RHETORIC ANALYSIS ON STAND UP COMEDY

Nuzulul Fitri Yolandari
*English Language Department, Graduate School,
The State Islamic Institute of Tulungagung, Indonesia,
yolandaf2601@gmail.com*

Abstract
 This kind of discourse has some specific characteristics in terms of its creation and language use. A qualitative study was conducted with the data source from stand-up comedy. The data were reduced to obtain the funniest humor discourse. Furthermore, the data were analyzed based on the creation technique and the construction elements of humor discourse in terms of linguistic and non-linguistic context. The research findings showed that the creation technique and the construction elements of stand-up comedy humor discourse in local perspective in Indonesia were in line with the general concepts and theories of humor discourse creation techniques namely: (a) rhetoric, (b) tone variation, (c) irony, (d) language misunderstanding, (e) wordplay, (f) verbal jokes, (g) sarcasm, (h) satire, (i) sexual satire, and (j) deception. In addition, the results confirmed that the most widely used of creation techniques were rhetoric, wordplay, and deception. The three techniques are more pronounced than other techniques due to the local comics circumscribed public speaking capability.

Key words: *Stand-up Comedy Humor Discourse, Punch, Creation Techniques of Humor Discourse, Elements Of Humor Discourse*

INTRODUCTION

In the pandemic era, online learning is one of the best media learning to support teaching and learning process in informal learning. The learner must be creative to use some applications to support their online learning. One

media of online learning as YouTube can supports their speaking especially in stand-up comedy. In a general term, stand-up comedy is an art that is delivered individually in front of the live audience. Specifically, stand-up comedy becomes more attractive because in producing jokes the comedian mostly relies on speaking proficiency rather than body language. This is in accordance with the development of Indonesian's young generation today which is more inclined to listen the story directly rather than to read. As a result, it makes stand-up comedy becomes more favorable amongst youth. In addition, its ability to attract audiences' critical thinking also contributes to its familiarity amongst youth.

The analysis of rhetorical study usually can looks in daily conversation such as in speech, sermon, teaching, and entertaining. Some studies that have been done by some researcher. For example, Adriani (2016) stated that study about rhetoric in Stand Up comedy is important because rhetoric use as persuasive language in Stand Up comedy. The other result by Syarif's (2015), the finding of this paper that is research were to find out of the rhetoric element by analyzing the arrangement of structure of ideas, structures of utterances and structure of language in Michelle Obama's speech. The writer used James L. Golden's theory focusing on the rhetoric elements. The result is Michele Obama puts attention to keep the unity, effectiveness, and persuasiveness in her speech through her choice of discourse that she raised in her speech and also the use of well-arranged language in her speech. Another study about rhetorical (Nugroho,2012; Syahriani,2011; Attardo 2001). Moreover, this article presents the rhetoric analysis that be useful and apply in some of major of study especially for people who want to improve their speaking skill, to make someone interesting to their speech by using rhetoric used in stand-up comedy. And the result of this study is expected to contribute on the development of analysis study, especially on how to analyze rhetoric in standup comedy to help English speaking in the learners.

The term of stand-up comedy discourse in this study is based on the discourse study introduced by Vandijk (1977) who argues that the discourse

is the abstract theoretical construct. His opinion is in line with Crystal (1987: 116) who states that discourse is limited to the structure of oral language only; however, referring these opinions, the defi¬nition and the use of both discourse and text in Indonesian language (hereafter called Indonesian) linguistics remain unclear and are often overlapping. Therefore, this study in¬volved Badara's (2013) opinion that examines the discourse in terms of positivism empirical view, constructivism view, critical view, and concludes that the discourse is the lan¬guage used in communicating. Based on the previous explanation, the researcher inves¬tigated the creation technique and construction elements of stand-up comedy humor discourse.

The research objective is to find out of the rhetoric element by analyzing the arrangement of structure of ideas, structures of utterances and structure of language native speakers speech in stand-up comedy. The writer used James L. Golden theory which focusing on the rhetoric elements. The result will puts attention to keep the unity, effectiveness, and persuasiveness in her speech through her choice of discourse that she raised in her speech and also the use of well-arranged language in her speech. Based on the three previous findings, this research has the similarity and the difference. The similarity is all of the previous research, including this research study about rhetoric. The difference of the previous research with this research is in the object of research. Syahriani's research focused on analyzing for whom the rhetoric was delivered and the effect of the rhetoric used in the speech. Nugroho's Research focused on strategic of Rhetoric in an Advertising of Automotive on France Media. Syarif's research focused on analyzing the elements of rhetoric which are represented in Michelle Obama's speech transcript.

This research was expected to be theoretically signif¬icant for the linguistic theory development, namely: (a) a description of rhetoric creation technique and construction elements of stand-up comedy humor discourse for student's speaking skills, and (b) one of references relating to the humor discourse of stand-up comedy. It was also expected to be practically sig-

nificant to contribute as the source for further research in an effort of stand-up comedy humor discourse utilization for a variety of purposes. Furthermore, theoretical and conceptual constructions were employed to examine the aforemen¬tioned research problems.

RHETORIC OF STAND UP CENTRAL COMEDY ON YOUTUBE FOR LEARNER'S SPEAKING SKILLS

Rhetoric is the art of language that someone used to persuade. There are some components in the rhetoric such as orator, message, channel, universe and audience. Every component have function each other to create effective organization to achieve the purpose. Rhetoric can use to make orator having a good speech and influence audience believe. Study about rhetoric already posted by Syarif's (2015). The research was to find out of the rhetoric element focus on structures of language in Michelle Obama's speech. The result is Michele Obama puts attention to keep the unity, effectiveness, and persuasiveness in his speech through her choice of discourse that she raised in her speech and also the use of well-arranged language in her speech.

Furthermore, the next study is done by Tara Lockhart's (2012) this research analysis of all four editions of Modern Rhetoric, Lockhart also examines reviews of various editions of the textbook and correspondence between Brooks and Warren. Modern Rhetoric centers on the chapters on style ("Style," "Diction," "figurative language," and "Situation and Tone"). This theory is support by Keraf and Goris, Rhetoric tries to influence people's feeling and behavior so it is using effective principle and beauty style, like: the accuracy of disclosure, effective of structural sentences, using figurative language, harmonious appearance and etc. Briefly, rhetoric talks about the fundamental basic to develop a discourse that is effective.

ANALYSIS 1 Rhetoric Analysis of Michele Obama's speech at the democratic national convention on September 4th 2012

Rhetoric is a system. In term of system is a unity which consists of several components. The components of rhetoric process are the orator (speaker or writer), message, channel, universe, and audience (listener

or reader). Each component has its own role and function, between one component and others have deep relation to create effective organization to achieve the purpose (Syafi'ie, 1988:71). Besides, Rhetoric is one of the three elements which known as Trivium, a humanities study in classic educational method. Those are logic (dialectic); art of reasoning, defining, researching, and truth finding are intended to make people be able to deliver what they wanted to say well in order can be understood and make a sense. The other element is grammatical; syntactic, figurative language and poetry studies are intended to make people be able to understanding communication medium well. The last element is rhetoric; structure of ideas, structure of utterances, and structure of language are intended to make educated people who can feel listener's feeling and need (Dorst, 2001). Golden's view of the elements of rhetoric are: structure of idea (proposition and argument), structure of utterance (cohesion and coherence), and structure of language (diction, sentence and figure of speech) (Golden et. al., 1983:98). It is supported by Keraf in his book which stated these three components basically the form of basic principles of modern rhetoric which covered:

(1) Mastering actively the numbers of vocabularies,

(2) Mastering the principles of linguistics,

(3) Mastering of stylistic,

(4) Mastering logic and well-arranged reasoning,

(5) Mastering the technique of reasoning either spoken or written (Keraf, 1985:18-19).

a. rhetoric element focus on structures of language by speakers

Golden's view of the elements of rhetoric are: structure of idea (proposition and argument), structure of utterance (cohesion and coherence), and structure of language (diction, sentence and figure of speech) (Golden et. al., 1983:98). It is supported by Keraf in his book which stated these three components basically the form of basic principles of modern rhetoric which covered (1) mastering actively the numbers of vocabularies, (2) mastering the principles of linguistics, (3) mastering of stylistic, (4) mastering logic

and well-arranged reasoning, (5) mastering the technique of reasoning either spoken or written (Keraf, 1985:18-19). Grammatical cohesion constructed the grammatical structures and each component ties each other. Halliday and Hassan classify grammatical cohesion into four major classes; references, substitution, ellipsis, and conjunction.

Reference is a semantic relation, in which a meaning is specified through the identification of a referent (Halliday and Hasan, 1976:308). Reference occurs when one item in text points to another element for its interpretation. Those are exosphere and endophoria. Exosphere is when the interpretation of reference lies beyond the text. Meanwhile, endophoria is when the interpretation of reference lies within the text. Both esophoria and endophoria reference embody an instruction to retrieve from elsewhere the information necessary for interpreting the passage (Halliday and Hasan, 1976:33).

Example: Anaphora: I met Ann. She was hospitalized. Cataphora: As soon as he arrived, Edward has Bella prepares a dinner. In the first sentence, 'she' is anaphoric which refers to 'Ann'. Without having a presupposed clause 'I met Ann', it cannot decide what 'she' refers to. Whereas, the second sentence, 'he' is cataphoric to the presupposed subject 'Edward. It is need to look forward to the following sentence to reveal what 'he' refers to.

Substitution is the replacement of one item by another, and Ellipsis is the omission of an item. Essentially the two are the same process; Ellipsis can be interpreted as that form of substitution in which the item is replaced by nothing. But the mechanisms involved in the two are rather different. And also at least in the case of ellipsis is fairly complex (Halliday and Hasan, 1976:88). Kinds of substitution are nominal substitution, verbal substitution, and clausal substitution. Nominal substitution is a process of replacement of Nouns with 'one', 'ones' or 'same'. Verbal substitution is a replacement process of Verbs with 'do', 'did' or other auxiliary verbs. Clausal substitution is replacement process of clause, by 'so' or 'not'.

The examples of each type of substitution are presented below:

Example (nominal substitution): My axe is too blunt. I must get a sharper one. When I was a kid, I had a kitten but then it lost. I wish I had the same now. Example (verbal substitution): You think Joan already knows? - I think everybody does. Why didn't you do the homework, Jane? All of your friends did! Example (clausal substitution): .... if you've seen them so often. Of course you know what they're like'. 'I believe so,' Alice replied thoughtfully. Do you think that the assignment will due this week? I hope not! I haven't written anything!

Ellipsis is the process in which one item within a text or discourse is omitted or replaced by nothing. Ellipsis occurs when something that is structurally necessary is left unsaid, as it is has been understood already. Where there is ellipsis, there is presupposition, in the structure that something is to be supplied or 'understood'. This is not quite the same thing as saying that we can tell from the structure of an item whether it is elliptical or not. For practical purposes we often can; but it is not in fact the structure which makes it elliptical. An item is elliptical if its structure does not express all the features that have gone into its make-up - all the meaningful choices that are embodied in it (Halliday and Hasan, 1976:144).

Example (Comparison among reference, substitution, and ellipsis):

a. This is a fine hall you have here. I'm proud to be lecturing in it. (Reference)

b. This is a fine hall you have here. I've never lectured in a finer one. (Substitution)

c. This is a fine hall you have here. I've never lectured in a finer. (Ellipsis)

Alike substitution, there are also three types of ellipsis, namely nominal ellipsis, verbal ellipsis, and clausal ellipsis. In nominal ellipsis, the Noun is omitted. In verbal ellipsis, the Verb is omitted, while in clausal ellipsis, the clause/s is omitted.

Example (nominal ellipsis) –the omitted noun is bracketed: They do not like it, yet (they) said nothing. How did you enjoy the exhibition? - A lot (of the exhibition) was very good though not all.

Example (verbal ellipsis): Have you been swimming?- Yes, I have (been swimming). What have you been doing?- (I have been) Swimming. Example (clausal ellipsis): Who was playing the piano? – John was. I hear Smith is having an operation? – He has

Conjunction refers to a specification of the way in which what is to follow is systematically connected to what has gone before. Conjunctions are usually structure a text/discourse in a precise way and bring the presented elements into a logical order.

b. keep the unity, effectiveness, and persuasiveness on his speech

The example of (additive conjunction): For the whole day he climbed up the steep mountain side, almost without stopping and in all this time he met no one. Doing work with passion will bear great result? Similarly, doing work professionally will keep you at the top. Example (adversative conjunction): He has little money on his pocket. However, he insists to buy the movie ticket. He will walk home for sure. The witch acts so arrogantly to everyone. On the other hand, Snow White acts so politely. Example (causal conjunction): She was 5 minutes late submitting her final project. As a result, she lost 5% of her final score

ANALYSIS 2 The Shifting Rhetoric of Style

The correlation of extra linguistic factors, such as socio-demographic and/or context variables, with linguistic variables, sociolinguistics has been able to detect, locate, describe and explain the symmetry existing between social variation and linguistic variation in terms of sociolinguistic variation (see Figure 1). In this correlation, style enjoys a pivotal position in sociolinguistic variation, with stylistic variation constituting a principal component together with linguistic and social variation (see Eckert & Rickford 2001: 1). Style has been related to diaphasic variation (Coseriu 1969), variety (Berruto 1987), register (Halliday 1978; Finegan & Biber 1994, 2001; Dittmar 1995; Irvine 2001), genre (Ferguson 1994) or repertoire (Gal 1987). Additionally, the observation of stylistic variability, for example, as Labov (1966) showed, has been crucial to detect and understand phenomena

such as linguistic change in progress (see Traugott 2001). Language variation and change are one of the two sides of the sociolinguistic coin (together with linguistic diversity), constituting the raison d'être for many generations of scholars since the beginning of Sociolinguistics in the 1960s.

a. Rhetoric style of language by native speaker

The study of style within the variations tradition has been marginal (see Macaulay 1999): Single-speaker variation has received considerably less attention from sociolinguistics over the years than other types of variation. Methodological complications alone – i.e. how to follow a single speaker through different (and in particular informal) situations – are by no means sufficient to explain the neglect of this area of study. (Gadet 2005: 1353). In variations sociolinguistics, style has always been understood in a narrow sense, focusing on context and topic mainly and very cursorily on speaker and listener. Therefore, it has been restricted to different varieties of language produced by different degrees of formality in particular situations and with particular interlocutors. This has allowed a distinction between interspeaker (social) and intraspeaker (stylistic) variation (Halliday 1978), and, recently, with reactive (responsive) or proactive (initiative) motivations for style-shifting of speakers' agency in society.

The traditional delimitation of style in variations studies conceived style shifting as a social reaction (response) to a situation: a reflection of the speaker's awareness and attention to his or her own speech depending on external factors such as topic, addressee, audience, and situation, which determine the linguistic variety to be employed. This reactive model of Attention to Speech (AS) is based on the co-variation of linguistic variables and the external constraints, who's linguistic result is the speech stylistic continuum established by Labov's (1966) pioneering studies for the sociolinguistic interview.

The Audience Design model provides a fuller account of stylistic variation than the Attention to Speech one because:

(i) it goes beyond speech styles in the sociolinguistic interview by trying

to be applicable to natural conversational interaction;

(ii) it aims at explaining the interrelation of intra-speaker and inter-speaker variation and its quantitative patterning; and

(iii) it introduces an element of speaker agency into stylistic variation, i.e. it includes responsive as well as initiative dimensions to account for the fact that (a) speakers respond to audience members in shaping their speech and (b) they sometimes engage in style shifts that do not correspond with the sociolinguistic characteristics of their present audience.

Subsequently, variation are now becoming more increasingly interested in incorporating social constructivist (creative) approaches into style-shifting that view speakers actively taking part in shaping and re-shaping interactional norms and social structures, rather than simply accommodating to them. People, as Coupland (2007) underlines, do identity work using language to create and recreate their multiple identities, regardless of social categories, because speakers are constantly shaping and creating the situation through strategic use of language style. There is a need, therefore, for more nuanced, active and person-oriented approaches

b. New perspectives in stylistic variation

Language is a perfect tool for expressing social identities (see Milroy 2001; Mendoza-Denton 2002; or Kristiansen 2008): language acts are acts of identity. Therefore, "the role of language in identity formation and presentation has been a prime interest of sociolinguistics since the field was launched" (Bell 2007b:99). Linguistic variation reflects the multifaceted shaping of human relationships for the transmission of social meaning, and accents, dialects and their styling are markers of this social meaning (Podesva 2006; Auer 2007). As any other social stereotypes, these different ways of speaking constitute prototype categorizes. within a wider frame that comprises not only ideological components, but also markers from a wide variety of dimensions, such as speech, physical appearance, dressing, dance, music, etc. (Kristiansen 2008:72–73). Styles represent our ability to take up

different social positions (Bell 2007b:95), because styling is a powerful device for linguistic performance, rhetorical stance-taking and identity projection (Bell & Gibson 2011).

(Barbara Soukup 1997) applies an interaction-oriented speaker-design perspective on the use of linguistic styles to the analysis of data from an Austrian TV political discussion show. The communicative functions of speakers' switches from the Austrian spoken standard ('Hochsprache') into the urbanized (BavarianAustrian) dialect are investigated. Soukup elaborates a proposal on how to analyze these switches, distinguishing between unintentional ones (the use of isolated dialect features is a constant in the standard) and strategic shifts, characterized by longer, continued stretches of dialect use. She shows how participants' switches into dialect in instances of side-comments and quotes contextualize their utterances in terms of the negative social meanings attaching to dialect use in Austria (Moosmüller 1995). These meanings can be assumed as shared by all Austrians, allowing a speaker to use the dialect strategically, particularly in juxtaposition with the standard, to create a met message that listeners are likely to interpret as negative (e.g. as sarcasm or antagonism). Dialect use here is thus clearly proactive (rhetorical) rather than responsive. This author provides further support in favor of an interaction-oriented approach to the study of language variation, and contributes to our understanding of how speakers use dialect actively and strategically in public domain interaction to achieve certain conversational outcomes, like negative met messages.

ANALYSIS 3 Rhetoric Analysis Tasks to Develop Audience Awareness in Writing

Rhetorical analysis is a type of task that facilitates learning through discovery (Parks, 2000; Rainey, 1990). Lee and Swales (2006) introduced students to corpus approach to language with the aim of helping them to take responsibility of their own learning. They found that such opportunities guide the students in advanced language classes to discover the function of language used by a writer other than their writing teachers. They concluded

that using corpora in writing classes boosts learners' confidence and empower them to learn independently by checking linguistic issues in corpora and not grammar and reference books. They mentioned that such activities help the learners of academic writing to find disciplinary exemplifications from the texts that have been written for specific contexts and disciplines. Therefore, rhetorical analysis can develop awareness of how and in what ways writers write (Nesi, 2012). In this research, rhetorical analysis tasks were used to lead learners to understand the ways in which good writers engage their audience interest/attention and persuade them to consider their messages and why bad writers fail to do so. The objective of this study was to understand whether rhetorical analysis tasks can foster audience awareness in writing specifically in thesis writing.

a. Analysis to develop students' awareness

This study is grounded in analysis of composition and rhetorical models in academic texts from Civil Engineering discipline. As discussed earlier, as graduate students need to learn specialized texts, rhetorical analysis seems suitable to prepare them for this goal. According to Swales (1990), genre includes a communicative situation in which the involved parties try to serve and/or fulfill particular communication purposes. In such a situation the target discourse members understand and recognize the communicative purpose. Based on this explanation, in an academic text the relationship between "what is written" and "the context that it is written for" has a significant role. Researchers, who take this view, usually analyze a large number of texts for a specific genre. In this process they look at different parts of a genre to extract the specific moves and sub-moves of these segments (Swales, ibid). Then, they use their findings to develop the ability for producing genre-specific writing skills among English for Academic Purposes (EAP) learners. Related teaching models generally take a constructionist perspective and offer learners writing guides for specific disciplines (cf. Swales & Feaks, 2004). Through these approaches learners understand that texts are not the same in all disciplines and they need to be

equipped with the rhetorical cultures and linguistic codes of disciplines.

Although the aim of these approaches is to use text analysis to develop students' awareness toward conventions and discourses, they have attracted a lot of criticism. This is mostly because of their prescriptive and form-focused nature (Hyland, 2009). Genre-approaches have expanded the concept of context by emphasizing learning in the discipline to develop students' critical awareness, but they fail to consider the relationship that writers should establish with their readers. In other words, writers are supposed to answer their readers' expectations. If student writers are spoon-fed with ready-made writing frameworks, they may not build up the confidence to explore their readers' needs and creatively express themselves to address them.

b. Student writers' reflections and responses to the interviews

The writers 'reflection and responses to the interviews for example shows when the adjectives that the interviewees used to describe the good sample were: "clear", "holistic", and "well-written", while the adjectives that they used to describe the bad sample were "disconnected", "unfocused", "weak" and "ineffective". Most of the interviewees claimed that a good thesis statement inform the readers the central focus of the following paragraphs, they draw readers in, motivate them to follow the discussion in the following paragraphs, and help the readers to determine the aim of the writer.

These the example of statement by Jason, one of the student writers, mentioned that: "In the second sample [the bad sample], I, as a reader, was quite lost when starting a new chapter or section. I found myself searching the lines to find a central focus of what I was reading. Sometimes it was boring and annoying, because I wasn't able to figure out why I need to read all these sentences."

The second frequent issue that the participants of the study pointed to was the connection between the sentences in one paragraph, the connection between the paragraphs, and the connection between the sections. The responses to interviews reported that the students agreed that the obvious

strong trait of the good sample was presenting information in clear, well-structured, and connected sentences in each paragraph. Moreover, the paragraphs were linked relevantly in such a way that readers could easily follow the discussions. However, the bad sample included unrelated arguments. The conjunction words in the beginning of the paragraphs were not used appropriately.

CONCLUSION

The study about rhetorical language learning is the study about linguistics patterns. It is supported by Keraf in his book which stated these three components basically the form of basic principles of modern rhetoric which covered (1) mastering actively the numbers of vocabularies, (2) mastering the principles of linguistics, (3) mastering of stylistic, (4) mastering logic and well-arranged reasoning, (5) mastering the technique of reasoning either spoken or written (Keraf, 1985:18-19). From the results it can be concluded that the study about rhetorical language pattern also can improve student's speaking skills learning in English language. Not only using rhetorical language by you tuber also improving student's speaking skills learning. Therefore, students can easily learn about rhetorical language by YouTube in everywhere. However, there are suggestion for the next research who which study about the writer hoped the analysis of rhetoric could be deeper and more complete, especially, the persuasiveness and ethic in language used to achieve effective utterances that could deliver the passage well.

REFERENCES

Andriani,W., 2016. Rhetoric Analysis of Stand Up Comedy in Indosiar. Makassar:Universitas Islam Negeri Makassar. English Literature Department

Alamargot, D., Caporossi, G., Chesnet, D., & Ros, C. (2011). What makes a skilled writer? Working memory and audience awareness during text composition. Learning and Individual Differences, 21(5), 505-516.

Batstone, R. (2012). Language form, task-based language teaching, and the classroom context. ELT journal, 66(4), 459-467.

Bitchener, J., & Turner, E. (2011). Assessing the effectiveness of one approach to the teaching of thematic unit construction of literature reviews. Assessing Writing, 16(2), 123-136.

Ba'dulu, Abdul Muis. 2004. Introduction to Linguistic. Makassar:Universitas Negeri Makassar. Fakultas Bahasa dan Seni.

Badara, A. (2013). Analisis Wacana: Teori Metode, dan Pen¬erapannya pada Wacana. Media. Jakarta: Kencana Pre¬nada Media Group. (Cetakan kedua).

Badara, A., 2018. Stand-up Comedy Humor Discourse in Local Perspective Indonesia. International Journal of Applied Linguistics and English Literature. Volume 7

Creswell, J. W. (1994). Resaearch Design: Copy Quantita¬tive & Qualitative Approaches. California: Sage Publi¬cation.

Crystal, D. (1987). Toward a "bucket" Theory of Language Disability: Taking Account of Interaction Between Linguistic Levels. Clinical Linguistics and Phonetics I, 7-22.

Greenbaum, A. (1999). Stand Up Comedy as Rhetorical Argu¬ment: An Investigation of Comic Culture. International Journal of Humor Research. Published Online: 2009-07- 17. DOI:https://doi.org/10.15151/humr.1999.12.1.33"

Halliday, M. A. (1989). Spoken and written language. Deakin University Press.

Hyland, K. (2009). Teaching and Researching Writing (2nd edition). Pearson

Education   Limited.

Johnstone, Barbara. (1996). The linguistic individual: Self-expression in language and   linguistics.New York: Oxford University Press.

Johnstone, Barbara. 2000. The Individual Voice in Language. Annu Rev Anthropol 29:   405–425.

Johnstone, Barbara. 2009. Stance, Style and Linguistic Individual. In: A. Jaffe (ed.),   Sociolinguistic Perspectives on Stance. New York: O.U.P., 29–52.

Johnstone, Barbara & Judith Nattson Bean. (1997). Self-expression and linguistic variation. Language in Society 26: 221–46.

Kroll, B. M. (1984). Writing for readers: Three perspectives on audience. College   Composition and Communication, 35(2), 172-185

Lee, D., & Swales, J. (2006). A corpus-based EAP course for NNS doctoral students: Moving from available specialized corpora to self-compiled corpora.English for   Specific Purposes, 25(1), 56-75.

Midgette, E., Haria, P., & MacArthur, C. (2008). The effects of content and audience awareness goals for revision on the persuasive essays of fifth-and eighth-grade   students. Reading and Writing, 21(1-2), 131-151.

Nesi, H. (2012). ESP and Corpus Studies. In B. Paltridge & S. Starfield (Eds.), The   Handbook of English for Specific Purposes (pp. 207-426). John Wiley & Sons,   Ltd,Chichester, UK. Nystrand, M., Greene, S., & Wiemelt, J. (1993). Where did composition studies come from? An intellectual history. Written Communication, 10(3), 267-333.

Paré, A. (2000). Writing as a way into social work. In Dias, P., Paré, A., & Farr, M. (eds)   Transitions: Writing in academic and workplace settings. New York: Baker and Taylor. Pp: 129-145.

Parks, S. (2000). Professional writing and the role of incidental collaboration: Evidence   from a medical setting. Journal of Second Language Writing, 9(2): 101-122.

Rainey, KT. (1990). Teaching technical writing to non-native speakers. Technical Writing   Teacher, 17(2): 131-135.

Swales, J. M. (1990). Genre analysis: English in academic and research

settings. Cambridge University Press.

Swales, J. M., & Feak, C. B. (2004). Academic writing for graduate students: Essential tasks and skills (Vol. 1). Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.

Rodasaut. (2013). "Apa Itu Stand Up Comedy?" http://ro¬dasaut. blogspot.com/2013/01/apa- itu-stand-upcomedy.html. Rustono. 1998. "Implikatur Percakapan sebagai Penunjang Pengungkapan Humor di dalam Wacana Humor Verbal Lisan Berbahasa Indonesia". Disertasi UI Jakarta.

Setyaningsih, N. (---). Ethnic Stereotypes in Stand up Com¬edy. Prosiding the 5 th International Confrence on Indo¬nesian Studies: "Ethnicty and Globalization"

Syarif, Suharwana. 2015. "Rhetoric Analysis of Michele Obama's speech at the democratic national convention on September 4th 2012". Fakultas Adab, UIN Alauddin Makassar.

Van Dijk, Teun (ed.) (1997). Discourse as Social Interac¬tion: Discourse Studies A Multidiciplinary Introduction. Vol. 2. London: Sage Publication. 1997.

Wong, A. T. (2005). Writers' mental representations of the intended audience and of the rhetorical purpose for writing and the strategies that they employed when they composed. System, 33(1), 29-47.