

---

## THE USES OF HONORIFICS BY PRESIDENT CANDIDATE IN THE CAMPAIGN NEWS TEXT ON NATIONAL NEWSPAPERS

MUKTI WIDAYATI, BENEDICTUS SUDIYANA

*Universitas Veteran Bangun Nusantara Sukoharjo*

[muktiwidayati@gmail.com](mailto:muktiwidayati@gmail.com), [benysudiyana@gmail.com](mailto:benysudiyana@gmail.com)

### *Abstract*

The research aims to describe the types of linguistic tools for honorary excretion by presidential candidates in Indonesian newspaper news texts. The research method used a qualitative approach. The data were in the form of direct sentence except from news texts that contain honorific expressions. Sources of data in the form of text national news about the presidential election campaign in the media Kompas, Media Indonesia, Republika, Sinar Harapan, and Sound Pembaharuan, published between January-March 2019. The collecting data was done by recording, clicking classify the linguistic tools used by taking fragments of sentence quotes . Data processing was done by identifying, sorting, verifying, interpretation of data, and concluding. The results of the study showed that the types of linguistic tools for honorific expression in the speech of presidential candidates in Indonesian newspaper news texts include 13 types, namely: (a) self-name reference and self-name greeting, (b) self-name reference and self-name greeting as well , (c) greetings of kinship, (d) greetings of personal pronouns, (e) personal pronouns, (f) greetings of social position (social deixis), (g) position references / ranks / professions / social positions, (h) fatis, ( i) passive speech forms in-, (j) expressive modalities, (k) self-defeats, (l) euphemisms, and (m) relational modalities. The study only focused on the type of use of honorific expressions so that it still needs to be revealed the factors that influence honorifics, strategies that bring up honorifics, aspects of positive faces and negative faces.

**Keywords:** *honorifics, news texts, linguistic markers*

### INTRODUCTION

There is an inspiring book title *Inventing Language, Inventing Worlds* (Stria, 2016) . From the title of this book the idea that "producing language that has respect will also produce a world that has respect". As a result of the culture of society and at the same time as a cultural developer, language plays a crucial role in managing and at the same time producing civilizations so as to create a harmonious social interaction system. One of the language tools to organize the social harmony of community members is the use of honorific language or the use of a form of respect in speech. Therefore, honorification (Agha, 1994) is an indispensable process and system for speaking in order to create harmony in social relations in the community. Evidence of the importance of this honorific system is shown by the fact that the honorific system exists in every language, such as English (Al-Rawi & Al-Assam, 2018; Stapleton, 2017), Korean (Ku, 2014), Thai

---

(McCready, 2014), Indonesian (Muljono, 1997; Zaman, Nababan, & Djatmika, 2018) . Almost all languages include regional languages in Indonesia, such as the Bugis language (Said, DM, 1985), Samawa in Sumbawa Besar (Ifansyah & Aini, 2019) , Javanese (Khairi, 2013; Krauße, 2018; Pranowo, 2020; Rahayu, 2014; Setyawan, 2018; Wajdi, 2012) , Sasak languages (Santana, Yassi, Machmoed, & Makkah, 2017). All of these languages have honorifics system to maintain the honor of the participants said.

Honorary expressions or forms of expression of respect in their use can be directed to the group "we" as part of the group, or to the group "they" as outside the group. In political language, expressions addressed to the group "us" are used in positive presentations, while expressions intended for "their" groups are used negative presentations (Akbar & Abbas, 2019; Ghachem, 2014; Rinaldo, 2016). Presentation of reality into negative and positive patterns is commonly used for political languages. Political language is understood as a language as a political tool (Kuntarto, 2018), which is used to defend the right or continue or seize power and authority (Sofyan, 2014).

This paper showed the fact that someone as a member of the language community in speaking sometimes besides using existing language choices, often must manipulate certain realities to produce polite or respectful language effects (Okamoto, 1999). This language has a relationship with individuals as group members in social affairs. The language spoken by presidential candidates is covered by many media outlets, and has the potential to be an example or influence the speaking style of both supporters and the wider community because "leaders are role models" (Uman, 2013: 81). The language of presidential candidates in campaigning purposes can be classified as political. The political language according to Bakhtin (1986) quoted by Karman & Waluyo (2018) is related to aspects of ideology and power, which can be observed through communication practices. How do the presidential candidates honorifics practice in speaking to constituents or supporters, to the rival candidate, even to all the participants of mass community members become part of a very interesting to study, described and formulated.

The phenomenon of using honorific tools in speaking in a society that is characterized by an asymmetrical relationship, that is between the two unequal parties is inevitable (Wajdi, 2012). Likewise, a speaker who acts as a speech act for several directive functions, such as asking for support, asking for help, asking for attention, is often conditioned by the context to present polite language by using certain honorific tools. The purpose of using honorific tools is for the speech partner to feel valued and finally the speech partner gives appreciation and feedback reaction as expected by the speaker. Here, the use of honorific tools enters the pragmatic strategy area (Al-Rawi & Al-Assam, 2018; McCready, 2014) , not merely the use of linguistic markers (Muljono, 1997) . As a pragmatic strategy, honorific expressions are directed so that the expression of communication spoken by the speaker has a value of respect. Therefore, the honorific system is very close to the principle of expressing politeness in languages (Bhattacharyya, 2015; Ifansyah & Aini, 2019; Shirado, Marumoto, Murata, & Isahara, 2011) . The politeness of the language is related to the recognition by the speaker of the speech participant's face, both the speech partner and the speaker itself, which consists of positive faces and negative faces (Lin, 2010). Presenting positive faces and negative faces will utilize a variety of positive politeness strategies and negative politeness to produce the desired forms of honorifics.

---

Research on honorifics that specifically examines the language of presidential candidates has not been conducted by other researchers. Research on other similar existing honorifics been done by Ward (2017) which revealed politeness strategies The English students in UIN Sunan Gunung Jati Bandung in apology. Zaman et al. (2018) examined the honorifics absolute in acomodate words hell and islamic verb in novel by Okky Madasari. As for other studies that reveal general honorifics, which are specifically not related to the study of political language in campaigns, include passively being honorific (Muljono, 1997) ; honorific form of comparison of Javanese-Japanese languages (Rahayu, 2014) ; reviews of honorary greeting views (Suhandra, 2014) , honorific systems in Bugis (Said, DM, 1985) , Javanese honorifics (Khairi, 2013) , honorific references in Sasak languages (Santana et al., 2017) ; Indonesian-Korean honorific system (Chang, Rasyid, & Boeriswati, 2018) . Here, a special study of the speech of presidential candidate Jokowi and presidential candidate Prabowo concerning the interaction of honorific speech between presidential candidates, the use of types of honorific devices between candidates, the use of politeness strategies by maintaining positive and negative faces to realize honorifics has not been conducted by previous researchers. Therefore, topics related to these problems will be the focus of this research study.

Based on the background above, this study aims to describe the types of linguistic tools for expressing honorifics in the speech of presidential candidates in the text of the Indonesian newspapers. This research has a significance of theoretical and practical / implicative aspects. The significance of the theoretical aspects, the results of this study are intended to contribute input related to the concept of honorifics in Indonesian. The practical significance is expected that the results of this study can help speakers and the speech community to have more choices in daily communication in applying respectful language principles and minimize the use of language that has the potential to interfere with fluency in communication due to the use of incorrect honorific expressions.

Honorific according to Kridalaksana (2008) quoted by (Suhandra, 2014) is interpreted as a form of language in a particular language that is used to express respect to greet others. This understanding is in line with the concept put forward (Said, DM, 1985) which is stated in more detail that the form of language that contains respect is addressed to the listener / speech partner and reference (the topic discussed). The honorific language in this view refers more to registers or variations that have a relatively permanent form. In this connection the expression of honorifics in the form of the use of diction or choice of language that leads to the register. On the other hand, there is a view that honorifics in language are a modification strategy in the use of language to obtain the effect of respect through alternative language expressions (Irvine, 1970). This view is paralleled by various linguists who tend to consider the context of the situation to be a determinant of the honorific effect. Therefore the expression of honorifics involves two domains, namely the socio-pragmatic domain which is related to the socio-cultural elements and the pragma-linguistic domain which is related to the utilization of linguistic forms.

Types of honorifics according to Supardo (1999) cited by Suhandra ( 2014) include (a) words of relatives, personal pronouns, ranks / positions / professions , religious titles, supernatural figures, and general honorifics. Levinson (1983) quoted by Al-Rawi & Al-Assam (2018) divides the concept of honorific into two types as presented in the following figure.

Types of Honorifics					
Addressee honorifics	Referential honorifics			Absolute honorifics	
		Referent honorifics	Bystander honorifics	Formality Level of honorifics	Authorized Speakers

Figure 1 Types of Honorifics according to Levinson (1983 )  
in (Adane, 2014; Al-Rawi & Al-Assam, 2018)

## METHOD

### Research Design

This study used a descriptive qualitative approach by revealing phenomena and fact data that exist as the work of Bodgan & Biklen ( 1982) with Mayring ( 2000) qualitative content analysis framework. The research included direct quote sentences written by journalists from the speech of Jokowi and Prabowo candidates. Data in the form of fragments of speech or direct quote sentences from the two candidates are displayed in the news text that has an honorific marker.

### Sources of Data

The corpus used as the data source of this research was the text of a newspaper report on media Kompas, Media Indonesia, Republika, Sinar Harapan, and Suara Pembaharuan which was published in the online edition of January to March 2019. The acquisition of data is done by downloading the text of news online, sort all quoted sentences directly from the entire news text.

### Instruments

Data collection was carried out with the main instrument of the researcher who was equipped with a set of understanding of the concept of honorifics, types of honorifics, and components of speech acts .

### Procedures

Data collection procedures were carried out by noting honorific phenomena. Classified based on linguistic tools used by taking fragments of sentence quotations. Through identification and classification, the types of honorifics found by candidates were found.

### Data analysis

Data processing is carried out with the following steps (1) identifying and analyzing the types of honorific speech in the data, (2) data that has been sorted is verified by utilizing the theory and findings of similar research, (3) interpretation of the data that appears related to the pattern use of honorifics, and (4) summarizes the results of the analysis.

## FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

In the speech of the presidential candidates in the Indonesian newspaper news text contained in *Kompas*, *Media Indonesia*, *Republika*, *Sinar Harapan*, and *Suara Pembaharuan* media, various types of linguistic tools were found to express honorifics to the speech partners or which were used as objects of speech, both among own group or for other groups. Speakers come from the figures as Jokowi candidates and Prabowo candidates. The following are findings about this type of honorific.

### 1) *Honorific by Using Self-Name Reference and Self-Name Greetings*

The self-name used in speech to show the speaker's respectful commitment to the persona of the person referred to. Here, a candidate for Prabowo was found.

- (1) *"Itulah perjuangan saya dengan **Sandiaga Uno** itulah perjuangan kami-kami semua, (SP.B19ia)*

In the quote (1) above, the name of *Sandiaga Uno* by Prabowo candidate is used as a reference that contains respect from the speaker and the party used as the object of speech. The use of self-name to show respect is in line with the findings of Nurhayati (2015). In that example, the use of proper names become noticeably less respect if it is not accompanied by any mention of calling kinship, so that in future proper name is usually no mention of the reference *pak, bapak, saudara* where to kind of guy, or *Bu, Ibu, Saudari* to the woman (bdk. Santana et al. (2017). The lack of completeness of the designation of kinship in the example (1) by the candidate Prabowo showed a sense of honor in itself because he assesses the services and struggle *Uno Uno*, positive assessment thus included in the assessment of positive behavior persistence in the classification *tenacity* as one of social esteem assessment (Bednarek, 2009; Metasari, 2013). Honorific is classified as a reference because the names are in a position as the object being discussed, ie the participants discussed are not present as the speech partners called (Ifansyah & Aini, 2019).

### 2) *Honorific Using the Reference of Self Names and Greetings of Self Names at Once*

The reference to self-name as a form of respectful choice is also combined by the greeting reference, which is attached to the front of the name as a form of expression of respect for the party used as the object of speech. The following research findings.

- (2) a. *"[...] Saya tahu **Pak Prabowo** memiliki lahan yang sangat luas di Kalimantan Timur sebesar 220.000 hektar juga di Aceh Tengah 120.000 hektar," (K.K56ia)*  
 b. *"Caleg itu yang tanda tangan ketua umumnya, berarti **Pak Prabowo** yang tanda tangan. [...]" (K.K9ia)*  
 c. *"Mungkin **bapak Jokowi** dan pemerintahannya, menarik dan populer untuk dua generasi. [...]" (SH.C12ia)*

Examples of utterances (2 a, b, c) are in the context that both parties, namely *Pak Prabowo* (who was addressed and referenced by Jokowi candidates) and *Pak Jokowi* (who was addressed and referenced by Prabowo candidates) were standing *face to face*, there were in a situation together facing each other. This happened at the time of the public debate campaign which was broadcast via television media. In the speech, all elements of the speech participants are taken into consideration so that the speech shows the existence of social communication relations and not interpersonal communication (bdk. Liddicoat, 2006). The consideration of the use of social communication relations makes each speaker consider that the speech participant in the public debate moment involves four elements of the speech participant at once, namely the speaker (*address / addresser*), *address* partner (addressee), *bystander*, and imaginary reference as stated by Searle (1969) quoted by Saifudin (2019). The speaker element is the party that initiates delivering speech. The

speech partner element is the greeting party. The *bystander* element is the parties present in the speech event, which includes (a) participants who are *overhearers* (those who know the speech event, but they don't care), (b) participants who are *eavesdroppers* (those who only hear / *eavesdrop*, ie just listening briefly), and (c) audience participants who take the time to attend, listen, and talk about. The imaginary reference element is a party that is not present in the speech event and does not hear, but as the subject of discussion and also determines the choice of language expression.

### 3) *Honorific by Using Family Friendly: Bapak, Ibu, Saudara*

If the example of the phenomenon that has been presented above uses references (references related to the object being made), the greeting is directly related to the speech partner.

- (3)
- a. "*Jadi kalau Bapak bangga dengan bagi-bagi 12 juta, 20 juta (sertifikat), pada saatnya tidak ada lagi lahan untuk dibagi. [...]*," (K.K51ia)
  - b. "*[...]? Dan saudara-saudara, saya ini ada darah Banyumasan. Kalau melihat begini saya sudah yakin bahwa bapak-bapak dan ibu-ibu semua sudah mengerti apa yang harus kita lakukan ke depan,*" (SP.B14ia)
  - c. "*Terima kasih bu, terima kasih Bu, mohon doanya,*" (SP.B7ia)
  - d. "*Saya melihat, dalam struktur pengurusan partai yang Bapak pimpin, seperti ketua umum, dewan pembina, sekjen, bendahara, semuanya laki-laki. Bagaimana Bapak menjawab inkonsistensi ini?*" (K.K24ia)

The kinship greeting / address in example (3a) is spoken directly by presidential candidate Prabowo in the context of a public debate on the podium broadcast by television so that they *face to face to face*. In the example (3b, 3c) occurred at a meeting with the public audience in a moment of a campaign that is spoken by the candidate Prabowo by greeting words, *Saudara, Bapak, and Ibu*. While in the example (3d) spoken by the candidate Jokowi to partners in a moment he said candidate Prabowo public debate face to face, the words used greeting kinship *Bapak*. The use of this greeting shows respectful relations in familiar relations in kinship relations. these findings support the findings of Ifansyah & Aini (2019); Mahmud (2013); Nurhayati (2015); Suhandra (2014); and Wajdi (2012).

### 4) *Honorific by Using the Pronoun Greeting Persona: Beliau, Anda*

- (4)
- a. "*Beliau sangat bagus,*" (R.L 9ia)
  - b. "*Negara kita dalam keadaan sulit dan susah, benar? Benar. Kalian merasakan?*" (SP.B17ia)

The quote sentence (4a) is spoken by candidate Jokowi when giving an appreciation of the appearance of his political opponents' debates addressed to candidate Prabowo. Said personal pronouns *he* showed respectful greeting selection in the third person. When persona pronoun *he* compared with the personal pronoun *he is* neutral, the choice of pronoun *he* is showing a relation of respect (cf. Ifansyah & Aini, 2019). If used for a second person or direct speech partner, *your* personal pronoun greeting is used, as Wajdi (2012) found; Setiawan (2014).

### 5) *Honorific by using the Persona pronoun*

Personal pronouns to show honorifics by speakers are expressed through the exclusive plural person "us" as a first-person manipulation of "my" or "I" authority and show an exclusive attitude.

- (5) *a. Kami dan para purnawirawan ini seharusnya sudah istirahat. (SP.H3ia)*  
*b. kami tidak rela melihat rakyat kita ada yang sulit mencari makan. (SP.B19ia)*  
*c. "Kami siapkan pupuk dalam jumlah berapapun yang dibutuhkan," (MI.E8ia)*  
*d. "Kalau berkuasa, kami jamin pangan tersedia dan harga terjangkau untuk seluruh rakyat. Kami akan segera turunkan harga makanan pokok. Produsen harus dapat imbalan penghasilan memadai," (MI.E4ia)*

In the example except (5a) *we* expression refers to the speaker, namely Prabowo, who should in reality refer to the "me" object. To have the effect of respect, consciously or not, speakers distract with *we* pronouns. Here applies the manipulation process for honorifics such as the view of Al-Rawi & Al-Assam (2018); Fukushima & Iwata (1985); Okamoto (1999). The pronoun "me" in the context of the above sentence quote is consciously or not expressed and chosen "we" by the speaker on account of the existence of authority. This supports the findings of Triana & Zamzani (2019) that my personal pronouns, you, you, them, are related to power or authority relations. The "me" pronoun is more selfish. In quotations (5b, c, d, e) the expression of pronouns persona in reality refers to the exclusive group of speakers, meaning collectively they are done in teamwork, then *we* use more precisely shows the meaning of denotation, but also simultaneously shows the honorific expression collectively together in team.

The use of pronouns that indicate honorifics also appears in the use of "we". The following findings were revealed by both Jokowi and Prabowo.

- (6) *a. Kita harus merebut kedaulatan kita, rakyat Indonesia harus berdaulat" (SP.B17ia)*  
*b. Negara kita sangat kaya tapi kekayaan kita tidak tinggal di Indonesia," (SP.B19ia)*  
*c. "Kita harus cari the best and brighter untuk lembaga-lembaga itu supaya jadi pilar. Sehingga, kita bebas dari korupsi," (R.A11ia)*  
*d. "Inilah perbaikan yang perlu kita lakukan agar uang rakyat betul-betul bisa kita amankan dan kita pakai untuk pembangunan," (R.B14ia)*  
*e. "Kita tidak berikan kepada yang gede-gede. Saya tahu Pak Prabowo memiliki lahan yang sangat luas di Kalimantan Timur sebesar 220.000 hektar juga di Aceh Tengah 120.000 hektar," (K.K56ia)*  
*f. "Kita ini sering grusa-grusu menyampaikan sesuatu. Misalnya, jurkamnya pak Prabowo, misalnya ini, katanya dianiaya, mukanya babak belur. Kemudian konfrensi pers bersama-sama. Tapi kemudian apa yang terjadi? Ternyata operasi plastik," (K.K41ia)*

Options *we* shows that contains personal pronouns honorifics attitude, containing inclusively meaning construction includes participants without limit all participants said. Use of *we* at quote (6a, 6b, 6c) is used by the candidate Prabowo and quotations (6d,

6e, 6f) used Jokowi candidate. *Our* personal pronouns refer to references to the speaker and the speech partner. This indicates the use of positive politeness strategies such as the findings of Achmad (2012); Ethelb (2015); Wardoyo (2017). The use of *our* pronouns also shows an attitude of solidarity, which unites feelings between speakers (Jokowi candidates / Prabowo candidates), speech partners, and with other parties without limits (Harwood, 2007; Wahyudi, 2014).

#### 6) *Honorific by using social status greetings (social deixis)*

Greetings by utilizing social position refer to the form of greetings in the form of references. The position of asymmetrical relations between the dominating authority and the mass parties as the object of social greeting reference. Found with the following words.

- (7) a. "*Rakyat Indonesia yang saya cintai, pembagian yang tadi saya sampaikan, pembagian yang hampir 2,6 juta itu adalah agar produktif. [...]*," (SH.D12ia)  
 b. "*Anak-anak muda Garut, sudah punya pekerjaan belum? Gimana mau dapat pacar kalau nganggur*," (K.D5ia)

In (7a) spoken by candidate Jokowi and in (7b) spoken by candidate Prabowo. In this context, the speech partners who are called a large number of collective patterns both present in the location of the speech event *bystander* or by imaginary reference. *Bystander* includes parties present in the speech event in both categories (1) *overhearers*: those who know the speech event do not care, (2) *eavesdropper*, those who only *eavesdrop* just by listening briefly, or (3) the audience who takes the time to participate being present, listening, and being the object being discussed; and imaginary references include those who were not present in the speech event and did not hear, but as the subject of discussion and helped determine the choice of language expression (Saifudin, 2019). The social deixis greetings of *the Indonesian people that I love*, and *young people of Garut* for those who are referred to feel greeted, involved, cared for.

#### 7) *Honorific by Using Position / Rank / Profession / Social Position Reference*

The use of references that refer to social positions and positions can show the speaker's respect for the object in question. Following his findings.

- (8) a. "*Saya mengucapkan terima kasih kepada para senior, para purnawirawan TNI-Polri, dari mitra Angkatan Darat, Angkatan Laut, Angkatan Udara, serta Kepolisian*," (R.E3ia)  
 b. *Kami dan para purnawirawan ini seharusnya sudah istirahat.* (SP.H3ia)  
 c. *Rakyat kita berhak mendapatkan keadilan dan kemakmuran.* (SP.B19ia)

The expressions of *seniors, retired military and police officers* were spoken by candidate Jokowi (quote 8a), and the expressions of *retired men, our people* (quotes 8b, 8c) were spoken by candidate Prabowo. Both candidates need the support of both parties, especially the extended family network, and empathy from the audience and the general public to gain support. Regarding social office / rank / position reference Suhandra (2014) mentions words such as *Regent, Camat, Kadus, Chair* (position); *Sergeant, Lieutenant, Captain* (rank); *doctor, teacher* (profession).



### 8) *Honorific by Using Religious Fatis*

Fatis in communication are often raised by speakers. Fatis is a function of language by speakers used for means of social contact, such as exchanging information and expressing ideas (Nurhayati, 2015). Fatis is also said to be a means for establishing social relations, building solidarity in the community (Susanti & Agustini, 2017). The form of a phatic can be very general can be very exclusive with religious terms. The following findings in the phatic for the term.

- (9) "*Insya Allah, saat saya mendapat mandat dari rakyat, sisa hidup saya akan saya abdikan untuk bangsa dan rakyat. [...]*," (K.D9ia)

The phrase, *God willing*, in quote (9) is a religious mysticism. For audiences who are adherents of the Islamic religion, the expression of fatigue besides the word is also *Assalamualaikum* and *Walaikumsalam* (Susanti & Agustini, 2017), *Astagfirullah* (Wardoyo, 2017), *Alhamdulillah* (Wajdi, 2012). The use of such a phatic also considers the context of the situation of speech participants in terms of the direction of the majority or minority. The choice of religious mystics is due to social considerations related to the majority of religious adherents who have this phatic, as well as religious considerations adhered to by the speakers themselves.

### 9) *Honorific by Using the Form of (Pasivasi)*

Sentence speech passive form *be* used to indicate honorifics as an effort to hide the actor. Honorifics of this type are found in Jokowi's candidate speech.

- (10) a. "*Kalau hal-hal seperti ini tidak **direspons** dan kita diam, masyarakat akan termakan,*" (MI.118ia)  
 b. "*Ada-ada saja sih ini. Fitnah-fitnah seperti itu jangan **diterus-terusin** lah,*" (SH.G14ia)  
 c. "***Dipikir** mengambil alih barang-barang seperti itu mudah? **Dipikir** mengambil alih aset besar seperti itu gampang? [...]*," (K.E15ia)

In quotations (10a, b, c) it appears that there is a passive form of being *responded to*, *continually thought of* as a passive form. The choice of this passive form is due to the consideration of social factors to hide the perpetrators. Shape *be* implicated offender is transferred to a third person, and the perpetrator was not raised to the surface so as to make the construction more polite as exposure (Muljono, 1997). The comparison is very clear where the honorifics are displayed in pairs as follows.

Table 1. Comparison of Shape Couple *be* passive with Form Use of Pronouns as Honorific and Non-honorific Expressions

<i>honorifik: di-</i>	<i>non-honorifik, tanpa di-</i>
<i>... tidak direspon....</i>	<i>... tidak kita respon....</i>
<i>... jangan diterus-terusin</i>	<i>jangan kamu terus-terusin ....</i>
<i>Dipikir....</i>	<i>Kamu pikir....</i>

Through this comparison, passive use seems to appear more polite or more respectful to the speech partner or to the party referred.

### 1 0 ) *Honorific by Using Expressive Modalities*

Expressive modalities are used to express the attitude of the speakers' commitment to propositions related to truth, possibility, certainty.

- (11) a. "[...]. Ini adalah **mungkin** dendam politik atau intimidasi politik," (SP.G7ia)  
 b. "**Insya Allah** saat saya mendapat mandat dari rakyat, sisa hidup saya akan saya abdikan untuk bangsa dan rakyat. Saya akan berantas korupsi. [...]" (K.D9ia)  
 c. **Saya yakin** rakyat Banjarnegara sudah paham, kalau nanti ada yang bagi duit, bagi barang, terima, karena itu uang rakyat, tapi coblos sesuai hati nurani," (SP.C11ia)  
 d. "**Saya meyakini**, dalam persaingan global ke depan, negara yang unggul adalah negara yang dapat bergerak cepat," (R.E15ia)  
 e. "[...]. Kami **yakin** negara ini sangat kaya, tapi terjadi kebocoran kekayaan," (R.A4ia)  
 f. "**Saya meyakini**, dalam persaingan global ke depan, negara yang unggul adalah negara yang dapat bergerak cepat," (R.E15ia)

In the quotations (11a, 11b, 11c) spoken by candidate Prabowo with *possible* expressions, *God willing, I am convinced* and the quotations (11d, 11e, 11f) are spoken by Jokowi's candidates with expressive modalities *I believe, we believe*. The use of this modality tool statement that is expressed in the form of assertive speech acts becomes noticeably softer, finer or more honorific. The use of expressive modality tools is in line with the use of *hedge* like the view of Agha (1994), Kusumaningrum (2016).

### 1 1 ) *honorifics with uses the Form disparaging phrase Ourselves*

The use of honorifics that use self-disclosure is found in the following quotation.

- (12) a. "**Kita ini sering grusa-grusu** menyampaikan sesuatu. Misalnya, [...]," (K.K41ia)  
 b. "**Gitu dibilang antek asing, antek asing, antek asing, antek asing.** [...]," (R.C12i)  
 c. "**Empat tahun dikatakan Presiden Jokowi antek asing. Empat tahun!**" (K.E3)  
 d. "[...]. Saya **bukan siapa-siapa** tanpa mereka," [SP.H6ia]

This form of honorific expression (1 2 a) was chosen to show that the speaker and speech partner are both considered negative, *we are often gratuitous*. In quotation (1 2 b) the expression refers to the negative self of the candidate Jokowi's speaker with *a foreign henchman*, meaning 'foreign accomplice'. The strategy of forming honorifics by self-deprecating was also put forward by Prabowo in the quote (1 2 d) by revealing "I am nobody". This method of establishing honorifics is in line with the strategy of politeness with the principle of fulfilling generosity, namely minimizing self-profit, and maximizing self-loss, as stated by Leech (1983) through Ethelb (2015).

### 1 2 ) *Honorific by Using the Form of Euphemism*

The use of euphemism is used to obscure reality. Found in the following utterance quote.

- (13) a. "*Ya biasa biasa saja, masyarakatlah yang menilai substansi-substansi apa yang kita sampaikan,*" (R.L 4ia)  
 b. "*Jadi kalau sekarang pembangunan infrastruktur ada di mana-mana ya wajar karena anggarannya tiga kali lipat dibanding sebelumnya,*" (K.G13ia)

Euphemisms by giving more subtle expressions to form honorifics are also found in Japanese. Assessment of *astounding ordinary course* (13a) by the candidate Jokowi himself on his appearance in a debate, but in appreciation both by the audience. Candidates cover up reality. In quote (1 3 b) the use of *natural* expressions also shows euphemism by Jokowi's candidates. Euphemism into one expression of honorifics to avoid negative impression as well as opinions Irvine ( 1970) and Mislikhah ( 2014) .

### 1 3 ) *Honorific by Using Relational Modalities*

Relational modalities related to language express the speaker's commitment to the speech partner. This is in accordance with the function of language for relations between speech-speech partners (Ahmadi, 2016). The expression of honorifics through the commitment of the speaker to the speech partner is shown through the following excerpt.

- (14) "*Ini negara hukum, kalau ada bukti-bukti silahkan lewat mekanisme hukum, laporkan dengan bukti-bukti, gampang sekali. [...]*," (K.K42ia)

The word "please" indicates a sign of honorific or politeness (Hermaji, 2013; Rahardi, 2012). Writing "please" uses standard writing standards, rather than "please" in the above usage categorized as non-standard (Language Center, 2008) . The phrase "please" shows the commitment of the speaker, the candidate Jokowi, which is addressed to the candidate Prabowo. Theoretically, a kind or equivalent expression "please" as a relational modality as a sign of respect other than using " *please* " is *please, begging, come on, come on, let, try, hope, should, let, let, be willing, be willing, be willing, be willing whatever it may be* (Rahardi, 2012) . Impmentatively, the use of the signatures of their emergence is determined by factors in communication relations such as power related to speakers - speech partners, the distance of social relations between speakers, and the formality of the situation of speech events (Ifansyah & Aini, 2019) .

## CONCLUSION

Based on the description of the findings above, it can be concluded that the type of device linguistics to eksrepsi honorifics in the speech of the presidential candidates in the text give ta Indonesian newspapers includes 13 species, namely: (a) reference proper name and greeting proper name, (b) self-name reference and self-name greeting at the same time, (c) kinship greeting, (d) personal pronouns, (e) personal pronouns, (f) social position greetings (social deixis), (g) office / rank / profession / position references social, (h) phatic, (i) passive speech forms in-, (j) expressive modalities, (k) self-deprivation,

(l) euphemisms , and (m) relational modalities. Honorifics involve greeting linguistic forms, references, choice of language forms, and modification of language forms.

Implications of a social and okultural this research is the fact regarding the use of honorifics is determined by proximity, position of power, and the situation of formality when the speech occurs. This understanding is very good as material for educational materials for students according to their psychological development related to the selection of the right language, is respectful, and carries a clear message. This is the expected outcome of language education competencies.

The limitation of this study is that there are still other related aspects that still need to be revealed related to the factors that influence the emergence of honorifics, language strategies that bring up honorifics that are related to aspects of positive and negative faces. This research only focuses on the type of use of honorific expressions.

## REFERENCES

- Achmad, S. (2012). Strategi Kesopanan Berbahasa Masyarakat Bugis Pinrang Provinsi Sulawesi Selatan. *Bahasa Dan Seni*, 40(1), 1–13. Retrieved from <http://journal2.um.ac.id/index.php/jbs/article/view/117/90>
- Adane, D. (2014). Social Deixis in Hadiyya. *International Journal of Language and Linguistics*, 2(5), 301–304. <https://doi.org/10.11648/j.ijll.20140205.12>
- Agha, A. (1994). Honorification. *Annu. Rev. Anthropol.*, 23, 277–302.
- Ahmadi, Y. (2016). Analisis Modalitas Tuturan Basuki Cahaya Purnama dalam Wacana Kalijodo. *Gramatika*, 4(2), 69–77. <https://doi.org/10.31813/gramatika/4.2.2016.59.69--77>
- Akbar, N. F. H., & Abbas, N. F. (2019). Negative Other-Representation in American Political Speeches. *International Journal of English Linguistics*, 9(2), 113. <https://doi.org/10.5539/ijel.v9n2p113>
- Al-Rawi, S. S., & Al-Assam, D. A. A. (2018). A Pragmatic Study of English Honorific Forms. *Journal of the College of Languages*, 38, 1–28.
- Bednarek, M. (2009). Polyphony in Appraisal: Typological and Topological Perspectives. *Linguistics and Human Sciences*, 3(2), 107–136.
- Bhattacharyya, P. R. (2015). Personal Pronouns in Assamese. *International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research and Development*, 2(10), 272–281.
- Bodgan, R. ., & Biklen, S. K. (1982). *Qualitative Research for Education: An Introduction to Theory and Methods*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc.
- Chang, T., Rasyid, Y., & Boeriswati, E. (2018). Similarities and Differences of Honorific Systems between Indonesian and Korean Languages. *Indonesian Language Education and Literature*, 3(2), 212–226. <https://doi.org/10.24235/ileal.v3i2.2470>
- Ethelb, H. (2015). Using Address Terms in showing Politeness with Reference to Their Translation from Arabic into English. *International Journal of Comparative Literature and Translation Studies*, 3(3). <https://doi.org/10.7575/aiac.ijclts.v.3n.3p.27>
- Fukushima, S., & Iwata, Y. (1985). Politeness in English. *Jalt*, 17(1), 1–14.
- Ghachem, I. (2014). A critical discourse analysis of self-presentation through the use of cognitive processes associated with we. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, 5(3), 550–558. <https://doi.org/10.4304/jltr.5.3.550-558>
- Harwood, N. (2007). Political Scientists on the Functions of Personal Pronouns in their

- Writing: An Interview-Based Study of “I” and “We.” *Text and Talk*, 27(1), 27–54.  
<https://doi.org/10.1515/TEXT.2007.002>
- Hermaji, B. (2013). Tindak Tutur Penerimaan dan Penolakan dalam Bahasa Indonesia. *Jurnal Cakrawala*, 7, 1–10.
- Ifansyah, N., & Aini, R. Q. (2019). Sistem Honorifik Bahasa Samawa dan Faktor yang Memengaruhi Pemakaiannya. *Bahastra*, XXXVIII(2), 106–112.
- Irvine, J. T. (1970). Ideologies of Honorific Language. *Pragmatics*, 2(3), 251–262.
- Karman, & Waluyo, D. (2018). Penggunaan Isu Demokrasi melalui Website oleh Kelompok Radikal dalam Melawan Pemerintah Indonesia. *Jurnal Pekommas*, 3(2), 157–168.
- Khairi, R. I. (2013). *Sistem Honorifik ing Desa Canan Kecamatan Wedi Kabupaten Klaten*. Universitas Negeri Yogyakarta.
- Krauß, D. (2018). Polite Vocabulary in the Javanese Language of Surabaya. *Wacana*, 19(1), 58–99. <https://doi.org/10.17510/wacana.v19i1.615>
- Ku, J. Y. (2014). *Korean Honorifics: A Case Study Analysis of Korean Speech Levels in Naturally Occurring Conversations*. The Australian National University.
- Kuntarto, E. (2018). Bahasa dan Kekuasaan Politik Oposan di Indonesia: Analisis Wacana Kritis. *Jurnal Kiprah*, 2, 37–47.
- Kusumaningrum, W. R. (2016). Deixis Analysis on Indonesian Shakespeare’s Comics Strip of Julius caesar. *Transformatika*, 12(2), 73–82.  
<https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.3929/ethz-b-000238666>
- Liddicoat, A. J. (2006). Learning the Culture of Interpersonal Relationships: Students’ Understandings of Personal Address Forms in French. *Intercultural Pragmatics*, 3(1), 55–80. <https://doi.org/10.1515/IP.2006.003>
- Lin, L. (2010). An Investigation of Students’ Face Wants in Chinese English Teachers’ Classroom Feedback. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, 1(1), 29–34.
- Mahmud, M. (2013). The roles of social status, age, gender, familiarity, and situation in being polite for bugis society. *Asian Social Science*, 9(5), 58–72.  
<https://doi.org/10.5539/ass.v9n5p58>
- Mayring, P. (2000). Qualitative Content Analysis. In *Forum Qualitative Sozialforschung* (Vol. 1). [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1479-3709\(07\)11003-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1479-3709(07)11003-7)
- Mccready, E. (2014). A Semantics for Honorifics with Reference to Thai. *28th Pacific Asia Conference on Language, Information and Computation*, 503–512.
- Metasari, D. (2013). *Appraisal System in the Jakarta Post’s Editorial “Start Working, Jokowi.”* Dian Nuswantoro University.
- Mislikhah, S. (2014). Kesantunan Berbahasa. *Ar-Raniry: International Journal of Islamic Studies*, 1(2), 285–296.
- Muljono. (1997). Honorifik di- dalam Percakapan. *Humaniora*, VI, 76–81.
- Nurhayati, E. (2015). Sistem Sapaan Dalam Wayang Kulit. *Diksi*, 15(2), 137–148.  
<https://doi.org/10.21831/diksi.v15i2.6602>
- Ogiermann, E. (2009). *On Apologising in Negative and Positive Politeness Cultures*.  
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2012.01.007>
- Okamoto, S. (1999). Situated politeness: Manipulating honorific and non-honorific expressions in Japanese conversations. *Pragmatics*, 9(1), 51–74.  
<https://doi.org/10.1075/prag.9.1.05oka>

- Pranowo. (2020). Perspektif Masyarakat Jawa terhadap Pemakaian Bahasa Nonverbal: Studi Kasus Etnopragmatik. *Litera*, 19(1), 52–71.
- Pusat Bahasa. (2008). *Kamus Bahasa Indonesia* (D. Sugono, Ed.). Jakarta: Pusat Bahasa Departemen Pendidikan Nasional.
- Rahardi, R. K. (2012). Imperatif dalam Bahasa Indonesia: Penanda-Penanda Kesantunan Linguistiknya. *Humaniora*, 11(2), 16–23. <https://doi.org/10.22146/jh.v11i2.658>
- 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.
- Rinaldo, Z. A. (2016). Positive-Self and Negative Other Presentation in the 2016 U.S. Presidential Announcement Speeches: A Critical Discourse Analysis. *Tell-Us Journal*, 2(1), 1–9. <https://doi.org/10.22202/tus.2016.v2i1.1333>
- Said, D.M, M. I. (1985). Subsistem Honorifik Bahasa Bugis: Sebuah Kajian Sosiopragmatik. *Linguistik Indonesia*, 3(6), 46–59.
- Saifudin, A. (2019). Teori Tindak Tutur dalam Studi Linguistik Pragmatik. *LITE: Jurnal Bahasa, Sastra Dan Budaya*, 15(1–16).
- Santana, L., Yassi, A. H., Machmoed, H. A., & Makkah, M. (2017). Self-Reference in Honorific of Sasak Speech Community: Sociolinguistics-Pragmatics. *International Journal of Science and Research (IJSR)*, 6(11), 728–734. <https://doi.org/10.21275/ART20177774>
- Setiawan, T. (2014). Ancangan Awal Praktik Analisis Wacana Kritis. *Diksi*, 22(2), 111–120.
- Setyawan, B. W. (2018). Fenomena Penggunaan Unggah-Ungguh Basa Jawa Kalangan Siswa SMK di Surakarta. *Widyapawra*, 46(2), 145–156.
- Shirado, T., Marumoto, S., Murata, M., & Isahara, H. (2011). System for flexibly judging the misuse of honorifics in Japanese. *PACLIC 25 - Proceedings of the 25th Pacific Asia Conference on Language, Information and Computation*, (2007), 503–510.
- Sofyan, N. (2014). Bahasa sebagai Simbolisasi Mempertahankan Kekuasaan. *Jurnal Interaksi*, III(1), 75–84.
- Stapleton, A. (2017). Deixis in Modern Linguistics. *Essex Student Research Online*, 9, 1–9.
- Stria, I. (2016). *Inventing Languages, Inventing Worlds: Towards a Linguistic Worldview for Artificial Languages*. [https://doi.org/10.14746/9788394760915\\*](https://doi.org/10.14746/9788394760915*)
- Suhandra, I. R. (2014). Sapaan dan Honorifik. *Society: Jurnal Jurusan Pendidikan IPS Ekonomi*, XI, 99–115.
- Susanti, R., & Agustini, D. (2017). Ungkapan Fatis Pembuka dan Penutup Percakapan Masyarakat Jawa di Surakarta. *LEKSEMA: Jurnal Bahasa Dan Sastra*, 2(1), 37–49. <https://doi.org/10.22515/ljbs.v2i1.654>
- Triana, P. M., & Zamzani. (2019). Power Representation in the Grammatical Form of Teacher's Speech Acts in Indonesian Language Learning. *Lensa: Kajian Kebahasaan, Kesusastraan, Dan Budaya*, 9(1), 77–89. <https://doi.org/10.26714/lensa.9.1.2019.77-89>
- Uman, A. K. (2013). Citra diri Pemimpin. *Nizham*, 1(1), 68–82. Retrieved from <http://repositorio.unan.edu.ni/2986/1/5624.pdf>
- Wahyudi. (2014). Pragmatics Study on Deixis in the Jakarta Post Editorial. *Jurnal*

- Penelitian Humaniora*, 15(2), 111–120.
- Wajdi, M. (2012). Sistem Kesantunan Masyarakat Tutar Jawa. *Seminar Nasional Bahasa Ibu (SNBI)*, 1–9.
- Wardoyo, C. (2017). Positive Politeness on Strategies of Expressing Apologies by English Department Students of UIN Sunan Gunung Djati Bandung. *Buletin Al-Turas*, 23(2), 367–380. <https://doi.org/10.15408/bat.v23i2.5786>
- Zaman, M. N., Nababan, M. R., & Djatmika. (2018). Analisis Ungkapan Honorifik Mutlak dalam Mengakomodasi Sapaan dan Verba Keislaman pada Novel Karya Okky Madasari. *Khazanah: Jurnal Studi Islam Dan Humaniora*, 16(1), 125–142. <https://doi.org/10.18592/khazanah.v16i1.2130>