Rhetorical Devices Used by Content Creators to Address the Boycott of the Game *Dead by Daylight*

Reynald Setyawan[1], Samuel Gunawan[2]

English Department, Faculty of Humanities and Creative Industries, Petra Christian University, Siwalankerto 121- 131, Surabaya, 60236, INDONESIA
E-mail: a11180083@john.petra.ac.id, samgun@petra.ac.id

ABSTRACT
This study was conducted to analyze the rhetorical devices used by Otzdarva, an affiliated content creator to Behaviour Interactive Inc., and Scott Jund, an unaffiliated content creator, to address the boycott of the game Dead by Daylight. In addition, the writer observed the similarities and differences in the rhetorical devices used by both content creators. In conducting the study, the writer used the rhetorical devices theory by Harris (2018) and the audience design model by Bell (1984, as cited in Seargeant and Tagg, 2014). This study was done using a descriptive qualitative approach. The findings show that Otzdarva used all rhetorical devices from the transition category and five rhetorical devices from the restatement category, while Scott Jund used all rhetorical devices from the transition category and six rhetorical devices from the restatement category. This study showed that the difference in audience roles creates differences in how content creators use rhetorical devices.

Keywords: rhetorical devices; transition; restatement; boycott; content creator; affiliation status

INTRODUCTION
Video games have evolved tremendously from their early days. What once appeared on pixelated screens with limited sounds now has become closer to reality. It is no wonder because technology also keeps on improving. If technology continues to improve, video games will continue to improve as well (Beattie, 2021). The industry itself has grown massively over the past few years. It has grown from a niche hobby enjoyed by small communities into a globally understood item (Aggarwal, 2021). Aggarwal (2021) further elaborates that this is due to the existence of content creators. Lockie (2019) mentions that marketing through content creators earns the same trust as word-of-mouth promotion, with personal knowledge of information providers being the key difference. This shows that content creators play an integral role in many industries' marketing in the past few years.

One of the gaming industries that makes use of this fact as previously mentioned is Behaviour Interactive Inc. Behaviour Interactive Inc. (2021) is an independent game developer and publisher company. One of the company's most successful IP (Intellectual Property), the award-winning game *Dead by Daylight*, currently has more than 36 million players worldwide (Behaviour Interactive Inc., 2021). *Dead by Daylight* is a multiplayer action survival horror game. The game is an asymmetrical multiplayer, which means different teams have a different number of players. One player takes the role of a Killer, who must catch and kill all Survivors. The other four players play as Survivors, who must finish their objectives in the form of fixing generators to escape and avoid getting caught and killed by the Killer.

In February 2019, Behaviour Interactive Inc. launched a partnership program called Fog Whisperers Program. Streaming and video content creators are rewarded in this program. The partners/affiliates of this program are called the Fog Whisperers. This Fog Whisperers program is Behaviour

Interactive Inc.'s way of utilizing content creators for their marketing. The company provides details on who the Fog Whisperers are on their website and on Twitch, a streaming website.

On June 26, 2021, a Reddit user under the username forFelix proposed a boycott against Behaviour Interactive Inc. According to forFelix (2021), Behaviour Interactive Inc., has become lazier, sloppier, and slower in designing the game. forFelix (2021) adds that for this boycott to work, the players as a collective need to stop buying Dead by Daylight in-game contents for three months to remind Behaviour Interactive Inc. that they should listen to the community.

The writer finds that, while there are lots of *Dead by Daylight* content creators, only a select few respond to the boycott proposition. Out of all responders, two content creators: Otzdarva and Scott Jund have the same opinion. In their respective response videos, they feel that the problem lies in the fact that the game *Dead by Daylight* has no competitors, the developers have no malicious intent, in this case, greed, but they work very slowly while trying to push lots of content, and the game *Dead by Daylight* constantly gets new players due to collaboration with popular IPs. Therefore, even if the old players suddenly stop paying for contents, the new players will eventually be their replacements. Even though they have the same opinion, both Otzdarva and Scott Jund packaged their opinion in a different way. Otzdarva adopts an aggressive style, while Scott Jund adopts a welcoming style.

The writer chooses those two because of some reasons as follows. The first reason is that the two (Otzdarva and Scott Jund) are from the two types of Dead by Daylight content creators: affiliate and non-affiliate. The second reason is the fact that the two content creators are content creators with marketing value for Behaviour Interactive Inc. Most importantly, the two content creators have the same opinion about the issue.

Bell (1984, as cited in Seargeant and Tagg, 2014) explains that there are three audience roles: (1) addressees, addressed directly by the speaker; (2) auditors, not addressed directly, but is still involved in some way; and (3) overhearers, within the speaker's mind, but not addressed and not involved. In the two response videos, the writer found three audiences in both response videos, which are the players of the game *Dead by Daylight*, Behaviour Interactive Inc, and the boycotters.

In Otzdarva's case, his addressee would be the players of the game Dead by Daylight. His auditor would be Behaviour Interactive Inc. and the boycotters. The company is the auditor because he has contractual obligation as an affiliated content creator. The boycotters are also the auditor because Otzdarva had an aggressive and borderline alienating attitude towards the boycotters, and he never addressed them directly. In Scott Jund's case, his addressee would be both the players of the game *Dead by Daylight* and the boycotters. The boycotters are the addressee in this case because Scott Jund directly invited his audience to imagine the things stated in the boycott proposition to be true, showed that he considered the possibility of the boycotters' potential objection, even if he, ultimately, rejected their idea. The company, Behaviour Interactive Inc., is only an overhearer for Scott Jund because he does not have any contractual obligation towards the company.

The reason why the study will revolve around the rhetorical devices used is that, according to the audience design model by Bell (1984, as cited in Seargeant & Tagg, 2014), a speaker's way of saying something is heavily influenced by their attempt to accommodate to their addressees. The use of rhetorical devices, according to Harris (2018), is to make communication clearer, more interesting, powerful, and enjoyable. This should mean that the use of rhetorical devices highly depends on the target audience, which could lead to rhetorical devices having additional use outside the intended purpose described in the theory. Therefore, there should be differences between the

286
Setyawan & Gunawan: Rhetorical Devices Used by Content Creators to
Address the Boycott of the Game *Dead by Daylight*

rhetorical devices used by affiliated and unaffiliated content creators because of their different audiences as explained in previous paragraphs.

METHODS

In this study, the writer used a descriptive qualitative approach. The source of data was all utterances of the two responders (Otzdarva and Scott Jund). These utterances were not the data because some utterances that did not contain rhetorical devices were kept for the preservation of context. The data were the utterances which contain rhetorical devices used by the content creators. The writer applied several steps to collect the data. First, the writer watched the two videos mentioned in Table 3.1 on their original source: YouTube. Next, the writer downloaded the two videos for re-watching while paying attention to the utterances made and transcription purposes. The writer transcribed the videos using a gisted transcription type: Condensed Transcription. The writer used a two-digit numbering system. The first digit represented the content creators. Number 1 (one) was for Otzdarva and number 2 (two) was Scott Jund. The second digit represented the content creators' utterances. Finally, the writer analyzed the data based on Harris' (2018) theory of rhetorical devices, specifically in the transition and restatement categories.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

This section discusses the findings of this study regarding what rhetorical devices are used by the content creators, their reasons for using them, and the similarities and differences in how they use the rhetorical devices

General Similarities and Differences

Otzdarva, in the transition category, uses metabasis, procatalepsis, and hypophora. In the restatement category, he uses anaphora, epistrophe, anadiplosis, epanalepsis, and diacope. He does not use symploce, conduplicatio, epizeuxis, antimetabole, and scesis onomaton. Scott Jund, in the transition category, uses metabasis, procatalepsis, and hypophora. In the restatement category, he uses anaphora, epistrophe, anadiplosis, conduplicatio, epanalepsis, and diacope. He did not use symploce, epizeuxis, antimetabole, and scesis onomaton.

Both Otzdarva and Scott Jund use the rhetorical devices mostly for the same purposes, except for the context in which they use them. Both content creators also use the rhetorical devices outside their main purposes stated by Harris (2018). The main difference is that Otzdarva uses the rhetorical devices he used to undermine the topic of the boycott, lower the boycotters' credibility, and defend the developers. Scott Jund, on the other hand, uses the rhetorical devices he used to show his care towards the topic of the boycott, assert certainty, and educate the boycotters.

Metabasis

In their respective videos, both Otzdarva and Scott Jund use metabasis to go into a more in-depth discussion. However, unlike Scott Jund where he refers to his own comments, Otzdarva uses metabasis to refer to the boycott proposition made by forFelix. This creates a connection between the boycott proposition and Otzdarva's response video, while Scott Jund's response video stands on its own.

Otzdarva's use of metabasis mainly revolves on taking a passage out of forFelix's boycott proposition to prepare for a more in-depth discussion. Otzdarva also uses metabasis to undermine the topic of the boycott itself. As an example, Otzdarva only quotes "*The past three chapters,*" and

then proceeds to make assumptions based on just the beginning of a topic. This shows disinterest in the topic, namely the boycott, itself. He briefly states, "*All right, let's start reading here,*" as if he had never read the boycott proposition. However, that cannot be further from the truth, as in every single bit and piece of the boycott proposition he tackles, he always has answers or objections

Scott Jund uses metabasis to go into a more in-depth discussion. He connects his initial statement that the boycott will not do anything into why it will not do anything. This can be seen from the subtle difference between his first statement "*It doesn't hurt anybody including Behaviour,*" and its continuation, "*I want to go over why boycotting does not really do anything.*" The way Scott Jund uses "*It doesn't*" instead of "*I think it doesn't*" is seen by the writer as his attempt to assert certainty of what will happen. Without using words and phrases such as "*I think*" and "*probably*", he can create an image in his audience's mind that what he is saying will indeed happen if the boycott comes to pass. It is as if he is educating the boycotters on the consequences (or lack thereof) of their boycott. Other than that, stating "*[...] in this particular scenario,*" may be an attempt to show that he truly has read the boycott proposition and is therefore showing that he cares about the topic.

Procatalepsis
Both Otzdarva and Scott Jund use procatalepsis to strengthen their initial position. However, their way of using procatalepsis is different. In Otzdarva's case, he uses procatalepsis in a demeaning and mocking way to undermine the boycott proposition, perhaps even the boycotters themselves. Otzdarva can be found stating that the boycotters are not paying attention to the game's growth and that forFelix's assessment is not good. So, in addition to strengthening his initial position, he is also trying to lower the credibility of the opposition.

In Scott Jund's case, he uses metabasis to show his care towards the boycott topic and to educate the boycotters. First, he shows that he cares about the boycott topic, and this can be seen by him saying "*let's assume,*" which is then continued with the boycotters' potential arguments, he is showing that he has already read and considered the boycotters' opinion. Second, he asserts certainty on what he is saying. Without words and phrases of uncertainty such as "*I think*", "*I believe*", and "*probably*", he is making it seems like what he is saying is absolute. This, consequently, can be seen as his attempt to educate the boycotters. By addressing the boycotters directly and asserting certainty of what will happen in his opinion.

Hypophora
Otzdarva uses hypophora to clarify ideas, ask potential questions, introduce important materials, and move to a new area of discussion. Otzdarva also uses hypophora to lower the boycotters' credibility, while also trying to defend the developers. Otzdarva uses hypophora to clarify what he perceives as mistakes made by the boycotters. He surfaces a question that he immediately answers, correcting mistakes people made regarding which chapter in the game that was delayed. He also clarifies a potential question from people who view the developers as greedy, clarifying that the developers are not greedy because the game has a lot of free contents. The writer sees this as Otzdarva's attempt to defend the developers while also trying to lower the boycotters' credibility by making notice of what he wants to show as mistakes.

In Scott Jund's case, he uses hypophora to clarify ideas and introduce important materials. Other than that, Scott Jund also uses hypophora to assert certainty and educate the boycotters. He is answering the question with utmost certainty. Since he is also addressing the boycotters, the writer also sees Scott's use of hypophora as an attempt to educate the boycotters of what will happen if the boycott, or any of the arguments made by the boycotters, happen: nothing. Scott Jund also makes

288

Setyawan & Gunawan: Rhetorical Devices Used by Content Creators to
Address the Boycott of the Game *Dead by Daylight*

the same attempt, where he mentions that when you are doing the boycott, you will not find anything similar to the game *Dead by Daylight*, which again, also asserts certainty that the boycott will not do anything.

Anaphora

Anaphora is used by both Otzdarva and Scott Jund to maintain focus on a concept and strengthen their alternative view presentation. Both use the hammering effect anaphora creates differently. Otzdarva uses anaphora to lower the boycotters' credibility and defend the developers, while Scott Jund uses anaphora to assert certainty and educate the boycotters.

Otzdarva uses anaphora to create a barrage of "*why*" questions to undermine a potential objection. The repetition of questions here significantly undermines opposite view since there is no answer his barrage of questions. Other than that, the incessant droning of the word "*please*" in utterance 1.33 is seen by the writer as Otzdarva's attempt to defend the developers by showing the large quantity of complaints made. The anaphora, followed with "*what else did we ask for?*", supports the writer's view that, indeed, Otzdarva tries to show the quantity of the complaints, which shows the attempt to defend the developers made by Otzdarva. He also attempts to lower the boycotters' credibility by portraying them in bad light.

Scott Jund uses anaphora in a mocking tone, mimicking what he believes is the way Behaviour Interactive Inc. would announce their apology as indicated by the repetition of "*we*", to simulate his opinion that Behaviour Interactive Inc. will response in a very ingenuine way. He also uses anaphora to hammer down the fact that he knows Behaviour Interactive Inc. well enough to know that the boycott will not work. A perfect example on Scott Jund's attempt to assert certainty is his repetition of "*I know.*" Even if his repetition of "*I know*" comes unnoticed, he already accounted for it by saying "*I know my Behaviour,*" instead of "*I know Behaviour.*" This makes his assertion seem more personal than it actually is. A perfect example on Scott Jund's attempt to educate the boycotters is his droning on the phrase "*even if,*" where it creates a hammering effect where he is telling the boycotters that whatever is happening to the boycott proposition, whether it becomes popular or not, only the minority of players will do it.

Epistrophe

Otzdarva uses it to make notice of his ideas. Scott Jund, however, uses epistrophe to stress concepts heavily. Additionally, Otzdarva uses epistrophe to show his disinterest towards the boycott topic and to lower the boycotters' credibility, while Scott Jund uses epistrophe to show his care towards the boycott topic.

It can be seen in his repetition of "*okay*". He only replies to the points made by forFelix using "*okay*" to show his disinterest in the points made. He does not object, he only said "*okay*". This is in line with his additional purpose of using metabasis where he undermines the boycott topic itself. Other than that, there is another additional purpose. He adds a variation to the epistrophe by continuing with "*[…] that sounds very disconnected from reality […],*" which portrays the boycotters in bad light, effectively lowering their credibility.

Scott Jund stresses the concept of trying the boycott. He is saying that he is open to people who wants to try boycotting as he believes that trying to do the boycott will not hurt anybody. Unlike in the previous subsections, he is not asserting certainty. On the contrary, he is actually using a phrase of uncertainty "*I think.*" The writer notices that it is because his use of epistrophe is not to convince people that the boycott is worthless, but it is to show that he cares about the boycott topic itself, which can be seen in him saying "*I'm all for you guys trying.*"

Symploce
Both Otzdarva and Scott Jund do not use symploce. It is possible that they do not use symploce because it functions as contrast clues. However, this function has been integrated in both Otzdarva and Scott Jund's response video using anaphora. They both use anaphora to highlight and strengthen an alternate view that they have. Thus, it is a possibility that they find no need to use symploce.

Anadiplosis
Both Otzdarva and Scott Jund use anadiplosis to give a sense of logical progression. Otzdarva uses anadiplosis in the form of the repeated "*the PTB.*" He is using that to show the logical progression of what the developers needed to accomplish in a very short, limited time. This utterance, using anadiplosis, effectively show that Otzdarva is trying to defend the developers by highlighting their workload and workflow.
For Scott Jund, he uses it to assert certainty of what he is saying. Scott Jund tries to convey that since he knows Behaviour, he knows that the boycott will not do anything using anadiplosis by repeating the phrase "*I know*". He makes use of anaphora's hammering effect to maintain focus on this concept of him knowing Behaviour Interactive Inc. well, while in these utterances he uses anadiplosis to show the logical progression that since he knows the company well, he will know what will and will not work. Thus, the writer sees this as his attempt to assert certainty that the boycott will do nothing because he knows that Behaviour Interactive Inc. will not be affected by it.

Conduplicatio
Otzdarva does not use conduplicatio. It could be because he had already used hypophora to move to a new area of discussion, which is similar to conduplicatio's purpose to move from one sentence to the next one. Scott Jund, on the other hand, uses conduplicatio because he did not use hypophora to move to a new area of discussion; thus, needing the use of conduplicatio. Other than that, Scott Jund uses it to educate the boycotters. This can be seen where after conduplicatio was used in "*It doesn't hurt anybody including Behaviour,*" he continues with *"[…] why boycotting does not really do anything […].*" Here he is attempting to educate the boycotters that since it does not hurt Behaviour, it does not do anything at all.

Epanalepsis
Epanalepsis is used by Otzdarva to call extra attention to repeated words where he tried to correct the wrong perception that the developers took a long time to listen to the community, which he insists as not true, as he corrects that it took the developers a long time to fix things. He also uses epanalepsis to show the fact that when the community agreed upon something, for example a change in game mechanic, the developers happily oblige. The writer sees this as Otzdarva's attempt to defend the developers and lower the boycotters' credibility. Epanalepsis is used by Scott Jund to show facts to clearly educate the boycotters by making notice of what is being repeated. For example, he says "*[…] they lose players for two days [..],*" continued by "*[…] they have lost absolutely nothing,*" which makes notice that what the boycotters think was a decisive strike towards Behaviour Interactive Inc. is of no significance to Behaviour Interactive Inc.

Diacope
Both Otzdarva and Scott use diacope to return to an idea after a short interruption. The difference is that in Otzdarva's case, he uses it to return to "*It's fucking crazy,*" which is referring to the developers' workload as an attempt to defend them, while in Scott Jund's case, he uses it to return to "*it doesn't hurt anybody to try it,*" which is referring to his opinion that the fact that the boycott does not hurt anybody is the problem. This is an attempt to educate the boycotters.

290

Setyawan & Gunawan: Rhetorical Devices Used by Content Creators to
Address the Boycott of the Game *Dead by Daylight*

Epizeuxis
Both Otzdarva and Scott Jund do not use epizeuxis. According to Harris (2018), epizeuxis is used to illustrate a large quantity of what is being repeated. In their respective videos, Otzdarva and Scott do talk about large quantities. However, they make use of anaphora's hammering effect for that. Otzdarva talks about the large quantity of complaints, while Scott Jund talks about the large quantity of locations the boycott proposition had spread.

Antimetabole
Both Otzdarva and Scott Jund do not use antimetabole. It is possible that they do not use antimetabole because it functions as contrast clues. However, this function has been integrated in both Otzdarva and Scott Jund's response video using anaphora. They both use anaphora to highlight and strengthen an alternate view that they have. Thus, it is a possibility that they find no need to use antimetabole.

Scesis Onomaton
Both Otzdarva and Scott Jund do not use scesis onomaton. Scesis onomaton's function is to emphasize dramatically, in which both Otzdarva and Scott Jund has already done by using anaphora. Since the use of scesis onomaton may create a comical effect and it is not in line with their topic, it is also a possible reason on why they do not use it.

CONCLUSION
The writer found that both Otzdarva and Scott Jund used the rhetorical devices mostly for the same purposes. The difference that was found was the context in which they used them. Both content creators also use the rhetorical devices outside their main purposes stated by Harris (2018). The main difference is that Otzdarva uses the rhetorical devices he used to undermine the topic of the boycott, lower the boycotters' credibility, and defend the developers. Scott Jund, on the other hand, uses the rhetorical devices he used to show his care towards the topic of the boycott, assert certainty, and educate the boycotters. The writer found that this difference was created due to the difference in the audience role of boycotters in both response videos. As this study was a small case study based on two response videos to a boycott, further research on a larger scale involving more sources of data or involving different types of videos is recommended. Further study which involves other social factors underlying the choice and use of rhetorical devices is also recommended. The exploration of other types of speech and rhetorical device categories are also recommended. Despite limitations to this study, the writer hopes that this study adds to the understanding of rhetorical devices and how audience design affects the use.

REFERENCES
Aggarwal, A. (2021, June 23). *How content creators and influencers will fuel the growth of the gaming and esports industry*. CXO Outlook. Retrieved November 10, 2021, from https://www.cxooutlook.com/how-content-creators-and-influencers-will-fuel-the-growth-of-the-gaming-and-esports-industry/

Beattie, A. (2021, August 10). *How the video game industry is changing*. Investopedia. Retrieved November 10, 2021, from https://www.investopedia.com/articles/investing/053115/how-video-game-industry-changing.asp

Behaviour Interactive Inc. (2021, October 7). *A leading independent game developer*. Behaviour Interactive. Retrieved November 11, 2021, from https://www.bhvr.com/about-us/

[forFelix]. (2021, June 26). *BHVR boycott follow-up, read this please* [Online forum post]. Reddit.
        https://www.reddit.com/r/deadbydaylight/comments/o7x9mw/bhvr_boycott_followup_read
        _this_please/
Harris, R. A. (2018). *Writing with clarity and style: A guide to rhetorical devices for contemporary
        writers* (2nd ed.). Routledge.
Lockie, M. A. (2019, November). *In vlogs we trust: Consumer trust in blog and vlog content*
        (Thesis). Auckland University of Technology.
Seargeant, P., & Tagg, C. (2014). *The language of social media: Identity and community on the
        internet* (1st ed.). Palgrave Macmillan.