PEDAGOGICAL IMPLICATION OF THE RHETORICAL STRUCTURES OF BARACK OBAMA'S AND HILLARY CLINTON'S DEBATES DURING DEMOCRATIC CAMPAIGN PERIOD OF AMERICAN PRESIDENTIAL ELECTION IN 2008

Slamet Utomo[1]

Abstract: This study discusses the rhetorical features of Barack Obama's and Hillary Clinton's debates. This debate was carried out during the Democratic campaign period on American presidential election in 2008. The main focus of this dissertation is on the examination of the patterns of Communicative purposes or 'moves' and their subsequent elements or 'steps' of the arguments. The analysis includes the examination of communicative purposes and persuasive values of the texts, and linguistic features used to materialise the communicative purposes and persuasive values.

The problem statements of the study are: 1/ What are the rhetorical features realized in Barack Obama's and Hillary Clinton's debates during Campaign Period on American Presidential Election in 2008?, 2/ From the rhetorical features perspective, how can Barack Obama's and Hillary Clinton's debates attract the audience?, 3/ Pedagogically, what lessons can language learners obtain from the debate between Obama and Hillary Clinton?

This study found that macro rhetorical structure of the debate (ie. Initiation, Response, and Feedback) is relatively similar to

---

[1] **Dr. Slamet Utomo, M.Pd.** <slamet_utomo16@yahoo.com> is a teacher training and education faculty at English Education Department, Muria Kudus University

that of a common debate except that, unlike in common debate, the Initiation is given by moderators and questioners, the Responses given by debaters, and Feedback can be given by moderator, questioner, or debaters. In this debate, there is no interruption while the debater was speaking. The debater would speak only if he/she was given an opportunity to speak. And the other difference from the common debate is that Barack Obama's and Hillary Clinton's debates had already been designed by the Dream Team before the debate occured. However, the communicative purposes and persuasions in the debates are relatively the same. The debaters persuade the audience to give them votes in the American presidential election in 2008. The differences are found in the way that rhetorical devicess use linguistic resources to realize the communicative purposes and persuations in the arguments. The rhetorical differences are caused by the differences in the arguments of offering the approaches to solve the Americans' problems.

The pedagogical implication of this study is that the debate genre needs to be explicitly taught to Indonesian students, especially university students in order to give them more acces to the content of debate, and to develop skills needed by Indonesian lecturers. For this purpose, an appropriate approach needs to be developed; that is to teach the generic features of debate such as in speaking.

Key words: *discourse analysis, rhetorical structures, linguistic features, debates, genre*

INTRODUCTION

There are two major parties in the United States of America, The Republican and the Democratic parties. Whenever the United States of America holds a presidential election, the parties hold debates among the president candidates in the party.

Before the presidential election, each party holds the debate among the president candidates, like what the Democratic Party did. In this debate, there were many president candidates at the begining,

but the writer just mentioned two of them, they were Barack Obama and Hillary Clinton. Barack Obama was a very controversial presidential candidate because he was the first African – American candidate who could then become the 44th president in America. There were a lot people who had different opinions about Barack Husein Obama, not only in his country but also outside his country, such as: in Africa, Hongkong, and also Indonesia.

Barack Obama was very well-known all over the world because of some reasons. First, his father came from Africa. Secondly, he was the first African-American running for president. Thirdly, he lived for several years in Indonesia. Besides those reasons above, Obama was an important force in history for the elimination of various different conflicts. Obama had a vision that everything can change America. Hopefully, his vision could change the world. Most of the countries in the world hope that Obama can change the American vision not to be the International police, but the United States of America will become the partner of other countries in all aspects.

Barack Obama's and Hillary Clinton's debates atracted many people all over the world. They wanted to know what happened in these debates. As we know that Barack Obama is not a special man like us, but he could be a candidate of the American president. And Hillary Clinton was the first woman who joined in the campign on the American presidential election. Both of them became well-known in the world because of these debates.

For Indonesians, Obama has a special meaning. He lived in Indonesia for several years. He studied here. And he has a step father and a sister from Indonesia. Moreover, the candidate of his foreign affair minister, Hillary Clinton, said that Indonesia was very important in America's eye. Indonesia was as important as other countries, such as: Brazil and Hongkong. In the following sections, the writer presents the bibliography of Barack Husein Obama and Hillary Clinton.

A.   Statement of the Problems

The followings are statements of problems in this research:

1.   What are the debate arguments conveyed in Barack Obama's and Hillary Clinton's debates during the Campaign Period on American Presidential Election in 2008?

2.   What are the rhetorical features realized in Barack Obama's and Hillary Clinton's debates during Campaign Period on American Presidential Election in 2008?

3.   From the rhetorical features perspective, how can Barack Obama's and Hillary Clinton's debates attract the audience?

4.   Pedagogically, what lessons can language learners obtain from the debate between Barack Obama and Hillary Clinton?

B.   Text and Context

Texts (spoken or written) can be simply defined as words used to communicate in a particular context (Schourup and Cauldwell, 1995), but the concept of context and the relationship between text and context are more complex, and therefore, need detailed discussion. There have been many definitions of context suggested in order to discuss its inter-relationship with text. Kathpalia (1992), for example, suggests that contexts refer to both texts appearing before and after a particular text, to what goes beyond the text, and to the total environment in which the text occurs.

In other words, Kathpalia perceives context as linguistic and non-linguistic material directly or indirectly related to a particular text which is necessary for the comprehension and production processes of a particular text.

C. The Notion of Genre

The term genre was traditionally used to refer to categories of literary texts. Johns (1997), for example, suggests that for many years students in literature classrooms have been assigned texts to read which have been refered to as novels, poems, or epics as examples of genres. However, according to Leckie-Tarry (1995), the emphasis of contemporary functional genre theorists is on the social and cultural aspects of genres as the generating factor of all communicative actions, including linguistic actions. Leckie-Tarry further suggests that concept of genre offers an interaction between socio-cultural features and textual feature; the socio-cultural features of a particular community in which a text is constructed and used affect the textual forms because of the constraints placed on them by the community members.

The notion of genre, however, is also not free from theoretical problems. Paltridge (1997), for example, suggests that the notion of genre has been used in a range of different areas including folklore studies, linguistic anthropology, the ethnography of communication, conversational analysis, rhetoric, literacy theory, the sociology of language, and applied linguistics. Paltridge further explains that, there are many ways in which the approaches to the descriptions and definition of genres described in these particular areas overlap, and at times, ways in which they are quite different from each other.

This is mainly because of the different goals of each of the approaches to genre such as Kress and Treadgoal (1998), Bathia (1993), Lekie-Tary (1995), Swales (1991) and Widdowson (1993), have found Halliday's concept of 'register' not to be adequate for capturing the phenomena of text-context relationships, especially in a wider scope of context. For these theorists, Halliday's register places too little weight on social processes and hence functional aspects of texts; it privileges linguistic features of texts over social contexts.

D.   The New Rhetoric Approach to Genre

The traditional concept of rhetorical studies, such as the work of Kinneavy (1971), used a deductive approach in analyzing genres; that is to classify discourses on pragmatic basis (Swales 1990). According to Kinneavy's deductive concept, a discourse can be classified into a particular text-type according to which component in the communication process receives the primary focus. If the focus is on the sender, the discourse will be expressive; if on the receiver, persuasive; if on the linguistic form or code, it will be literary; and if the aim is to represent the realities of the world, it will be referential. However Swales (1990:42) points out, although this classification system is intellectually impressive and considerably powerful in discourse organization, "… the propensity for early categorization can lead to a failure to understand particular discourses in their own terms". Swales illustrates that, following Kinneavy's classification system, debate will be a representative example of a referential discourse. However, according to Swales, the main focus of scientific texts is not only to represent the realities of the world but also to argue, convince and persuade for acceptance.

E.   Debates as an Established Genre

Debating is a clash of arguments. For every issue, there are always different sides of a story; why people support or disagree with that certain issue. Debating seeks to explore the reasons behind each side. To make those reasons understandable and convincing, debater should deliver their arguments with good communicative skills.

Competitive debating is debating using a specific format: with formats, people are regulated to speak one at a time and each side is given the same amount of time and opportunity to prove their point. This format rules out the possibility of who-speaks-loudest-or-fastest shall win the debate. It encourages people not only to speak out but also to listen to the other side. There are many formats of debates: Karl

Popper format, British Parliamentary format, World Schools format, etc.

F. The Research Methodology

The research methodology used in this study is mainly qualitative, although the frequency of the Moves and Steps found in the debates as the data for this study were also calculated. The use of linguistic and discourse clues, and the use of an independent rater in the identification of the Moves and Steps are independent procedures which help to ensure the validity of the analysis results.

The writer used the discourse analysis to analyze the data, more specifically is genre analysis. According to Halliday (1985), Eggins (1997), and Gerrot (1995), genre analysis includes: Communicative purposes, Generic Structures, and Linguistic features. There is a little bit different between Halliday and Gerrot in linguistic features. According to Halliday, there are six process types, they are material process, mental process, behavioural process, verbal process, relational process and existential process. Wheares according to Gerrot, there are seven process types. The six process types are the same as Halliday and there is one additional process type, i.e. meteorological process. In my study, I use Gerrot's process types.

G. The Sources of the Data

A total of 11 debates in which the data of the study were taken from different dates and places during campaign period on American Presidential Election in 2008. The inclusion of a relatively large number of texts for genre analysis is important in order to achieve an accurate picture of the rhetorical features of a particular genre (Biber, et al. 1998). The choice of all debates is aimed at representing American discourse in the social sciences. This choice, however, is more for both practical and substantial reasons.

H.   Data Analysis Procedures

The text analysis processes followed a step-by-step procedure. First, the topics, and the key terms (if available) of the debates were read in order to get a rough understanding about the research reported in the debates. Second, the entire text of the 11 debates was read one by one to figure out the whole process of the research reported in the debates. The main focus of the text analysis at this stage is to identify the debate arguments found in Barack Obama's and Hillary Clinton' debates and their communicative purposes or functions.

The third stage of the text analysis focused on analyzing the whole arguments of Barack Obama's and Hillary Clinton's debates. The communicative units or Move and their subsequent elements or Steps in the texts and their communicative purposes or functions were identified with the guidelines from the linguistic and discourse clues and by inferencing from the context.

Finally, the text analysis process advanced to identifying the common rhetorical patterns in Barack Obama's and Hillary Clinton's debates. The main focus of the text analysis at this final stage was to find out the common Steps and Moves found in the Barack Obama's and Hillary Clinton's debate arguments, their frequencies, their positions and sequences, and their communicative purposes or functions. The analysis procedures go from top to bottom. However, although the analysis procedures may look linier, the identification of Move and Steps in the data for this study is full of re-reading or re-analysis. Re-reading or re-analysis of every part or segment of debates can happen any where in the analysis stages when necessary. In other words, re-readings or re-analysis of any part of the debates were carried out until the identification of the communicative units of Moves and Steps are satisfactorily done.

FINDINGS

A. The Generic Structure/Arguments of Barack Obama's and Hillary Clinton's Debates

Analysis of whole Barack Obama's and Hillary Clinton's Debates reveals that the organisational structure of the texts consistently follow the sequence of Initiation – Response - Feedback (IRF). The distribution of the arguments found in the debates of barack Obama and hillary Clinton in this study is summarised in Table 1.

Arguments	Number of arguments	Frequency
Initiation	176	21.2%
Response	635	76.5%
Feedback	19	2.3%
Total	830	100%

Table 1:
The distribution of the Arguments in the debates of
Barack Obama and Hillary Clinton

B. The Communicative Purposes of the IRF Arguments

Debates, as other types of speech, is a one-way communication process between debaters and their audience or listeners. In debates, debaters normally have a set of communicative purposes in delivering an argument realised not only through lexical choice and syntactical construction but also through the text's organisational pattern of the debate. Day (1996) provides an illustration for the importance of such communicative purposes from the speakers' point of view when she says that a professional speaker when asked to say a few thousand words will ask him/hersel, " a few thousand words about what? A few thousand words for whom? A few thousand words to achieve which objective?" (1996:19). Thus, in order to achieve a successful

communication, according to Day, listeners, or audience have to be able to comprehend the specific purposes conveyed in the text.

Debates, as discussed earlier, are commonly structured into several arguments (IRF) for the benefits of the listeners or audience; that is to ease the comprehension process in order to Facilitate successful communication. Golebiowski (1998:74) suggests, " ....the division into sections facilities the process of speaking and assists the listeners's search for information relevant to their interest." Each argument conveys a set of related messages. In addition, the communicative purposes of arguments can be interpreted or understood from the meaning of the clauses of sentences constructing the argument.

One of the main communicative purposes of the debate is to persuade the audience or the discourse community members to accept that the debate is important, realible, interesting. In other words, the different messages in a particular argument are expressed through sentences and/or paragraphs constructing the arguments. Since a debate is commonly broken down into several arguments, so too are their communicative purposes: each argument of the debate carries out part of the overall works of persuasion of the debate. The communicative purposes and persuasive value of each argument in the debate, is summarized in Table 2.

Arguments	Persuade the audience that.........
Initiation Response Feedback	The problems faced by government are very important, necessary and worthwhile to solve.
	The problem solutionsoffered by debaters are very useful, appropriate and advantageous for audience.
	Debaters support the right problem solutions offered by the other ones.

Table 2:
Communicative Purposes and Persuasive Values of Debate Arguments

C.   The Linguistic Features of Barack Obama's and Hillary Clinton's Debates

The following section the writer will present the tenses and also Transitivy found in the Barack Obama's and Hillary Clinton's debate.

1.   Kinds of tense used in Barack Obama's and Hillary Clinton's debates

The theses of each clause are shown in the Appendix. Table 3 presents the total number of clauses of each Tense in the debate.

Kind of tenses	Number of tenses	Frequency
Present tense	2189	84,9%
Past Tense	388	15%
Total number	2577	100%

Table 3:
Tenses in the Debates of Barack Obama and Hillary Clinton

2.   Process Types used in Barack Obama's and Hillary Clinton's Debates

As discussed in Chapter 2, Transitivity is talking about the process types. They are material, mental, verbal, behavioral, existential, relational, and meteorological processes. The process types and participant configurations of each clause (both ranking and embedded clauses) are shown in Apendix 3. Table 4 presents the total number of clauses of each process type in each text.

Process Type	Number of Process	Frequency
Material	1197	48.6%
Mental	388	15.7%

Verbal	136	5.4%
Behavioural	12	0.9%
Relational	716	29%
Existential	7	0.3%
Meteorological	0	0%
Total	2,456	100%

Table 4:
Transitivity in Barack Obama's and Hillary Clinton's debates

CONCLUSION

So far in my paper, he has discussed the specific rhetorical features of Barack Obama's and Hillary Clinton's debates. The discussion focuses on the patterns of communicative purposes or Moves or Arguments and their subsequent elements or steps, persuasive values, the linguistic resources used to realise the Moves and Steps. From the discussion and evidence presented in this study, several important conclusions can be drawn. First, the rhetorical structures are good, because they follow the rule of Debate, the rhetorical structures (moves/arguments) found in the Barack Obama's and Hillary Clinton's debates are Initiation, Response, and Feedback (IRF). In these arguments, the debaters only response from the moderator and questioner arguments, that is usually in question. The questioner and moderator only give questions and statements which sport the questions. The feedback can be given either by debaters, moderator or questioner.

Second, the most important thing is that there is no interruption during the debate. All the debaters, moderator and also questioners listened to anybody who was giving arguments. The people who were involved in the debate could speak based on the instructions of moderator. Each person would speak when he/she was given an

opportunity to speak by the moderator. All the people there, became good listeners, they respected the person who was still speaking, although they had a different opinion with someone who was still speaking. The other person was waiting until he/she got a turn to speak.

Third, he has shown with examples and illustrations that the tenses on the linguistic features of Barack Obama's and Hillary Clinton's debates are dominated by present tenses. This is because of many approaches which are offered by the debaters to solve the American problems when they become president of the United States of America. Whereas the past tenses are less than the present tenses because those conditions tell about the past experiences of debaters. They (Barack Obama and Hillary Clinton) think those conditions are the failed George Bush administration.

The other linguisctic features are process types. The process types are dominated by material processes. Material processes are process of action. It means that Barack Obama and Hillary Clinton want to do many things to change the United States of America. The second rank of process types are realation processes. Relational processes are process of having or being. It means that whether Barack Obama or Hillary Clinton is ready to be a president who have realized that there are many problems faced by the new president of the Uinted States of America. The other process types are mental processes. These processes tell about the feeling of Barack Obama and Hillary Clinton towards the George Bush administration. Obama and Hillary Clinton think that George Bush administration is failed. And they think that they   can change the condition better when he/she becomes   president of the United States of America. After mental processes are followed by verbal processes which talk about what Barack Obama and Hillary Clinton say. And then behavioural processes which tell about how Barack Obama, Hillary Clinton and Americans behave today. They are living in bad condition, such as in

mortgage crisis, economic crisis, and so on. And the last processes are existential processes. These processes tell about the existance of many people who could not buy health care insurance, could not buy houses, and many people who are still poor.

Finally, this debate is a good debate, because this debate follows the rule of good debate. This debate is good because according to my "Rater" from Ohio State University, Douglas Mactbeth, the debate has already been designed by the Dream Team of Barack Obama and Hillary Clinton before the debates began. And the writer thinks that the conclusion above can attract the audience all over the world. And the writer thinks that the interesting debate is because of Barack Obama' Slogan, Change of America". But it is not true. His rater said that this debate is interesting because we know that, first: Barack Obama is the human being like us, but he can be the candidate of the president of the United States of America. Second, that Hillary Clinton (the wife of William Clinton), was the first woman who joined the Democratic campaign on the American presidential Election. The reasons above can also attract the audience to see and hear the debates.

When the writer sees the findings of the study, he can say that the debaters used the highest frequency of arguments is the Response Arguments, the highest frequency tense is the Present Tense, and the highest frequency of the Process types is Material Processes. This situation means that the debaters want to do (Material Processes) many things, namely they offered approaches to solve the problems (Response Arguments), in order that the United States of America become better in the future time (Present Tenses).

A.   Pedagogical Implications in the Findings of the Study

The main pedagogical implication of this study relates to the teaching of debate genre to English education department of

Indonesian university students and Indonesian researchers or scholars and the sorts of teaching which may be required. Given that the social science debate constitutes a coherent genre, and that students and researchers need to be able to control this genre, it is important to consider how information about the debate genre could be integrated into teaching. For this purpose an analysis of the needs of English education department of Indonesian university students and researchers in learning the rhetorical features of debate will be presented.

The other pedagogical implication of this study relate to the awareness of using genre which may be needed by the Indonesian university students who are not in the English education department. Then, different views on the roles and importance of explicit teaching of genre from applied genre theorists will be discussed. Finally, the common approach used for the teaching of genre will be reviewed.

The pedagogical implication can be more applicable in teaching speaking. Indonesian university students need to listen to the debate, particularly for English department, as part of their individual learning activities and for preparing the literature study or review for speaking. There are several reasons why Barack Obama's and Hillary Clinton's debates are important resources for university students in Indonesia. First, the materials are spoken in English; the language that they have to master at least since they study at University. Thus, it is likely that students will experience significant language problems when debating the topic.

Second, speaking is one of language skills which must be mastered by the Indonesian students, especially those of the English education department. They have to be able to speak English well, not only in debating, but also with their friends and their teachers. In teaching and learning process, teachers and students usually use English as a means of communication in the classroom.

Finally, the students of English education department should have the capability to speak in front of the audience, because they will be English teachers. They have to speak English well, both grammatically and also in good pronunciation. During the teaching and learning process, hopefully, the teachers and the students use English to deliver the materials. By this way, they are accustomed to using English. The rhetorical structures should be applied in the teaching and learning process, the teacher gives the students a question as Initiation, then he/she asks them to answer the question as Response. In Response, the teacher gives the students a chance to answer freely, although their answers are not right. If the students' answers are right, whoever can give feedback, it can be the teacher or the students. While someone is speaking, there is no interruption. Interruption can make the students discourage. At last, the teacher should give the correct answer. In delivering the material, the teacher should select the appropriate linguistic features: tenses and process types.

Indonesian English teachers and scholars also need to be familiar with the rhetorical features of debate, because they are required to speak or debate in order to socialize their teaching or delivering the materials in their classroom.

In summary, Barack Obama's and Hillary Clinton's debates are valuable and important speaking materials for Indonesian university students. This is not only because they provide important and often the most recent information on a particular topic. Similarly, Indonesian teachers and scholars need to be familiar with the rhetorical features of debate. For this reason, they need to know the rhetorical structure of these academic debates, such as the common communicative units and persuasions in the debate and linguistic resources used to materialize them. Thus, debate genre needs to be explicitly taught to Indonesian students to give them more access to the content of Indonesian debate and to develop skills needed by

speaking researchers. The awareness of using genre is also important for the Indonesian university students outside of the English education department. By understanding the communicative purposes, generic structures and linguistic features, the students can convey the message effectively and efficiently.

REFERENCES

Ahmad, U. Khair. *Scientific Research Articles in Malay; A Situated Discourse Analysis*, Ph. D. Dissertation in the University of Michigan, Michigan: UMI Publication, 1997.

Bathia, Vijay K. "Genre-Mixing in Academic Introductions". In *English for Specific Purposes*. Vol. 16, No. 3, 1997: 181-192

Bathia, Vijay K. *Analysing Genre: Language Use in Professional Setting*, London and New York: Longman, 1993.

Biber, Douglas; Susan Conrad and Bandi Reppen. *Corpus Linguistics: Investigating Language Structure and Use*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998.

Bizzell, Patricia. *Academic Discourse and Critical Consciousness*. Pittsburg: University of Pittsburg Press, 1992.

Brett, Paul. "A Genre Analysis of the Results Sections of Sociology Articles". In *English for Specific Purposes*. Vol. 13, No.1, 1994: 47-59.

Brown, Gillian and George Yule. *Discourse Analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983.

Brishan, Michael. *Debating Handbooks for Debater*. New York: Longman, 2005.

Coulthard, R. Malcolm. *Advances in Written Text Analysis*. London: Routlegde, 1994.

Coulthard, R. M. and D. Brazil. *Exchange Structure*. Birmingham: English Language Research, 1979.

Crooks, Graham. "Towards a Validated Analysis of Scientific Text Structure". In *Applied Linguistic.* Vol. 7, No. 1, 1986: 57-70.

Dudley-Evans, Tonny. "Genre: How far can we, should we go?" In *World Englishes.* Vol. 16, No. 3, 1997: 351-358.

_____. "Genre Analysis: An Approach to Text Analysis for ESP". In *Advances in Written Text Analysis.* Edited by M. Coutledge. London and New York: Routledge, 1997: 219-228.

Eggins, Suzanne and James R. Martin. "Genre and Registers of Discourse". In *Discourse as Structure and Process.* Edited by Teun A. Van Dijk. London: Sage Publication, 1997: 230-256.

Firth, J. Rupert. *Papers in Linguistics.* London: Oxford University Press, 1957.

Freedman, Aviva. Do as I Say: *The Relationship Between Teaching and Learning New Genre'in A Freedman and P. Medway,* 1994: 191-210.

Freedman, Aviva and Peter Edway. *Genre and New Rhetoric.* London: Taylor and Francis. Sydney: Gerd Stabler, 1994.

Gerrot, Linda et al. *Making Sense of Functional Grammar.* Sydney: Gerd Stabler, 1995.

Golebiowski, Zofia. "Rhetorical Approaches to Scientific Writing: An English-Polish Contrastive Study". In text, 1998: 67-102.

Halliday, M.A.K. *Language as Social Semiotic: The Social Interpretation of Meaning.* Lomdon: Edward Arnold, 1978.

Halliday, M.A.K and Ruqaiya Hasan. *Language, Context, and Text: Aspects of Language in Social Semiotic Perspective.* Victori: Deakin University, 1985.

Hatim, Basil. *Communication across Cultures: Translation Theory and Contrastive Text Linguistics.* Devon: University of Exceter Press, 1997.

Hasan, Ruqaiya. "Text in the Systemic Functional Model". In *Current Trend in Text Linguistics.* Edited by W. Dresser. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1997.

Holmes, Richard. *Variation in Ademic Text Structure: The Discussion Section in Research Articles in Economics*, an unpublished manuscript, 1998.

Hopkins, Andy and Tony Dudley-Evans. "A Genre Based Investigation of the Discussion Sections in Articles and Dissertation". In *English for Specific Purposes*. Vol. 7, 1988: 113-122.

Johns, Ann M. *Text, Role, and Context: Developing Academic Literature*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997.

Kathpalia, Sudjata S. *A Genre Analysis of Promotional Texts*, a Ph.D. dissertation, 1992

Kress, Gunther. *Linguistic Process in Sociolinguistic Practice*. Geelong, Victoria: Deakin University Press, 1985.

Kress, Gunther and Terry Threagold. "Towards a Social Theory of Genre". In Southern *Review*. Vol. 21, No.3, 1988: 215-243.

Leckie-Tarry, Helen. *Dictionaries: the Art and Craft of Lexicography*. New York: Scriber, 1995.

Martin, James R. *English Text: System and Structure*. Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 1992.

Miller, Carolyn R. "Genre as Social Action". In *A. Freedman and P. Medway*, 1994: 23-42.

Malinowski, Bronislaw. Coral Gardens and their magic Vol. II. London: George Allen and Unwin, 1935, Reprinted as *The Language of Magic and Gardening*, Bloomington, Ind: Indiana University Press, 1967.

_____. "The Problem of Meaning in Primitive Language" reprinted in C.K. Ogden and I.A. In *The Meaning of Meaning: The study of the influence of Language upon Thought and the Science of Symbolism*. Edited by Richards. London: Routledge and 2egan Paul, 1949.

Nwogu, Kevin Ngozi. "The Medical Research Paper: Structure and Functions". In *English for Specific Purposes*. Vol. 16, No.2, 1997: 139-150.

_____. "The Structure of Science Population: A Genre Analysis Approach to the Schema of Popularized Medical Texts". In *English for Specific Purposes*. Vol. 10, 1991: 111-123.

Oetomo, Dede. "Pelahiran dan Perkembangan Analisis Wacana". In PELLBA VI.: *Pertemuan Linguistik lembaga bahasa Atmajaya ke enam*. Edited by B.K. Purwo. Jakarta: lembaga Bahasa UNIKA Atma jaya, 1993.

Safnil. *Rhetorical Analysis of the Indonesian research Articles*. A Ph.D. dissertation, 2000.

Stubbs, Michael. *Discourse Analysis*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell Publisher Limited, 1983.

Swales, John M. *Genre Analysis English in Academic and Research Settings*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990.

Taylor, Gordon and Chen Tingguang. "Linguistic, Cultural, and Sub cultural Issues in Contrastive Discourse Analysis: Anglo- American and Chinese Texts". In *Applied Linguistics*. Vol. 12, No. 3, 1991: 319-336.

Thompson, Geoff. *Introducing Functional Grammar*. London: JW Arrowsmith Ltd. Bristol, 1996.

Van Dijk, Teun A. *Text and Context*. London: Longman, 1977.

Widdowson, Henry G. *Learning Purpose and Language Use*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1983.

_____. *Explorations in Applied Linguistics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1979.

_____. //D:/OBAMA/ABC News. *Transcript Obama and Clinton Debate*.htm. Retrieved in January 31, 2008.

_____. http://id.wikipedia.org.wiki/Debate. Retrived 25 July 2009