersonal relations (e.g., power) among others. We argue that some morning greetings are of course correlated to historical backgrounds between the addressers and the addressees. The words *rencang-rencang sedoyo* (or only *sedoyo* or *sedulur* or *dulur* as independent words), *sedulurku*, *kanggeh tiang sedoyo*, or *poro sedulur* (consider the utterances 1, 2, 6, 10, 12, 20, 21, and 39) signify the history of relations between Javanese because of their great grand-fathers. Meanwhile, the expressions, such as, *para pencari cinta sejati*, *sayang*, *wahai tresnaku*, and *kanggo kowe sek paling ayu dewe* (see utterances 4, 5, 7, and 14) which are addressed to the addressees can be interpreted to denote to the history of interpersonal relations, although power does not exist in the utterances.

Concerning Firth's (1972) third consideration which is strongly related to the audience characteristics and relations to participants, we can argue that the addressers communicate to the addressees with assumptions that their audience understand the addresses therefore they use Javanese as the chosen language. By the use of Javanese as the chosen language, they tried to build cultural relations with participants who also think that they feel respected although they cannot give responses to the addressers.

CONCLUSION

All utterances neither have names nor titles and the 2nd SG and PL are noted to appear 19 times while affection/esteem 34 times. Contributors 1, 2, 3, and 4 produces 7, 7, 6, and 10 JMG with 2nd SG and PL respectively. All JMGs appear initially; contributors 2 and 4 produce more greetings than others. Compared to *wilujeng enjang* and *sugeng enjang*, the *sugeng enjing* has two frequency (5%); hence, contributor 2 and 4 write more JMGs with frequency of 14 (35%) and 10 (25%) respectively. About JMGs without addressees, the *sugeng enjing* are dominant with 50 frequency but contributor 3 is noted to use the *sugeng enjing* in 100%, followed by contributors 2, 4, and 1 with percentage of 86,6%, 83,3%, and 75%; all contributors use *sugeng enjang*. In case of the JMGs preceded by *wilujeng enjing*, contributors 1 and 4 write them in three frequency respectively, followed by contributors 2 and 3. The addressers communicate to the addressees with assumptions that their audience understand the addresses therefore they use Javanese as the chosen language. The JMGs have high speech level or high Javanese, which is classified as formal (or vertical) greetings, and are not influenced by weather and routine and addressers do not consider such aspects as their greeting materials. Only harmony as well as respect plays a role since the greetings are written in *kromo inggil*.

All addressers imagined that they are "at homes among the family members" by the use of native language. Kinship titles and names are unavailable or Φ as well as zero use in relation to region difference, sex variation, and race variation. In case of mode of communication, all greetings use visual channel and only involve anonymous addressers and addressees (the last ones are not considered as specific targets). The reception of the addressees as the receivers cannot be measured although several addressers intend to speak to special addressees rather than for others, which are indicated by the use of addresses like *wong sing gaweane sambat*, *para pencari cinta sejati*, *saying*, *wahai tresnaku*, and *kanggo kowe sek paling ayu dewe*. Javanese greetings fall under linguistic, but not interactional, routines and consist of 'recounting of one's mission' (without apology, gratitude, and thanksgiving as well as non-verbal behaviour). No greetings are preceded by God's blessing as piety, except by the concept of honor and by shouts. Javanese morning greetings do not specify any words concerning the attributes of participants, except the occupation and socioeconomic status and can be interpreted to denote to the history of interpersonal relations, although power does not exist in the utterances.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The first Author would like to thank the UISU's Faculty of Literature as the Organizing Committee of 2022 ESAI Congress and to the ESAI Central Committee Board (*Pengurus Pusat*) which have given occasions for presentation. We also acknowledge the Universitas Islam Sumatera Utara for moral support.

REFERENCES

- Abduganievna, S. R. (2021). Addresser-addressee relationships in structural-semiotic analysis of literature. *World Bulletin of Social Sciences* (WBSS), 5, 135-137. <https://www.scholarexpress.net>.

- Agyekum, K. (2008). The pragmatics of Akan greetings. *Discourse Studies*, 10(4), 493-516. <http://dis.sagepub.com/cgi/content/abstract/10/4/493>.
- Akmajian, A., Demers, R. A., Farmer, A. K., & Harnish, R. M. (1995). *Linguistics: An introduction to language and communication*. New Delhi: Prentice-Hall of India.
- Alatas, S. H. (1977). *The myth of the lazy native: A study of the image of the Malays, Filipinos and Javanese from the 16th to the 20th century and its function in the ideology of colonial capitalism*. London: Frank Cass and Company Limited.
- Developed for United States Special Operations Command. (1908). Introduction to Javanese and the Java culture. Corps Foreign Language Training Center: USA.
- Arslan, E. (2025). Validity and reliability in qualitative research. *Pamukkale Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, 69: 383-394. <https://dergipark.org.tr/en/download/article-file/4930996>.
- Aziz, A. (2003). Memahami fenomena sosial melalui studi kasus. In B. Bungin, *Analisis penelitian kualitatif: Pemahaman filosofis dan metodologis ke arah penguasaan model aplikasi*. Jakarta: PT. Raja Grafindo Perkasa.
- Bola.com, Jakarta. (2020). <https://www.bola.com/ragam/read/4348947/25-kata-kata-ucapan-selamat-pagi-dalam-bahasa-jawa-bikin-semangat-awali-hari>. Issued in September 2020.
- Bola.com, Jakarta. (2021). <https://id.berita.yahoo.com/33-ucapan-selamat-pagi-dalam-004040781.html>. Issued in June 2021.
- Candrakirana, T. (2025). Unveiling perspectives: The utility and limitations of qualitative research methods in understanding human experiences and behaviors. *Educationist: Journal of Educational and Cultural Studies*, 3(3), 210-216. <https://jurnal.litnuspublisher.com/index.php/jecs/article/view/248>
- Caton, S. C. (1986). Salam tahiyah: Greetings from the highlands of Yemen. *American Ethnologist*, 13(2), 290-308. <https://doi.org/10.1525/ae.1986.13.2.02a00060>.
- Clayman, S.E. (2010). Address terms in the service of other actions: The case of news interview talk. *Discourse & Communication*, 4(2), 161-183. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1750481310364330>.
- Clyne, M., Norrby, C., & Warren, J. (2009). *Language and human relations: Styles of address in contemporary language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2018). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed-methods approaches*. 5th Ed. London: SAGE Publications, Inc.
- Creswell, J. W. (2016). *30 essential skills for the qualitative researcher*. Thousand Oaks, California: SAGE.
- Creswell J. W. (2013). Steps in conducting a scholarly mixed methods study. DBER Speaker Series. <https://digitalcommons.unl.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1047&context=dberspeaker>
- Cresswell, J. W., & Clark, P. V. L. (2011). *Designing and conducting mixed method research*. (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Creswell, J. W. (2009). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches*. 3rd. Ed. Los Nageles: SAGE.
- Cruse, D. A. (2000). *Meaning in language: An introduction to Semantics and Pragmatics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (1985). *Intrinsic motivation and self-determination in human behavior*. New York: Springer Science & Business Media.
- Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (2000). The “what” and “why” of goal pursuits: Human needs and the self-determination of behavior. *Psychological Inquiry*, 11, 227-268. https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1207/s15327965pli1104_01

- Dickey, E. (1996). *Greek forms of address: From Herodotus to Lucian*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Dickey, E. (2002). *Latin forms of address: From Plautus to Apuleius*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Dunkling, L. (1988). *A dictionary of epithets and terms of address*. London & New York: Routledge.
- Eberhard, D. M., Simons, G. F., & Fennig, C. D. (eds.). (2025). *Ethnologue: Languages of the world*. Twenty-eighth edition. Dallas, Texas: SIL International. <https://www.ethnologue.com/subgroup/1561/>.
- Echols, J. M. (1971). A critical survey of studies on the languages of Java and Madura. A translation of A. S. Teselkin's *Drevnejavanskii Jazyk* (Kawi). Cornell University.
- Etikan, I., Musa, S. A., & Alkassim, R. S. (2016). Comparison of convenience sampling and purposive sampling. *American Journal of Theoretical and Applied Statistics*, 5(1): 1-4. <https://www.sciencepublishinggroup.com/article/10.11648/j.ajtas.20160501.11>.
- Ewing, M. C. (2005). *Grammar and inference in conversation: Identifying clause structure in spoken Javanese*. 18. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Farihaini, B. (2025). Language as culture: An ethnographic study of linguistic practices in Indonesian communities. *LITERACY: Journal of Literature Studies, Linguistic, & Language Teaching*, 1(01): 1-7. <https://ejournal.kabarmoe.com/index.php/literacy/article/view/32/32>.
- Fedorenko, E., Piantadosi, S. T., & Gibson, E. A. F. (2024). Language is primarily a tool for communication rather than thought. *Nature*, 630(8017), 575-586. <https://www.nature.com/articles/s41586-024-07522-w>.
- Fekete, J. T. & Györfy, B. (2025). Web-based tool for the rapid meta-analysis of clinical and epidemiological studies. *Journal of Medical Internet Research*, 27, 1-11. <https://www.jmir.org/2025/1/e64016>.
- Firth, R. (1972). Verbal and bodily rituals of greeting and parting. In J. S. La Fontaine (Ed.). *The interpretation of ritual*. London and New York: Routledge. Pp. 1-37.
- Gerber, J. (2014). 650+ English phrases for everyday speaking. <http://EnglishTonightBooks.com>.
- Gusdian, R. I. (2016). Penggunaan kata sapaan oleh pembawa acara “Apa Kabar Indonesia” (AKI) di TV ONE. *KEMBARA: Jurnal Keilmuan Bahasa, Sastra, dan Pengajarannya*, 2(2), 212-215. <http://ejournal.umm.ac.id/index.php/kembara/index>.
- Haq, M. Z., Samosir, L., Arane, K. M., & Endrardewi, L. S. (2023). Greeting tradition to build interreligious peace in Indonesia: Multicultural education perspective. *PROGRESIVA: Jurnal Pemikiran dan Pendidikan Islam*, 12(1), 71-84. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.22219/progresiva.v12i01.25778>.
- Hasegawa, T., Kaji, N., Yoshinaga, N., & Toyoda, M. (2013). Predicting and eliciting addressee's emotion in online dialogue. *Proceedings of the 51st Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 964–972, Sofia, Bulgaria, August 4-9.
- House, J., Kádár, D. Z., Liu, F., & Liu, S. (2023). Greeting in English as a foreign language: A problem for speakers of Chinese. *Applied Linguistics*, 44(2), 189–216. <https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/amac031>.
- Hudeček, L., & Mihaljević, M. (2021). Addressing the audience: Gender analysis. *Coll. Antropol.*, 45(4), 319–328. <https://doi.org/10.5671/ca.45.4.4>.
- Hwang, S. J. J. (1991). Terms of address in Korean and American cultures. *Intercultural Communication Studies*, 1(2), 117-133. <https://www.sciltp.com/journals/ics/articles/1991122010> or <https://media.sciltp.com/articles/sciltp/ics/1991/08-Shin-Ja-J.-Hwang.pdf>.

- Irvine, J. T. (1992). Ideologies of honorific language. *Pragmatics*, 2(3): 251-262. <https://www.jbeplatform.com/content/journals/10.1075/prag.2.3.02irv>.
- Jucker, A. H. & Taavitsainen, I. (2000). Diachronic speech act analysis: Insults from flying to flaming. *Journal of Historical Pragmatics*, 1(1), 67 – 95. <https://www.jbeplatform.com/content/journals/10.1075/jhp.1.1.07juc>.
- Kapanlagi Plus. (2021). <https://plus.kapanlagi.com/42-ucapan-selamat-pagi-bahasa-jawa-lucu-dan-menyentuh-jadi-penyemangat-memulai-hari-6605d0.html>. Issued in Feb. 2021.
- Kelly, S. (2010). Qualitative interviewing techniques and styles. In I. Bourgeault, R. Dingwall and R. de Vries, (Eds.), *The Sage handbook of qualitative methods in health research*. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.
- Klok, J. V. (2019). The Javanese language at risk. Perspectives from an East Java village. *Language Documentation & Conservation*, 13, 300–345. <http://hdl.handle.net/10125/24868>.
- Krauß, D. (2018). Polite vocabulary in the Javanese language of Surabaya. *Wacana*, 19(1): 58-99. <https://scholarhub.ui.ac.id/wacana/vol19/iss1/3>.
- Krapivkina, O., Kolesnikova, K., Borisovskaya, I., & Taranova, E. (2019). Addressee as a key factor of courtroom discourse production. SHS Web of Conferences 69, 00068. CILDIAH-2019. <https://doi.org/10.1051/shsconf/20196900068>.
- Kupietz, M., Bański, P., Diewald, N., Trawiński, B., & Witt, A. (2024). EuReCo: Not building and yet using federated comparable corpora for cross-linguistic research. BUCC 2024: The 17th Workshop on Building and Using Comparable Corpora, pages 94–103, 20 May, 2024. ELRA Language Resource Association.
- Kurniasih, Y. K. (2005). Gender, class and language preference: A case study in Yogyakarta. ALS Conference in September 2005. <http://www.als.asn>.
- Lasan, I. (2025). Salience in EFL speakers' perceptions of formality: (In)formal greetings and address forms combined with (in)formal nouns, verbs, and adjectives. *Language Teaching Research*, 29(1), 174–198. <https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/pdf/10.1177/13621688211055086>.
- Lyons, J. (1977). *Semantics*. Vol. 1. New York: Cambridge.
- Magnis-Suseno, F. (2013). Etika Jawa. Makalah seri keempat kuliah umum filsafat etika dari Yunani klasik hingga Jawa di Teater Salihara, 23 Februari.
- Marrelli, J. M. V. (1990). Terms of address: Problems of patterns and usage in various languages and cultures by Friederike Braun: A review. *Journal of Linguistics*, 26(1), 265-274. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/4176051>.
- Merdeka.com., Jakarta. (2021). <https://www.merdeka.com/trending/30-ucapan-selamat-pagi-bahasa-jawa-yang-penuh-makna-cocok-untuk-status-medsos-klm.html>. Issued in March 2021.
- Miles, M. B., & Huberman, A. M. (1992). *Analisis data kualitatif*. A Translation. T. R. Rohidi. Jakarta: UI Press.
- Nadar, F.X. (2007). The prominent characteristics of Javanese culture and their reflections in language use. *Humaniora*, 19, 168-174.
- Naeem, M., Smith, T., & Thomas, L. (2025). Thematic analysis and artificial intelligence: A step-by-step process for using ChatGPT in thematic analysis. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, 24. <https://doi.org/10.1177/16094069251333886>.
- Naeem, M., Ozuem, W., Howell, K., & Ranfagni, S. (2023). A step-by-step process of thematic analysis to develop a conceptual model in qualitative research. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, 22. <https://doi.org/10.1177/16094069231205789>
- Nurani, L. M. (2015). *Changing language loyalty and identity: An Ethnographic inquiry of societal transformation among the Javanese people in Yogyakarta, Indonesia*. Arizona: Arizona State University.

- OmniGlot. <https://www.omniglot.com/language/phrases/javanese phrases .pdf>.
- Özcan, F. H. (2016). Choice of address terms in conversational setting. *International Journal of Human Sciences*, 13(1), 982-1002. <https://doi.org/10.14687/ijhs.v13i1.3489>.
- Palinkas, L. A., Horwitz, S. M., & Green, C. A. (2015). Purposeful sampling for qualitative data collection and analysis in mixed method implementation research. *Administration and Policy in Mental Health and Mental Health Services Research*, 42(5): 533–544. <https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s10488-013-0528-y>.
- Panggelo, M. T. (2023). Kerukunan dan hormat dalam etika Jawa. *EUNTES: Jurnal Ilmiah Pastoral, Kateketik, dan Pendidikan Agama Katolik*, 2(1), 1-10. <https://journal.stikpartoraja.ac.id/index.php/euntes/article/view/50/22>.
- Pelucio, L., Quagliato, L. A., Cardoso, A., Horato, N., & Nardi, A. E. (2025). Could the use of web-based applications assist in neuropsychiatric treatment? An umbrella review. *BMC Psychology*, 13(302), 1-21. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40359-024-02263-x>
- Peters, A.M. & Boggs, S.T. (1986). Interactional routines as cultural influences upon language acquisition. In B. B. Schieffelin and Elinor Ochs, (Eds.), *Language socialization across culture* (pp. 80-96).
- Poedjosoedarmo, S. (1968). Javanese speech levels. *Indonesia*, 6, pp. 54-82. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3350711>.
- Poedjosoedarmo, S. (1979). *Tingkat tutur bahasa Jawa (The speech levels of Javanese)*. Jakarta: Pusat Pembinaan dan Pengembangan Bahasa Depdikbud (Centre for Language Development and Maintenance of The Department of Education and Culture).
- Pratama, M. R. A. (2018). Greeting strategies employed by Javanese People. *Philosophica: Jurnal Bahasa, Sastra, dan Budaya*, 1(1), 52-56. <https://jurnal.unw.ac.id/index.php/philosophica/article/view/78>.
- Quinn, G. (2011). Teaching Javanese respect usage to foreign learners. *Electronic Journal of Foreign Language Teaching*, 8, Suppl., pp. 362–370. <https://e-flt.nus.edu.sg/wp-content/uploads/docroot/v8s12011/quinn.pdf>.
- Rahayu, S. P., Lumban Tobing, R., & Rohali. (2018). Greetings and politeness used in French and Indonesian language communication. *Advances in Social Science, Education and Humanities Research*, 301. Seventh International Conference on Languages and Arts (ICLA 2018). <https://www.atlantis-press.com/proceedings/icla-18/55914545>.
- Rahayu, E. T. (2014). Comparison of honorific language in Javanese and Japanese speech community. *International Journal on Studies in English Language and Literature (IJSELL)*, 2(7): 140-146. <https://www.arcjournals.org/pdfs/ijSELL/v2-i7/16.pdf>.
- Riazi, A. M. (2025). Inference in qualitative research: An overlooked index of quality. *Journal of Modern Research in English Language Studies*, 12 (special issue), 147-164. <https://doi.org/10.30479/jmrels.2025.3839>.
- Robson, S. (1992). Javanese grammar for students. Monash Papers on Southeast Asia – No. 26. Clayton, Vic.: Centre of Southeast Asian Studies, Monash University.
- Ru, Y. (2024). Research on the value and language features of Chinese language and literature texts based on text mining technology. *Archs Sci.*, 74(2), 150-158. <https://doi.org/10.62227/as/74221>
- Saddhono, K., & Rohmadi, M. (2014). A sociolinguistics study on the use of the Javanese language in the learning process in primary schools in Surakarta, Central Java Indonesia. *International Education Studies*, 7(6), 25-30. <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1070067.pdf>.
- Sato, Y. (1978). *Minimalist interfaces: Evidence from Indonesian and Javanese*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins B.V.
- Setiawan, S. (2013). *Children's language in a bilingual community in east Java*. School of Humanities, Discipline of Linguistics: The University of Western Australia.

- https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Slamet-Setiawan-2/publication/320592038_Children's_Language_in_a_Bilingual_Community_in_East_Java_taken_from_httpscholargooglecoidscholarhlenas_sdt02C5qslametsetiawanoq/links/59ef405aaca2721ca5e92fd1/Childrens-Language-in-a-Bilingual-Community-in-East-Java-taken-from-https-scholargooglecoid-scholarhlen-as-sdt02C5-qslamet-setiawan-oq.pdf.
- SOLT-I Indonesian Module 1 Lesson 2. (no date). *Student manual greetings and introductions*. No city: Defense Language Institute Foreign Language Center. [https://fsi-languages.yojik.eu/languages/DLI/Indonesian/Student%20Manuals%20\(Modules%201%20-%206\)/Student%20Manual%20M1/M1L2student_%20correctionfinal_govtnored.pdf](https://fsi-languages.yojik.eu/languages/DLI/Indonesian/Student%20Manuals%20(Modules%201%20-%206)/Student%20Manual%20M1/M1L2student_%20correctionfinal_govtnored.pdf).
- Statista. (2024). Number of social media users worldwide from 2017 to 2028. <https://www.statista.com/statistics/278414/number-of-worldwide-social-network-users/>
- Subroto, D. E., Dwirahardjo, M., & Setiawan, B. (2008). Endangered krama and krama inggil varieties of the Javanese language. *Linguistik Indonesia*, 26(1), 89-96. <https://lib.atmajaya.ac.id/default.aspx?tabID=61&id=140435&src=1>.
- Suharno, I. (1982). A descriptive study of Javanese. Pacific Linguistics Series D – No. 45 (Materials in Languages of Indonesia No. 11). Canberra: Department of Linguistics, Research School of Pacific Studies, The Australian National University.
- Suryadi, M., Astuti, S. P., Supatra, H., & Rusyda, H. F. S. (2020). Lingual form of unifier of social harmony Javanese coastal community in Semarang. E3S Web of Conferences 2020, 07034 (2020). ICENIS 2020. <https://doi.org/10.1051/e3sconf/202020207034>.
- Tho, C., Heryadi, Y., Lukas, L., & Wibowo, A. (2021). Code-mixed sentiment analysis of Indonesian language and Javanese language using lexicon based approach. Annual Conference on Science and Technology (ANCOSSET 2020). Journal of Physics: Conference Series 1869 (2021) 012084 IOP Publishing. Pp: 2-6. <https://doi.org/10.1088/1742-6596/1869/1/012084>.
- Thoits, P.A. (2011). Mechanisms linking social ties and support to physical and mental health. *Journal of Health and Social Behavior*, 52(2), 145–61. <https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/abs/10.1177/0022146510395592>.
- Tongco, D.C.Ma. (2007). Purposive sampling as a tool for informant selection. *Ethnobotany Research & Applications*, 5: 147-158. <https://ethnobotanyjournal.org/index.php/era/article/view/126>.
- Uhlenbeck, E. M. (1970). The use of respect forms in Javanese. In S. A. Wurm, and D. C. Laycock, (Eds.), *Pacific linguistic studies in honour of Arthur Capell*. C-13: 441-466. Pacific Linguistics, The Australian National University.
- van der Molen, W. (2015). *Introduction to old Javanese*. Tokyo: Research Institute for Languages and Cultures of Asia and Africa, Tokyo University of Foreign Studies.
- Villierius, S. P. (2018). Development of Surinamese Javanese: Language contact and change in a multilingual context. Ph.D. Dissertation. Utrecht: LOT.
- Waldvogel, J. (2007). Greetings and closings in workplace email. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication*, 12(2), 456–477. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1083-6101.2007.00333.x>.
- Wardani, N. A. & Suwartono, T. (2019). Javanese language interference in the pronunciation of English phonemes. *CELTIC: A Journal of Culture, English Language Teaching, Literature & Linguistics*, 6(2), 14-25. <https://ejournal.umm.ac.id/index.php/celtic/article/view/8589/pdf>.
- Wibawa, S. (2005). Efforts to maintain and develop Javanese language politeness. International Seminar of Javanese Language Held in Embassy of Republik Indonesia Paramaribo, Suriname 28th – 29th May 2005.

- Widhyasmaramurti. (2008). Tak and kok in Javanese language. The Netherlands: Utrecht Institute of Linguistics (UiL-OTS), Utrecht University.
- Wijayanto, A. (2025). Impoliteness in Javanese: Beyond breaching honorifics. *Russian Journal of Linguistics*, 29(2), 386-408. <https://doi.org/10.22363/2687-0088-37907>.
- Yang, X. (2010). Address forms of English: Rules and variations. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, 1(5), 743-745. <https://doi.org/10.4304/jltr.1.5.743-745>.
- Yannuar, N. (2019). Walikan as a youth language and bōsō walikan malangan: Structure and development of a Javanese reversed language. In A. Ziegler (Ed.), *Jugendsprachen: Aktuelle perspektiven internationaler forschung* (Youth languages: Current perspectives of international research) (pp. 559-574). Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton.
- Yao, S. X., Lee, J., Reynolds, R. M., & Ellithorpe, M. E. (2025). Problematic social media use in 3D? Relationships between traditional social media use, social virtual reality (VR) use, and mental health. *PLoS ONE*, 20(1), 1-14. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0314863>
- Yao, D., Qian, F., Tung, T. H., Shin, H., & Bi, D. (2025). The effectiveness of web-based grief intervention for adults who lost a loved one: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *BMC Palliative Care*, 24(61), 1-15. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12904-025-01679-5>.
- Yeshchenko, T. (2020). Poetic discourse as an act of communicative interactions between addresser and addressee. *Scientific Journal of Polonia University*, 43(6), 153-157. DOI <https://doi.org/10.23856/4319>
- Yin, R. K. (2011). Qualitative research from start to finish. The Guilford Press.
- Youssef, I. A. G., Grimshaw, A. D., & Bird, C. S. (1976). Greetings in the desert. *American Ethnologist*, 3(4), 797-824. <https://doi.org/10.1525/ae.1976.3.4.02a00140>.
- Zurbuchen, M. S. (1976a). *Introduction to old Javanese language and literature: A Kawi prose anthology*. Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan.
- Zurbuchen, M. S. (1976b). Introduction to old Javanese language and literature: A Kawi prose anthology. In the Michigan Series in South and Southeast Asian Languages and Linguistics, 3. Michigan: Center for South and Southeast Asian Studies, The University of Michigan.