STUDENTS' ARGUMENTATION TEXT ANALYSIS IN INDONESIA USING APPRAISAL APPROACH (APPRECIATION)

Atika Lisamawati [1], Dessy Dwijayanti [2], Wahyu Rima Agustin [3]
Kusuma Husada University, Banjarsari, Surakarta, Indonesia [1,2,3]
[1]ddessy25@gmail.com

Abstract

This research is qualitative descriptive research with a fixed case study that has the following objectives: to describe students' opinions in the text about "Services in Private Hospitals are better than services in State Hospitals". Hence after, to determine and describe data expressions included in the appraisal category. Furthermore, to describe data expressions included in appraisal appreciation. The data in this study were obtained through document analysis and Focus Group Discussion (FGD). The instruments in this study were documentation and interviews. In the study, 444 data were found. The 403 data were included in the category of Appraisal assessment types: Appreciation-Valuation. The data obtained were divided into 2 types of assessments, 1) assessment of Private Hospital and State Hospital services, 2) assessment of Private Hospital and State Hospital facilities. From these findings, the average expression used by students to describe Private Hospital services was; quality and so on 20 data, professional 22 data, faster 12 data, fast 10 data, quality 20 data, friendly 8 data, more friendly 10 data, friendly 8 data, more friendly 10 data, efficient 22 data, great 13 data, good 19 data, and bad 1 data. Based on the study, it was found that there were shortcomings in the results of the argumentative text produced by students. When asked to write an argumentative text, students in giving their opinions were still not persuasive. There are fundamental differences that students must understand regarding the differences between opinion texts and argumentative texts, namely: the purpose of making the text.

Introduction

Appraisal is a linguistic framework developed in Systemic Functional Theory by M.A.K. Halliday and further developed by Jim Martin and Peter White. Appraisal focuses on how attitudes, evaluations, and feelings are expressed in language. There are three main categories in the Appraisal system: Affect, Judgment, and Appreciation. Each category helps in understanding how writers or speakers express their attitudes toward people, phenomena, or events. Affect is the part of appraisal that refers to the expression of emotions and feelings. In this case, the feelings of the subject are evaluated directly or indirectly. Affect can be a positive or negative emotion, depending on the feeling or

reaction to something. Judgment relates to a person's moral or ethical judgment of the behavior of an individual or group. Judgment assesses a person's actions or character, whether they are in accordance with moral, social, or legal standards. Judgment can be divided into two categories: Social esteem: Judging a person's behavior in terms of decency, competence, or moral integrity, for example "He is an honest person." Social sanction: Judging behavior based on more formal norms such as the law, for example "He is guilty of committing an offense." Judgment is often used in social and political discourse to evaluate the actions of a person or group. Appreciation is concerned with the assessment of aesthetic objects or phenomena. This includes judgments about the quality of objects, events, or phenomena. Appreciation generally assesses in terms of how good, beautiful, or useful something is.

Comparison with Similar Theories: Evaluation Theory, Appraisal in the context of linguistics is often compared to evaluation theory in psychology. Evaluation theory focuses on how individuals judge or respond to situations based on emotions or cognition. Both theories view evaluation as a subjective process, but in Appraisal, evaluation focuses more on how these feelings and attitudes are expressed through language, while evaluation theory in psychology focuses more on the underlying mental processes. Pragmatic Theory: In the study of pragmatics, the analysis of language often focuses on the intentions behind utterances (illocutionary acts). Pragmatics examines the social context and how language is used to achieve certain goals. The concepts of Judgment and Appreciation in Appraisal can be seen as part of pragmatic analysis, especially in identifying how speakers position themselves in relation to their interlocutors through evaluative expressions. Sociolinguistic Theory: In sociolinguistics, issues such as power, ideology, and social norms are often central to the study. Judgment and Appreciation in Appraisal touch on these themes because evaluations in language often reflect the social and cultural views prevailing in a given society.

Appraisal makes an important contribution to discourse analysis because it helps reveal how attitudes and ideologies are expressed subtly in texts and verbal interactions. It has strong theoretical value when used in conjunction with other studies such as critical discourse analysis (CDA), where mapping attitudes in language can reveal relations of power and dominance in society. For example, a study of media discourse can show how Judgment and Appreciation are used to influence public perceptions of particular social groups. Comparing Appraisal with other approaches, we can see that Appraisal provides a more structured tool for analyzing the expression of attitudes in language, whereas psychological and sociological approaches often focus on the motivations or impact of these evaluations on human behavior and social structures.

Method

This research is a descriptive-qualitative translation research. This research is called qualitative research because in this research the researcher tries to understand phenomena that occur naturally in natural conditions. In this case, the field of study is analyzing data in students' argumentative texts. The linguistic phenomena studied are in the form of words, phrases, or clauses that realize expressions of appreciation that appear in students' argumentative texts.

This research is called descriptive research because it aims to describe in detail the existing cultural phenomena. In addition, this research describes the phenomenon qualitatively using discursive data in the form of words, groups of words, or clauses in

sentences in a cohesive text (Santosa, 2017:31). Specifically, this research connects the use of appraisal appreciation devices contained in students' argumentative texts. The research instrument is the researcher himself because the researcher can adapt to the data environment (Santosa, 2017:119) to get a holistic picture. The researcher conducted direct observations to obtain data regarding the assessment of appraisal appreciation of the argumentative texts made by students.

The data collection technique used in this study is document analysis. and Focus Group Discussion (FGD). Data validation techniques use source triangulation and method triangulation. Data analysis techniques use Domain analysis, Taxonomy analysis and Componental Analysis . Research instruments are tools and facilities used by researchers in the data collection process so that the results are better, more accurate, complete and consistent so that they are easy to process. The instruments in this study are documentation and interviews.

Result and Discussion

Table 1. Data Distribution

VALUATION							
Services				**Facilities**			
Private	**Freq**	**State**	**Freq**	**Private**	**Freq**	**State**	**Freq**
excellent	20	Low Quality (imp)	16	Clean	22	Not Clean Enough (imp)	18
professional	22	Less Professional	13	Neat	22	Neat	8
		Less Professional (imp)	9	Adequate	22	Inadequate	6
Faster	12	Not Fast Enough (imp)	7	Complete	20	Complete	7
Fast	13	Slow	12	-	-	-	-
Excellent	20	Poor Quality (imp)	7	-	-	-	-
Friendly	8	Not Friendly	8	-	-	-	-
More Friendly	10	Less Friendly (imp)	10	-	-	-	-
Efficient	22	Less Efficient	22	-	-	-	-
Great	13	Not Great (imp)	10	-	-	-	-
Good	19	Enough	3	-	-	-	-
Bad	1	Good	1	-	-	-	-

This study focuses on the analysis of appraisal translations that describe the expression of Appreciation . The translation of the expression of Appreciation obtained comes from the results of student writing . The expression of Appreciation as data in this study is all

the expressions of Appreciation found from the results of student writings that comment on "Pelayanan di RS Swasta lebih baik daripada pelayanan di RS Negeri".

After collecting data on the results of students' writings commenting on "Services in Private Hospitals are Better than Services in State Hospitals", 444 data were found. The 403 data were included in the category of Appraisal: Appreciation - Valuation assessment types . The data obtained were divided into 2 types of assessments , 1) assessment of services in Private Hospitals and State Hospitals, 2) assessment of facilities in Private Hospitals and State Hospitals. From these findings, the average expression used by students to describe services in Private Hospitals are; good quality 20 data, professional 22 data, faster 12 data, fast 10 data, quality 20 data, friendly 8 data, more friendly 10 data, friendly 8 data, more friendly 10 data, efficient 22 data, great 13 data, good 19 data, and bad 1 data. From table 5.1, there is also a tendency to use implicit expressions in explaining services at state hospitals. The average use of these expressions is opposite in nature to the use of expressions in explaining services at private hospitals. With the details of the data findings explaining state hospital services as follows: not good quality (imp)   16 data, less professional 13 data, less professional (imp) 9 data, less fast (imp) 7 data, slow 12 data, less quality (imp) 7 data, not friendly 8 data, less friendly (imp) 10, less efficient   22 data, not great (imp) 10 data, sufficient 3, and good 1.

In addition to comparing services in private and state hospitals, students also compared the facilities in private and state hospitals. Four adjectives were found that students tend to use to describe facilities in private and state hospitals, namely; clean, neat, adequate, and complete. The frequency of use of these expressions is as follows; 1) Private Hospital; clean 22 data, neat 22 data, adequate 22 data, and complete 10 data. 2) State Hospital is less clean (imp) 18 data, neat 8 data, inadequate 6 data , and complete 7 data.

Hospital Services

From the research that has been conducted, it was found a phenomenon in composing argumentative texts that students tend to use implicit sentences or expressions in expressing their opinions regarding the services and facilities available in state hospitals when compared to private hospitals. For the word "quality" which is used to describe the services in both hospitals, it can be seen that when describing the services in private hospitals there are 20 uses of the word quality written by students. While there are 6 uses of the word "not quality" to describe the quality of service in state hospitals from 22 student argumentative texts. Where the expressions used by students are in the form of implicit expressions and or use the word "if compared" in expressing their opinions. Example:

Data 1

*Pelayanan yang ada di rumah sakit swasta lebih bermutu **jika dibandingkan** pelayanan di rumah sakit negeri.*

Data 347

Selain itu tenaga medis di rumah sakit swasta lebih ramah, jika dibandingkan rumah sakit negeri

From the example data above, it can be seen that students tend to use comparisons in describing the quality of services in hospitals. As seen from the data in table 5.1, 20 students wrote that services in private hospitals are of better quality, and 16 of them used comparisons that were opposite in nature to private hospitals to describe public hospital services.

The same thing can also be seen in data 347. Where in assessing the services of medical personnel, 10 students stated that private hospitals are of better quality and still in the same text they stated that state hospitals are of less quality implicitly because of the use of the word "more". While the other 12 students did not explain the quality of medical personnel in private or state hospitals.

Data 39

dalam hal pelayanan jasa medis rumah sakit swasta lebih profesional

Data 43

Tenaga medis di rumah sakit negeri terkadang kurang profesional

In examples 39 and 43, there are two differences in the way students write their opinions about. In data 39 students use the word "more" to describe the quality of service of medical personnel in private hospitals. 22 students simultaneously said that the quality of service of medical personnel in private hospitals is more professional, and 9 of them explicitly stated that it is less professional which can be seen in expression 43. While the other 13 did not express or write their assessment of the service of medical personnel in private hospitals explicitly, but what can be seen in data 39 is the use of the word "more" in the assessment of private hospitals implicitly stating that they consider the service of medical personnel in state hospitals to be less professional.

There is also the use of the word "no" in the assessment of the quality of medical services in private and state hospitals. For example, it can be seen in the data below.

Data 323

Tenaga medis di rumah sakit negeri tidak ramah

Data 327

sedangkan tenaga medis di rumah sakit swasta ramah-ramah.

There are 8 students who describe the service of medical personnel in private and state hospitals. Where they all describe the personnel in state hospitals as unfriendly. The use of the word not in this expression illustrates their inherent view that state medical personnel are the same as unfriendly. In contrast to medical personnel in private

hospitals who use repetition of the adjective "friendly". Where this illustrates their view of medical personnel in private hospitals as the same as very friendly.

Hospital Facilities

In contrast to hospital services, students in describing the quality of facilities in hospitals only use four types of adjectives. Namely clean, neat, adequate, and complete. However, similar to their opinions on hospital services, in hospital facilities, all 22 students describe private hospital facilities as better than state hospitals.

Data 146

Kamar mandi di rumah sakit swasta selalu lebih bersih jika dibandingkan dengan rumah sakit negeri

In the sentence above, it can be seen that they use the word "more" to describe the cleanliness of the bathroom in the hospital. The use of comparative words implies that they implicitly feel that the cleanliness of the bathroom in a state hospital is not comparable to that of a private hospital.

In addition to the bathroom assessment, students also assessed the completeness of medical equipment provided by the hospital. 20 children wrote in their arguments that private hospitals provide complete medical equipment. Seven children also stated that state hospitals provide adequate (complete) medical equipment. However, there were two students who did not mention the medical equipment provided by the hospital in their argument text.

Data 248

Fasilitas kesehatan yang disediakan oleh rumah sakit swasta dapat dikatakan memadai

Data 87

Jika dilihat, fasilitas kesehatan yang ada di rumah sakit negeri dirasa kurang memadai

As many as 22 students also considered that the health facilities provided by health hospitals were adequate, while 6 students said that health facilities in state hospitals were inadequate. Meanwhile, 16 students did not assess health facilities at home, either explicitly or implicitly.

From all that has been explained above, it can be seen that in expressing their opinions on the assessment of private and state hospitals, there is a main point that students tend to forget when writing this text, namely that the text they write is an argumentative text. The main purpose of argumentative text is to convince readers to be able to accept and be influenced by the statements conveyed in the text. Meanwhile, if seen from the results of the writing that students make, it is an opinion text, not an argumentative text. It can be seen from the use of adjectives used to describe state hospitals and private hospitals.

It is true, in describing a writer's assessment of an object or thing must use adjectives. However, what is forgotten by all students is that in writing argumentative texts must be accompanied by objective opinion-supporting evidence. While in the argumentative texts written by students are still subjective and not accompanied by evidence. Proven by the use of comparative words, more + adjectives, and negation of adjectives.

Conclusion

Based on the results of research conducted by researchers on 22 students, it was found that there were shortcomings in the results of argumentative texts produced by students. When asked to write an argumentative text explaining the quality of private and state hospitals, students in giving their opinions were still not persuasive. It can be seen in the way they express their assessments, where after giving their assessments of the quality of hospital services and facilities, they were not accompanied by evidence to support their opinions.

There is a fundamental difference that students must understand regarding the differences between opinion texts and argumentative texts . Although at first glance these two types of texts are almost the same , what differentiates them is the purpose of creating the text. In opinion texts, the writing perspective is subjective because it is the result of the author's thoughts and opinions. In writing opinion texts, the author's preferences will be clearly visible. While in argumentative texts, this text is created to influence someone to believe the author's statement. Writing argumentative texts must be objective and accompanied by facts that support the ideas written by the author.

However, the author found, based on research conducted on the results of argumentative text writing conducted by students, most of the students could not distinguish the differences between the two types of texts. It can be seen from the research conducted using the appraisal approach, the adjectives used to describe the facilities and services in private and state hospitals are still subjective. The absence of supporting facts also shows that students do not understand the differences between the two types of texts. In addition, what makes it clear that the majority of students write argumentative texts as opinion texts is the use of comparative words in explaining the assessment of the services and quality of state and private hospitals.

References

Arfianti, N.I. 2019. Kajian Terjemahan Metafora Gramatika Ideasional Dalam Novel "Diary of Wimpy Kid" Edisi I-III Dengan Menggunakan Pendekatan SFL. Tesis. Universitas Sebelas Maret

Anggororeni, P. Analisis Terjemahan Makna Interpersonal Dalam Dubbing Film Thomas and Friends: Blue Mountain Mystery. Lingua 15(1), 7-18. DOI: 10.30957/linguav15i.426.

Beekam, J., Callow, J. (1974). Translating the word of God. Grand Rapids, M.I: Zondervan

Davidse, K & Vandenbergen, A.M.S. 2015. Introduction: The Realization of Interpersonal Meaning. WORD 59(1), 3-23. Retrieved from https://doi.org/10.1080/00437956.2008.11432579

Halliday, M.A.K & Hasan, R. 1985. Language, Context, and Text: Aspect of Language in a Social-semiotic Perspective. Victoria: Deakin University Press.

Halliday, M.A.K. 1994. An Introduction Functional Grammar. London: Edward Arnold

Halliday, M.A.K & Matthiessen, M.I.M Christian. 2004. An Introduction Functional Grammar. London: Hodder Arnold.

Halliday, M.A.K & Matthiessen, M.I.M Christian. 2014. Halliday's Introduction to Functional Grammar Fourth Edition. London dan New York: Routledge.

Martin, J.R., & Rose, D. (2007). Working with discourse (2 Ed). London/New York: Continuum

Martin, J.R., & White, P. R. P. (2005). The language of evaluation. New York: Palgrave Macmillan

Newmark, P. (1988). A text book of translation. Uk Prentice Hall Intrernational Ltd.

Santosa, R. 2003. Semiotika Sosial. Surabaya: JP Press.

Santosa, R. (2017). Metode penelitian kualitatif kebahasaan. Surakarta:UNS Press

Santosa, R. (2014). Metode Penelitian Kebahasaan. UNS Press.

Spradley. P. James. (1980). Participant observation. Florida: Holt, Rinehart and Winston

Sutopo, H.B. (2002). Pengantar penelitian kualitatif. Surakarta: Universitas Sebelas Maret Press

Thompson, G. 2014. Introducing Functional Grammar Third Edition. London and New York: Routledge.

Wiratno, T. (2018). Pengantar ringkasan linguistic sistemik fungsional. Yogyakarta: Pustaka Pelajar

Wiratno, T & Santosa, R. 2011. Pengantar Linguistik Umum, Cetakan kedua. Jakarta: Universitas Terbuka.