

EVALUATIVE LANGUAGE IN THE DISCOURSE OF CEBONG VS KAMPRET ('TADPOLE VS MICROBATS') ON TWITTER

Ahmad Fadly

Universitas Muhammadiyah Jakarta, Jalan KH. Ahmad Dahlan, Cirendeuy, Ciputat, Tangerang Selatan, Indonesia
ahmad.fadly@umj.ac.id

Accepted: 2020-01-16 , Approved: 2020-01-25 , Published: 2020-01-31

ABSTRACT

As an interactive social media, Twitter gives significant role in creating social systems. Evaluative language was intensively used on the social media. The Cebong vs Kampret issue coloured on Twitter and polarized people. By using data Tweet and Reply from Twitter during 2019 this researcher investigates evaluative language. This research results that Twitter community were very emotionally force and defense on the Cebong vs Kampret issue, depicted from many evaluative languages classified into subsystem attitude. Subsystem graduation was also intensively used in accordance to that issue. It means that Twitter community emphasized on semantic scale in evaluating things and person.

Keywords: evaluative language; discourse; appraisal; Twitter

INTRODUCTION

Language has a role in building social systems. Language is not limited to expressing objective reality, but becomes a medium of evaluation of an object, even an action. Evaluation is in the form of an assessment that is subjective and influences the perspective of others. In addition, evaluation is reflected through the choice of linguistic units and the

grammatical structure used. Language evaluation also reflects the behavior of its users. This behavior has the potential to influence other language users to form a social system (McGue & Bouchard, 1998).

The social system is formed not randomly, but can be demanded from human behavior, including in language. Therefore, human behavior can be predicted (Gunawan, 2007; Hofstede,

2001). As a language producer, the human brain can be likened to a program (mental program) that determines the form of human behavior in different situations. Mental is classified into three types, namely individual, collective and universal mental. Individual mentality is behavior that is passed down through family-specific genes so that a person has behavioral characteristics that are different from those of other family members. Meanwhile, collective mentality results from the environment in which a person is born and raised. The universal mental is the natural human behavior that is generally owned, such as crying and laughing.

Language behavior that is classified as a collective mental is very closely related to the formation of the social system. The rise of mass media and social media makes human interaction very intensive. Various

issues coloring the mass media every day. The community evaluates various issues in various ways. Not infrequently there is controversy on social media about certain issues that affect the collective memory of readers. Even so, the increasing number of social channels to express these ideas has the potential to cause more and more ignorance of language wisdom. This is based on similar conditions after 1998 when there was a growing mass media in the public sphere. Since post-reformation, the use of language in the mass media has increasingly shown its lack of wisdom (Rahyono, Sutanto, Rachmat, & Puspitorini, 2005). Mass media is often a reference, even a "weapon" to strengthen the argumentation on social media. The social media that is most often the "arena of battle" between community members is Twitter. As an interactive social media platform, Twitter provides

hashtags for dialogue and debate certain issues with other users (Tremayne, 2014). The existence of hashtags has caused debate to focus on a particular issue, makes it easy for users to engage in debate, and can take place intensively. As such, debates on the Twitter media often involve users who don't know each other.

Indonesian people are generally not accustomed to debating directly. Although television media often airs debates or pro and contra discourses, the community is limited to acting as a spectator and seeking canalization in other media, which is not direct. Avoiding conflict directly may still be embedded in the collective memory of the Indonesian people. In interactions involving large numbers of people such as on trains or public transportation, for example, direct debate is rarely found related to current issues. At least one of them tends to

budge or avoid. Different conditions with Twitter media. With features that make it possible for users to create fake accounts, Indonesian people freely launch their "attacks" at others by hiding behind their fake identities.

In debates, language evaluation can reflect the attitudes and behavior of the people involved in it. Through this evaluation also reflected the prevailing social system or background. What the attitude of Twitter users in evaluating discourse of Cebong vs Kampret in social media Twitter could be reflected through evaluative language.

The term *evaluation* is interpreted as an evaluation framework for analyzing language expressions from the opinions of speakers / writers (Bednarek, 2006). Evaluation can relate to the assessment of entities or propositions such as good / bad news, important / unimportant, comprehensive

/ non-comprehensive, possible / impossible, sincere / deceitful, expected / unexpected, and others. Meanwhile, Thompson and Hunston define evaluation as a term to see the attitude of the expression of the speaker or writer, his tendencies, point of view, or feelings about the entity or proposition he is talking about (Thompson & Hunston, 2003). The discussion of evaluative language is important because it functions as a tool to interpret the world and provide evaluations of others that include their behavior (Bednarek, 2006).

Given that during 2019 there was an intense debate on Twitter, evaluative language allowed it to be reflected therein. The focus of this research study is appraisal with three subsystems: attitude, engagement and graduation.

Appraisal as a framework developed from interpersonal meaning,

as offered by Halliday, has been studied by several researchers. In 2005, Hyland and Tse identified that there was a phenomenon that said in scientific articles, especially abstract sections. By using data that were consisted of 240 research articles from 8 fields of science, they found that the word *that* appears once every five sentences and is important in providing author space for comment or evaluation (Hyland & Tse, 2005). Few years later, Asher, Benamara and Mathieu (2009) utilize the appraisal system as an evaluation of language to analyze opinions. They identified that opinions, as expressed in daily life, are difficult to analyze precisely because they have many sides. So far sentiment analysis has been examined using two approaches: psychological and computational. But for them, the Natural Language Processing (NLP) system is able to reach beyond the expression of positive

and negative sentiments, even reaching a broader scope, including motivation, recommendations and speculation, as well as how they are all related in a discourse. They use opinion analysis based on lexical semantic analysis combined with analysis of how clauses combine with one another. The data they use are three types of online corporations with different styles and audiences: film reviews, letters to editors, and news reports in English and French. The result is an evaluation of their annotations showing the validity of the opinion categorization they offer. In addition, referring to the structure and logic of the discourse, opinions found are contradictory and supportive. By including reporting expressions, they are able to differentiate between the opinions of agents in the text and the opinions of the authors (Asher, Benamara, & Mathieu, 2009). The research offers a novelty that lies in

categorizing emotional expressions using a four-level typology, namely reporting expressions, expressions of judgment, expressions of advice, and expressions of sentiment. Besides that, the interrelated rhetorical web of their concerns. Moreover, when other studies only rely on annotations on a single corpus, while they involve two languages, namely English and French. Nevertheless, the large variety of data causes the analysis of opinion not to focus on a particular issue.

In 2009, Bednarek developed one of the appraisal subsystems: attitude. She based her research on the "challenges" of Martin and White (2005) which provided space for the development of "feeling maps" in the attitude subsystem by expressing them as a hypothesis. She develops emotions (affect) into two more subsystems, namely overt affect and covert affect (Bednarek, 2009). The development

was very positive in adding to the appraisal study, but not exploiting corpus linguistics in his research reduced the level of objectivity. Meanwhile, in 2011 Gales examined the threat discourse using appraisal theory. He thinks that the discourse of threats is related to anger, defamation, and authoritative meaning. Certain ideologies can be linked to violence when there is an attempt to command with linguistic forms that reinforce the threatening role. The data he uses is the linguistic corpus of The Army of God. As a result, the Army of God threat marked stance in several ways, namely epistemic stance, threatening attitude stance, and repetition (Gales, 2011). His research contributed to revealing the stance of The Army of God that has the potential to cause violence, but the ideology at issue at the beginning of his research was not completely answered.

In 2017 Mayo and Taboada reviewed the Cosmopolitan women's magazine using appraisal theory. Since November 2014, Cosmopolitan magazine decided to include politics in its content with the aim of increasing reader participation in voting (to vote) in elections and seeking advocacy for women's rights in the electoral process. On that basis, they sought to reveal the writer's attitude, both the content on Cosmovotes's page and the readers' response. The data used is the Cosmovotes page along with the response of its readers. As a result, there is a difference between the editor's position and the reader's response and the role of the verbal process in his expression. Cosmopolitan has special characteristics such as the superiority of intensifying reader opinions and strong negative judgments, while political issues are less "contentious" and not intensive (Aloy Mayo & Taboada,

2017). Their research is useful for uncovering the gap in views between Cosmovotes content writers and their readers' responses. Even so, disclosure of the background of the study still contained non-alignment (Cosmopolitan Magazine with its website development) to determine the selection of data.

Recent research was conducted by Xu and Nesi (2019) who examined the engagement subsystem. They considered that the publication of research results was influenced by the cultural background of the author and the expectations of his local community. For this reason, they investigated the subsystems of engagement in English-language scientific articles written by Chinese writers and compared them with English authors. As a result, the frequency of heteroglossia and monoglossia markers was calculated

using the UAM Corpus Tool and showed a significant difference between the two corporations using one-tailed t-test (Xu & Nesi, 2019). The research is interesting because it uses the UAS Corpus Tool software so that it ensures a more valid analysis. However, the influence of original culture on the authors of scientific articles has not yet been proven.

Those researches are commonly related to one-way communication. Specifically on cebong vs kampret issue, there are researches (Fensi, 2019; Hamid, Darwis, & Andriyani, 2018). However, both of them did not operate appraisal so the evaluative language could not be captured. For that, this research used Twitter as data source and operated appraisal system to capture how its users behave through language.

METHOD

This research uses a qualitative approach. Observing and recording method is used to observe the discourse "cebong vs kampret" who are the pros and cons in Twitter media during 2019. After that, researchers record the linguistic data on Twitter by typing on search feature with the keyword "cebong vs kampret" and then copying to Microsoft Word form and saving. This researcher limits the time span of linguistic data available on Twitter from January 1, 2019 to December 31, 2019.

The cebong vs kampret issue represents supporters of the 2019 presidential candidate serial number 01 and serial number 02. The issue, which is intensively debated on Twitter, has caused Indonesian society to be polarized. The impact, various aspects of life are associated with political affiliation. The debate over the four issues is generally triggered by a Twit

and then the debate takes place in the reply column. The twit and reply are used as data by the researchers.

Based on the data collected, there were 65 Twit and 1044 replies on the issue of cebong vs kampret. In analyzing data, this researcher uses an appraisal framework divided into 3 subsystems: attitude, engagement and graduation. Attitude subsystems are categorized into three groups, namely affect, assessment, and appreciation. Meanwhile, engagement is grouped into heteroglos (the use of "voices" of others) and monoglos (the use of "voices" of the authors themselves). In addition, engagement is divided into four types, namely denying, stating, accepting, and referring. The graduation is divided into two types, namely force and focus.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

In evaluating an issue, Twitter users are very emotional when responding to the analogy of the animal being, which is associated with the idolized figure. The analogy, for example Cebong vs Kampret which is referred to the presidential candidate pair number 01 and presidential candidate pair number 02. In 2019, the analogy of the Cebong vs Kampret is very intensively discussed, even debated on Twitter. There were 65 Twit and 1044 replies debated on that issue during 2019. The data that consist of tweets and replies

T4: *Nyaksiin keributan antara Cebong VS Kampret mah ud biasa. Yang luar biasa itu nyaksiin keributan antara Kampret VS Kampret. Gw amat sangat menikmati keributan itu* ('Witness the commotion between Cebong VS Kampret is an ordinary thing. What was amazing was witnessing the commotion between Kampret VS Kampret. I'm so enjoying to see this commotion')

The writer of the tweet has a feeling of enjoying the shuffle of kampret vs kampret. This attitude shows that there are people who want a commotion between two society groups, although not between the cebong vs kampret.

were categorized and analyzed into three subsystems: attitude, engagement and graduation.

Attitude

Attitude is divided into three types: affect, appreciation and judgment. Affect functions as feeling or emotions like *interested* and *satisfied*. Appreciation is valuing things like *important* and *complex*, while judgment evaluates people or their behavior like *honest* and *courageous*.

Based on the type of affect, it could be seen in the following data.

Judging from his attitude, the writer feels pleasure when particular group is noisy. This also indicates that the writer is affiliated with the cebong group.

Based on appreciation, seen in the following data.

T5: *Cebong vs Kampret: Polarisasi politik setelah Pemilu 2019 akan semakin tajam akibat akumulasi strategi kampanye kedua kubu sejak 2014* ('Cebong vs Kampret: Political polarization after the 2019 elections will be sharper, due to the accumulation of campaign strategies of the two camps since 2014')

The author of the tweet evaluates an object (polarization) as something that has a sharper impact. As it is known that the subsystem in the appraisal is not

exclusively, the tweet also contains another subsystem: graduation.

Meanwhile in terms of judgment, the following data appears.

RP6: *terus gak mau kalah padahal salah mungkin didikan kadrurun* ('continue to not want to lose even though one might educate kadrurun'). Kadrurun is the acronym of kadal gurun (desert lizard).

The judging of right and wrong judgment in the reply shows the attitude of the writer who evaluates the person. However, the judgment is not based on certain norms prevailing in society. This is also followed by possible hedges

(*mungkin*) which indicate the writer's uncertainty about his attitude.

Engagement

Engagement related to stand point of the writer in evaluating things or person.

Based on data, it was shown below.

T3: *Abis lebaran gak ada lagi cebong vs kampret Nyang ada: pejuang vs penghianat! Mukminin vs Munafikun* ('After Lebaran there is no longer cebong vs kampret. There is only a warrior vs traitor! Believer vs Hypocrite!')

Link:

<https://www.cnnindonesia.com/nasional/20190605133733-20-401121/zulhas-harap-usai-lebaran-tidak-ada-lagi-cebong-dan-kampret>

This twit provides news links from online mass media. This is used by the writer to strengthen his opinion.

Graduation

Graduation related to choice on meaning-scale to express graduation value. This subsystem that was depicted in data could be seen below.

T9: *Beda wajah cebong vs kampret pasca pilpres. Cebong ceria, bahagia, saling mendukung, follower nambah drastic, makin pinter dan bijaksana. Kampret muka kusut, wajah seram, senang memaki, saling cakar2an sesama kampret, nyari follower pake promo segala. Hidupnya makin susah.* ('Different face of Cebong VS Kampret after the presidential election. Cebong is cheerful, happy, supporting each other, follower added dramatically, more intelligent and wise. Kampret Face tangled, spooky face, happy cursing, mutilating fellow kampret, looking for followers using all promos. His life is getting harder and harder')

That tweet was replied by another writer with response below:

RP9: *Menyelamatkan bangsa dari kaum monster sebuah karunia Tuhan yang tak terhingga* ('Saving the nation from the monsters is an infinite gift of God')

In the tweet the writer was audited by comparing the condition of the Cebong (as an analogy from supporters of Presidential Candidate 01) and Kampret (as an analogy from supporters of Presidential Candidates 02) in binary terms. The evaluation uses the choice of smooth lexis on one side, and uses the choice of rough lexis on the other side. On the other hand, another Tweeter user responded with an agreed evaluation. In fact, he uses a more coarsely lexis, namely monsters. Debate whose topic is idolized causes Twitter users to be easily provoked into emotions.

CONCLUSION

Based on findings and discussion, it can be concluded that Twitter users tend to evaluate cebong vs kampret emotionally. Even if the presidential election result has been announced, the debate on cebong vs kampret has been lasting. By operating appraisal system, it was depicted that subsystem attitude and graduation intensively used by writer. It shows that related to idolized person, Twitter users prioritize emotions or feeling than logical. On the other hand, they emphasized the evaluation on semantic scale that commonly consist of adjective words.

REFERENCES

- Aloy Mayo, M., & Taboada, M. (2017). Evaluation in political discourse addressed to women: Appraisal analysis of Cosmopolitan's online coverage of the 2014 US midterm elections. *Discourse, Context and Media*, 18, 40–48. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.dcm.2017.06.003>
- Asher, N., Benamara, F., & Mathieu, Y. (2009). Appraisal of Opinion Expressions in Discourse. *International Journal of Linguistics and Language Resources*, 32(2), 279–292. <https://doi.org/10.1075/li.32.2.10as>
- Bednarek, M. (2006). *Evaluation in Media Discourse: Analysis of a Newspaper Corpus (book)*. London: Continuum.
- Fensi, F. (2019). Paradoxic Language “Cebong-Kampret” in Facebook as a Mirror of the Political Language of Indonesia. *Bricolage: Jurnal Magister Ilmu Komunikasi*, 5(2), 103–120.
- Gales, T. (2011). Identifying interpersonal stance in threatening discourse: An appraisal analysis. *Discourse Studies*, 13(1), 27–46. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1461445610387735>
- Gunarwan, A. (2007). *Pragmatik: Teori & Kajian Nusantara*. Jakarta: Penerbit Universitas Atma Jaya.
- Hamid, A., Darwis, & Andriyani, S. (2018). Fenomena Politik Cebong dan Kampret di Indonesia: Sebuah Analisis... *Jurnal Politea*, I(1), 29–36.
- Hofstede, G. (2001). Culture's Consequences: Comparing Values, Behaviours, Institutions, and Organizations Across Nations. In *Sage Publications* (Second). <https://doi.org/10.1002/ejoc.20120>

Hyland, K., & Tse, P. (2005).

Evaluative that constructions:

Signalling stance in research

abstracts . *Functions of Language*,

12(1), 39–63.

<https://doi.org/10.1075/fol.12.1.03hyl>

McGue, M., & Bouchard, T. J. (1998).

Genetic and Environmental

Influences on Human Behavioral

Differences. *Annual Review of*

Neuroscience, 21(1), 1–24.

<https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.neuro.21.1.1>

Rahyono, F. X., Sutanto, I., Rachmat,

R., & Puspitorini, D. (2005).

Kearifan Dalam Bahasa Sebuah

Tinjauan Pragmatis Terhadap

Profil Kebahasaan Media Massa

Pada Masa Pascaorde Baru.

Makara Human Behavior Studies

in Asia, 9(2), 46.

<https://doi.org/10.7454/mssh.v9i2>.

Thompson, G., & Hunston, S. (2003).

Evaluation in Text: Authorial

Stance and the Construction of

Discourse (S. Hunston & G.

Thompson, eds.). Retrieved from

https://books.google.co.id/books?id=k8nSuoF0-XoC&printsec=frontcover&hl=id&source=gbs_ge_summary_r&cad=0#v=onepage&q&f=true

Thompson, G., & Hunston, S. (2003).

Evaluation in Text: Authorial

Stance and the Construction of

Discourse (S. Hunston & G.

Tremayne, M. (2014). Anatomy of

Protest in the Digital Era: A

Network Analysis of Twitter and

Occupy Wall Street. *Social*

Movement Studies, 13(1), 110–

126.

<https://doi.org/10.1080/14742837.2013.830969>

Xu, X., & Nesi, H. (2019). Differences

in engagement: A comparison of

the strategies used by British and

Chinese research article writers.

Journal of English for Academic

Purposes, 38, 121–134.

[https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeap.2019.](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeap.2019.02.003)

02.003