

THE RHETORIC OF ARTICLE ABSTRACTS: A SWEEP THROUGH THE LITERATURE AND A PRELIMINARY STUDY

Yazid Basthomi

Abstract: This paper discusses the notion of abstract writing. It starts with some discussion of the literature on the writing of abstract, which, unfortunately, very much takes the form of guidelines for abstract writing, rather than studies on abstract writing. It then goes on to present results of a preliminary investigation into article abstract writing by Indonesians. The data for the preliminary study were drawn from two publications: English Language Education (ELE) (July, 1999) and TEFLIN Journal (August, 1999). The investigation arrived at the notion that Indonesian culture still thickly taints in the presentation of the first sentence of the journal abstracts.

Key words: article abstract, contrastive rhetoric, Indonesian rhetoric.

There has been, recently, a burgeoning interest to conduct contrastive rhetoric studies on various genres of writing, such as letter writing (Susilo, 2004), academic writing (Latief, 1990; Harjanto, 1999; Budiharso, 2001; Cahyono, 2001), newspaper articles (Susilo, 1999; Kartika, 1997), and research articles (Swales, 1990; Mirahayuni, 2001). However, very few have been reported on “part-genre analysis” (to borrow Dudley-Evans’ (2002) term) of abstract writing. To the knowledge of the present writer, no research on journal article abstracts has been reported in the Indonesian contexts. The only one which deals with abstracts is that by Junining (2003). Yet, this study deals with translation; it evaluates the translation of thesis abstracts which are written both in Indonesian and English. As such, the body of literature on

Yasid Basthomi adalah dosen Jurusan Sastra Inggris Fakultas Sastra Universitas Negeri Malang

abstract writing has not spoken much of research findings, rather, it accumulates to the aspect of guidelines suggestive of how good abstracts might be achieved. In what follows, the paper shall talk about the literature on guidelines for abstract writing.

OF GUIDELINES FOR ABSTRACT WRITING

As Swales (1990) rightly points out, abstracts seem to have been neglected by researchers. This notion also seems to apply to the Indonesian context. What seems to be widely known are textbooks or guides for writing good an abstract. In this regard, Swales (1990) cites those of O'Connor and Woodford (1976), and Cremmins (1982). These, even, unfortunately, have been intended for native speakers of English.

Tuckman (1978:340), who also seems to be concerned with abstract writing by native speakers of English, has the following to say about writing a research article (RA) abstract: 1) it should be "written according to well-delineated standards", 2) it is usually written in a limited number of words, about 100 up to 175 words, 3) it should be written in a block form, constituting a paragraph without indentation, 4) it should be written in complete sentences, 5) it should include problem, method, results, and conclusions, 5) it is to contain research results, for the primacy of a piece of research pertains to the results, 6) it should state the number and kind of subjects, research design, and the significance levels of the results, 7) it might use acronyms and, where possible, the standard ones. Such insightful guides by Tuckman, however, seem to be allied with quantitative research, particularly, as indicated by point number six concerning the levels of significance. This is a statistic-specific term and pertains to the quantitative research methodology. This might be due to the golden age of positivist philosophical approach to knowledge and research in which Tuckman wrote the book.

Also included as guidelines for abstract writing for English NSs are those of Rathbone (1985), and Brinegar and Skates (1983). In Rathbone's formulation, an abstract stands as something separate from the text; in fact, it appears before the full text of an article or a paper. Rathbone also considers an abstract to be more as a representative of a text than a review of the text. This means that an abstract informs the readers what the principal ideas of the message encapsulated by the text so that the readers can come to a decision if reading the details of the text is necessary. In other words, an abstract

bears two kinds of functions (Rathbone, 1985). The first function recounts the main points of the text; it serves as a “report in miniature”, whereas the second one communicates the main topics to be covered in the text; it resembles a table of contents.

Rathbone (1985) also puts forward that some authors call an abstract which has the first characteristic as “informative abstract” and the second “descriptive abstract.” Rathbone, however, also reminds us that these two terms (informative and descriptive) might be confusing. This caveat is conceivable, for the informative abstract is likely to contain technical descriptions and descriptive abstract is also by all means entitled to inform. In this case, Rathbone (1985) proposes to use “indicative” for “descriptive”. So “table-of-contents type” “indicates” what the report contains. In this line, Brinegar and Skates (1983) seem to be in agreement with Rathbone (1985).

The question which might be at stake is as to which one is preferable. In answering such a question, Rathbone (1985) sets forth that it is not an “either/or” choice; rather, a selection should be made by first “analyzing the nature of the subject matter and then by establishing the objective of the reader.” Rathbone continues that an informative abstract is not as flexible as an indicative one with regard to its application. An indicative abstract is much more flexible that it can be composed for almost any type of communication. The informative abstract works very well with a short technical communication (e.g., a report or article) whereby the condensation of the original full text to be an abstract will not necessarily run the risk of losing the important parts of the original text.

As the readers are given credence, the informative abstract is very likely to be opted for by the audience who need to quickly secure the main points, such as the results, conclusions, and recommendations, without necessarily sacrificing their time and energy to meticulously read the text itself (Rathbone, 1985). The indicative abstract is probably sufficient to meet readers who need to know the general coverage of the writing, including the subdivisions, and the way in which the material is developed. What is tricky at this juncture is that an informative abstract might satisfy the readers better even if an indicative abstract is adequate. In a different outlook, the indicative abstract can be said to be a general-purpose device. This means that it should not be used when a special-purpose tool will do a better job, due to a special situation at issue (Rathbone, 1985). At this point, Rathbone (1985) observes that failure to make this distinction and, subsequently, wrong selec-

tion of the abstract types are the main causes of inadequate abstracts composed by a writer. In other words, in the foregoing discussion, Rathbone (1985) speaks of the procedure for selecting the proper type of abstract, which includes three steps: 1) determining the nature of the communication, 2) determining whether an informative abstract is ruled out, and 3) determining the readers' preference.

SOME UNSETTLED QUESTIONS

Quite probably no one denies that an abstract should be short (see Rathbone, 1985; Brinegar and Skates, 1983; Porte, 2002; Tuckman, 1978). Yet, the question at issue is as to how short is short. It seems that those concerned with guidelines for good abstracts have come to a unanimous agreement that abstracts should go over one-half page or 150 to 200 words. This is by no means to set a doctrine. Some might be in need for satisfying the informational needs of the reader. The majority, however, will easily fit within the 150 to 200 word limit. This seems to apply to, especially, the writing of abstracts of journal articles.

Even though very short abstracts are evidently available (see examples by Swales, 1990), exceptionally short abstracts, running well with one or two sentences, invite questions of justification (Rathbone, 1985). A question which also arises when an abstract is simply the repetition of the information already given by the title is as to what is the function of the abstract. In such a case, Rathbone (1985) proposes to view the title and abstract as forming a communication unit and behaving as a paragraph, the title being the announcement of the topic and the abstract the development of the topic. In such a sense, the whole has unity, transition, and movement. So, any remaining redundancy should be assumed and done on purpose, thus, meaningful in its own right.

What is questionable about Rathbone's (1985) point relates to his observation that two or three paragraphs might go well for an abstract. This seems to be in contradiction to his caveat that an abstract runs well for about 150 words. The point is a 150-or-so-word abstract simply looks best to compose a paragraph, not two even three paragraphs. The convention of confining abstracts to one paragraph seems to be sounder than that of his observation.

Similar to the notion of the "shortness" of an abstract is the idea perti-

nent to the language of an abstract. All seem to agree that an abstract should employ a high density of significant words (Rathbone, 1985; Porte, 2002; Tuckman, 1978; Graetz in Swales, 1990). Yet, this does not mean that transitional words are useless (Rathbone, 1985). An abstract is also the venue for the writer to launch key words, which are important in setting up an effective communication between the writer and the reader. The key words refer to the nouns and verbs that name, define, and describe the important ideas in the writing (Rathbone, 1985). Practically, the key words are those which allow accurate filing, referencing, and retrieval of the writing. Hence, the consistent use of standard terms in both the abstract and the body is commendable.

Dissimilar to other writers concerned with abstract writing, Rathbone (1985) mentions an unwritten convention within the technical (discourse) community. This refers to a forewarning that writers are not supposed to use graphic illustrations in abstracts. This is understandable, for abstracts have a limited space which is in line with the notion of word limit as abovementioned, without which an abstract would not materialize. However, Rathbone (1985) also observes a possibility that when an abstract does not exceed a page, nothing to worry about the use of graphic illustration. Yet, this possibility might be at odds with the foregoing consensus that an abstract better runs at 150 to 200-word essay.

Another “controversial” point by Rathbone (1985) deals with the use of subheadings. He is positive about them when they are used not as one-standing alone subheading; two subheadings, at least, have to appear when subheadings are opted for in writing an abstract. Apparently, this goes in line with his aforementioned proposal about the possibility of using two or three paragraphs. Again, this is against his own agreement on the limit of 150-or-so word use.

SOME MORE CONCLUSIVE ASPECTS

Despite others’ inconclusive point concerning when to write an abstract, whether it should be written prior to or after writing the full text, Rathbone (1985) is quite determined to argue that an abstract should be written “*after* the main body of the communication, not before” [emphasis original]. By this contention, he means that an abstract should not influence the shape of the original communication of the text; the text should come about with its own shape by itself without the dictation of the abstract. Here, he seems to

be aligned with van Dijk (in Swales 1990) that an abstract is a discourse by itself which comes into existence to represent, not to determine, the points in the main text following it.

Important points posed by Rathbone (1985), which are not controversial relate to the notion that an abstract should never mention information not presented in the body of the text represented. For him, an abstract “is a replica, in miniature, of the original. It, too, has a beginning, a middle, and an end, with emphasis on the key ideas and/or results”. In this sense, he has come up with seemingly a generic structure of abstracts. Rathbone (1985:82) has the following to say about the structure of abstracts:

Most writers outline their material before they write the first draft. The enlightened ones also prepare a statement of thesis, which they use as a guide for selecting and rating the raw material they have collected during the investigation. This statement of thesis relates the initial problem and objective to the subsequent results and conclusion. It prescribes the course of development the author wishes his or her message to take in order to communicate successfully with a specific audience. Reduced to its key words, the statement of thesis will form a meaningful title; expanded with supporting details, it will form a meaningful abstract.

Brinegar and Skates (1983) have similar words to those of Rathbone as aforementioned: “an abstract briefly describes the information in an article, a report, or a book.” As noted above, Brinegar and Skates (1983) also mention two types of abstracts: informative and indicative. Yet, different from Rathbone, Brinegar and Skates succinctly mention that the difference between the two refers to the purpose and amount of detail covered in the abstract. In a different formulation, they observe that an informative abstract can stand by itself as a discourse whereas the indicative does not possess that potential.

It is stimulating to compare Tuckman’s (1978) notion aforementioned with that of Graetz (in Swales, 1990:179). Graetz has a conclusive mention that: 1) abstracts are characterized with the employment of past tense, third person, passive, and the non-use of negatives, 2) they do not usually use subordinate clauses; they use phrases rather than clauses, and words rather than phrases, 3) they do not usually use jargons, abbreviations, symbols and

any language shortcuts; they are devoted to clarity rather than inviting confusion, 4) they are dense in words, succinct, and free from repetition and unnecessary expressions, superlatives, adjectives, illustrations, preliminaries, descriptive details, examples, and footnotes. In this way, Tuckman and Graetz differ in their view of the use of abbreviation; Tuckman seems to be positive about the use of it, whereas Graetz is the opposite. It is also worth noting that Tuckman's list is meant for guidelines whereas that of Graetz is a survey finding. In this line, Rathbone (1985:81) mentions that all abbreviations, except the most familiar abbreviations and acronyms, are supposed to be "spelled out at first appearance." This also means that Rathbone (1985) attests Tuckman in agreeing on the use of abbreviations in abstracts.

SOME REMAINING ISSUES

Referring to Swales (1990), the scarcity of manuals for writing research article (RA) abstracts for NNS of English might be the belief that when they can write RAs, they can override the trouble of writing a shorter piece of writing, i.e., an abstract. Swales (1990) also notes that in some regions such as Cordoba, Spain, people usually write RAs in Spanish and it is only the abstract that they also supply with the English version. Additional information about those in Spain is that just often do they go to translation services, yet are worried about the "linguistic and substantive accuracy of [the] translations" (Swales, 1990:179). In this case, an abstract in English is an independent piece of writing, deserving to be deemed constitutive of a single work. This, to the present researcher's anecdotal observation, seems to be true in the Indonesian academic contexts.

It is important to note that people usually read the title of an article first before proceeding with the reading of the rest. And those reading the title, some will continue to read the abstract. Those reading the abstract, only some will read the wholesale text (Swales, 1990). This being the case, an abstract exists as an independent discourse (van Dijk in Swales, 1990), yet represents the whole article.

Another point which is critical relates to the common structure of abstracts. Graetz (in Swales, 1990) mentions that the structure generally takes the form of the Problem-Method-Results-Conclusions (PMRC) model. However, Swales (1990) points out that such a structure seems to be disconfirmed by his observation, i.e., abstracts tend to be composed in IMRD (In-

roduction-Method-Results-Discussion) rhetorical structure. IMRD seems to be similar to what has been proposed by Rathbone (1985) as quoted earlier.

The foregoing discussion has been about abstracts in general. As a specific attention is needed to address abstract pertinent to RAs, Porte's (2002) deserves credence. Like the other authors, Porte mentions that the principal aim of the abstract is to summarize the most important points of RAs. The summary is usually the first contact made by the readers with the RAs; at times, it is even the only contact. Despite the various guidelines for abstract writing, Porte resorts to the notion that an abstract "provides concise information and all-information indicators to the reader about what to expect in the body of the text".

Viewing from readers' point of view, readers typically: 1) would like to have enough information to be in a position to judge whether the study reported in the main article is sufficiently relevant to their own current interests for further reading in its entirety and 2) may want to make a mental note at pertinent points during their reading of the abstract of aspects mentioned about which they would be looking for more details in the main body of the text where the study is going to be of interest (Porte, 2002). Stated item by item, according to Porte (2002), readers read the abstract for some or all of the following:

- a. A statement of the topic and aim of the paper, which may be accompanied by a statement more broadly situating the research.
- b. A concise description of the sample and materials used.
- c. Some information about the procedures used and the way the data were analyzed.
- d. A brief summary of results, or the general trend of these, and what conclusions are to be drawn from these.

OF ABSTRACT WRITING BY INDONESIANS: A CASE

Language and culture has special a venue in the discussion of philosophy of language and language theorization (e.g., Cooper, 1973; Sapir, 1921). Whorf is one of the best known figures who advocate the connection between language and culture (Dobson, 2001). Referring to Saussure's idea that *la langue* has legitimized the view of the world as one articulated by signs, Dobson (2001:62) observes that one's language has a pivotal role in

“determining how one perceives the world.” In a nutshell, language and culture are inseparable (Singh, 1999; Crozet & Liddicoat, 1997).

In this line of argument, it is insightful to reckon Stern’s (1992) observation that adaptation is an important step to be bicultural and Kramsch’s caveat (cited in Hinkel (1999:6) “that even the non-native speakers who have had many years of experience with second culture may have to find their ‘own place’ (p.257) at the intersection of their natal and target cultures.” This situation might apply to rhetoric. In one chapter *Cerminan Budaya dalam Bahasa: Kasus Retorika Indonesia* (Reflections of Culture in Language: The Case of Indonesian Rhetoric), Wahab (1995) refers to rhetoric as a model of thinking to express intended ideas. This point suggests that rhetoric relates to ways of analyzing, collecting data, interpreting and synthesizing. This also pertains to the logic undergirding every culture which is relative. In other words, rhetoric is likely to be culture-specific. In this regard, Wahab (1995) provides an example that Indonesian writers strongly tend to indirectly approach the very topic of their writing. This characteristic tends to give color to the rhetoric of academic texts written by Indonesians.

Kaplan (1980) classifies rhetoric into four types. The first is the Anglo-Saxon. This is the continuation of Plato-Aristotelian rhetoric, which is characterized as linear. In a paragraph, for instance, this rhetoric is characterized with a direct statement of a topic encompassing the whole idea to be elaborated in the sentences which follow. This is usually developed and held by Western people. Semitic rhetoric is the second type, in which parallelism is the main characteristic. Coordinators are typically and redundantly employed in developing a paragraph. The third type is that which is frequently developed by Asians (inclusive of Indonesians). Indirectness is typical in this sort of rhetoric. Essence or topic is approached or expressed indirectly. Franco-Italian is the fourth, which has the characteristic of the excessive use of “blown up” words.

In light of the above points, it is safe to tentatively believe that Indonesians writing journal abstracts in English wend “their own place” of Indonesian rhetoric in that the first sentence of the abstract does not “immediately” reflect the wholesale journal article proper. On this ground, the spelled-out question addressed in this investigation is: “How do Indonesians construct the first sentence of journal article abstracts written in English?” As such, it taps upon the realm of rhetoric; it deals with the staging of information.

THE DATA: THE FIRST SENTENCE OF ABSTRACTS

The sources of the data for analysis in this preliminary undertaking were ELE (July, 1999) and TEFLIN Journal (August, 1999). The selection was carried out on the basis of convenience; both the publications are written in English. All articles, except the first one of the TEFLIN Journal, were written by Indonesians. We shall now have a look at the first sentence of all the abstracts in the two publications. It is also informative to note the title of every article as shown Table 1.

Table 1. List of First Sentences of Journal Abstracts Written in English by Indonesians

No	Publication	Title	First Sentence of the Abstracts
1.	ELE	The Problem of Developing Speaking Skills: Limitations of Second Language Acquisition in an EFL Classroom	The objective of <i>Speaking</i> course is to develop the students' ability to communicate in the target language.
2.	ELE	Comments between Drafts in the Teaching of Writing: One Way of Improving the Students' Composition	The stereotype pattern of teaching writing is the teacher gives a topic and each student writes a paper on it.
3.	ELE	Trends in the Development of Research on Persuasive Rhetoric	The development of the study of persuasive rhetoric is not limited to the examination of students' persuasive essays.
4.	ELE	Ideal non-native English Teachers are Permanent Learners of English Vocabulary	For all non-native English teachers English is essential for their career and advancement.
5.	ELE	What to Do in Grammar Courses: Some Practical Ideas	Since the introduction of the communicative approach to teaching English in Indonesia, there have been debates on whether to teach grammar or not.
6.	ELE	The Relationship between Beliefs about Language Learning and Language Learning Strategies	Beliefs about language learning are considered to be (in part) responsible for learning strategies that learners adopt.
7.	ELE	The Gender Representation	Quite a number of articles have

No	Publication	Title	First Sentence of the Abstracts
		in the MacQuarie Children's Dictionary	been written and studies done on sexism in language and teaching materials, especially in English.
8.	ELE	From Anne Bradstreet to W. H. Auden: American Poets through the Centuries	Taking at the outset the recently published anthology <i>101 Great American Poems</i> , this article takes a close look at the thirty-nine American poets who established literary prominence through the period of three and a half centuries.
9.	TEFLIN	Suggestions on Writing for Publication in Language Learning Journals	This article provides suggestions on writing for journals in the field of language learning.
10.	TEFLIN	English Language Teacher Education: Rewriting S-1 National Curriculum	As part of an overall attempt to improve secondary school teacher education, a program has been launched to review and develop the national curriculum (KURNAS) of English language teacher education in Indonesia as means to improve the quality of teachers of English.
11.	TEFLIN	The Role of Needs Analysis in English for Specific Purposes	This article discusses the role of needs analysis in ESP.
12.	TEFLIN	English Department Students' Collocation Abilities	In order to discover how well English Department students' knowledge of collocations and how successful the communication strategies students used to help them supply the expected collocation, 60 subjects were involved in this study.

No	Publication	Title	First Sentence of the Abstracts
13.	TEFLIN	Semiotic of Symbolic Mode in Interpreting Mythology in English Poetry	This paper is primarily based on the assumption that we need theories of literature in order to interpret the literary texts and explain literature as a unique form of communication.
14.	TEFLIN	English Classroom Culture Reformation: How Can It be Done?	People say that the teaching of English in Indonesia is unsuccessful.
15.	TEFLIN	Towards a Reduction of Grammar Teaching a Lexical Analysis	Learning a language is essentially learning vocabulary, and it is the lexical competence that enables the learners to use the language with ease.
16.	TEFLIN	Premature Use of English Grammar by EFL Learners	The roles of conscious learning and error corrections have been questioned since the development of communicative approaches to language teaching.
17.	TEFLIN	The Functions of the Word "Get" in Texts	This study investigates the function of the word 'get' and its use in real communication.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

Out of the seventeen abstract-first-sentences, there are four which bear a resemblance to each other, i.e., the sentences in rows 8, 9, 11, and 17. The rest, on the other hand, share an identical characteristic to each other, which is different from the four aforementioned. The first group of four "directly" states the content of each article; no. 8 immediately says that it takes a close look at something, no. 9 provides suggestions, no. 11 discusses the role of needs analysis in ESP, and no. 17 reports on an investigation of the function of the word "get" and its use in real communication. In contrast, the rest do not "directly" tell anything about the topic; instead, they go about, sometimes, relatively aloof, and at times, somewhat close to the topic. Some may serve as introduction to the article, for instance, no. 10. , others, might tap a bit upon the topic, for example, no. 12. The point is that they do not "di-

rectly” reflect what the article is about, i.e., whether it is a report of an investigation, discussion of something, suggestions on something, etc.

We should remember, however, that sentence no. 9 was not written by an Indonesian. It was written by one in authority in the SEAMEO-RELC board in Singapore. It means that only three out of the sixteen Indonesian writers (18.75%) wrote their first sentence of a journal abstract in a direct mode. It seems that the majority of Indonesian writers tend to opt for the indirect way for constructing the first sentence of a journal abstract. This suggests that Kaplan’s notion of Asians’ circular rhetoric is attested by this small piece of investigation. The Indonesian writers were, consciously or not, referring to and applying their L1 rhetoric—indirectness—even though they wrote in English, in which directness is very likely to be the norm. Adaptation, put forward by Stern (1992) as the important step to be bicultural, was not apparent in this observation. Instead, Kramsch’s aforementioned notion (in Hinkel, 1999) seems to be endorsed.

Irrespective of the cultural background, it might sound bizarre that journal abstracts are written with verbosity, that the first sentence does not immediately talk about what the article is about. This means that the long-windedness of the abstract first sentences is against the idea of the construction of the abstract proper, i.e., to give a general idea of the content of the article in a succinct way, so that any reader can quickly decide whether to read the rest of the article or not. In such a sense, there is no much space for the writer to talk about something else other than the very topic of the article just at the time of constructing the first sentence of the abstract. In a sense, thus, Indonesian writers still tend to be entangled within the tradition of “samudana” (indirectness) (Wahab, 1995).

The above phenomenon suggests that rhetoric, *inter alia*, is a tricky aspect for Indonesian writers to “beat” in order to produce “bicultural” or the likely favored “direct” mode of English writing. Indonesian writers were still wending their “own place” in their English composition of journal abstracts, the manifestation of which can be found in the construction of the first sentence of abstracts.

On the basis of this preliminary observation, it can be concluded that Indonesian writers who write journal articles in English still apply their L1 rhetoric in that their construction of the first sentence of the journal abstracts does not directly touch upon the topic of the article. Circular rhetoric of Asians as asserted by Kaplan (1980) is still shared by the majority of the

writers. It is interesting here to note that absence of preliminaries in abstracts, as put forward by Graetz above, is not in accord with abstracts written in English by Indonesians; Indonesians tend to resort to the use of preliminaries in writing journal article abstracts. This seems to be a potential site of disagreement between Indonesians and English writers. Subsequently, Indonesians are likely to deviate from the English rhetoric in writing RA abstracts in English. This being so, they might fail to conform to the rhetoric of the international discourse community concerning RA writing. However, this needs more rigorous evidence, particularly, some comparative studies.

CONCLUDING REMARKS

The literature on abstract writing has still been limited to be in the form of guidelines, which unfortunately are also still limited to be those intended for native speakers of English. There is a point extractable from the preceding discussion that an abstract is basically a discourse in its own right, the rhetoric of which is not monolithic even in the eyes of English NS. It follows that studies on abstract writing is very much commendable so as to provide a large amount of information concerning the abstract writing of non-native speakers of English.

There is also a notion that Indonesians seem to deviate from the rhetorical norms of English abstract writing. These two constitute a good reason to conduct research on abstract writing. The need to conduct such a kind of studies might seem even more crucial owing to the fact that English abstract writing might be conducted by people to whom English is foreign. In other words, how nonnative English writers write abstracts in English is still poorly documented; therefore, studies in this area are in the offing.

The preliminary study adumbrates that a total adaptation to the culture of the target language seems to be hard to be achieved by Indonesian writers. This situation signifies that deliberate training (or teaching-learning) of the rhetoric of English speaking writers needs to be conducted further by Indonesian teachers in the Indonesian writing classes of EFL. However, such a conclusion resulted from a pilot observation which was very parochial, in terms of the sources of the data and point of analysis; the result was still cursory in nature. Therefore, a broader coverage of sources of data as well as points of analysis is imperative for future investigations.

REFERENCES

- Brinegar, B. C. and Skates, C. B. 1983. *Technical Writing: A Guide with Models*. Glenview, IL: Scott, Foresman and Company.
- Budiharso, T. 2001. *Rhetoric and Linguistic Features of English and Indonesian Essays Made by EFL Undergraduate Students*. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation. Malang: PPS UM.
- Cahyono, B. Y. 2001. How English Learning Development Influences EFL Students' Rhetoric of Indonesian Essays. *BAHASA DAN SENI*, 29 (1), 98-108.
- Cooper, D. E. 1973. *Philosophy and the Nature of Language*. London: Longman.
- Crozet, C. and Liddicoat, A.J. 1997. Teaching Culture as an Integrated Part of Language Teaching: An Introduction. *Australian Review of Applied Linguistics*, series S (14), 1-22.
- Dobson, A. 2001. Teaching of Culture within Foreign Language Teaching and Its Relationship to Nationalism. *Australian Review of Applied Linguistics*, 24 (1), 61-73.
- Dudley-Evans, T. 2002. Genre Analysis: A Key to a Theory of ESP?, *IBERICA*, no 2, online accessed on October 1, 2004.
- Harjanto, I. 1999. *English Academic Writing Features by Indonesian Learners of English*. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation. Malang: PPS UM.
- Hinkel, E. 1999. Introduction: Culture in Research and Second Language Pedagogy. In E. Hinkel (Ed.), *Culture in Second Language Teaching and Learning* (pp. 1-7), Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Junining, E. 2003. *The Translation of Thesis Abstracts in the Accounting Department of Brawijaya University*. Unpublished Master Thesis. Malang: PPS UM.
- Kaplan, R. B. 1980. Cultural Thought Pattern in Inter-cultural Education. In Kenneth Croft (ed.), *Readings on English as a Second Language* (pp. 399-418). Cambridge: Withrop Publishers, Inc.
- Kartika, O. R. 1997. *A Study on Rhetoric by Indonesian and English Native Writers in the Jakarta Post*. Unpublished Master Thesis. Malang: PPS UM.
- Latief, M. A. 1990. *Assessment of English Writing Skills for Students of English as a Foreign Language at the Institute of Teacher Training and Education IKIP MALANG Indonesia*. Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation.

- Iowa: University of Iowa.
- Mirahayuni, N. K. 2001. *Investigating Generic Structure of English Research Articles: Writing Strategy Differences between English and Indonesian Writers*. A paper presented at THE 49th TEFLIN International Conference 2001 Kuta, Bali, 6-8 November 2001.
- Porte, G. K. 2002. *Appraising Research in Second Language Learning: A Practical Approach to Critical Analysis of Quantitative Research*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Rathbone, R. R. 1985. *Communicating Technical Information: A New Guide to Current Uses and Abuses in Scientific and Engineering Writing* (2nd edn.). Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company, Inc.
- Sapir, E. 1921. *Language: An Introduction to the Study of Speech*. San Diego: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, Publishers.
- Singh, I. 1999. Language, Thought, and Representation. In L. Thomas & S. Wareing (Eds.), *Language, Society and Power: An Introduction*, (pp. 17-30), London: Routledge.
- Stern, H.H. 1992. *Issues and Options in Language Teaching*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Susilo 1999. *Rhetorical Patterns as Reflected in Argumentative Discourse in the Jakarta Post Articles*. Unpublished Master Thesis. Malang: PPS UM.
- Susilo. 2004. *Thought Patters as Reflected in the Linguistic Features in Indoensian and English Letters Written by Indonesians*. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation. Malang: PPS UM.
- Swales, J. M. 1990. *Genre Analysis: English in Academic and Research Settings*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Tuckman, B. W. 1978. *Conducting Educational Research* (2nd edn.). New York, Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.
- Wahab, A. 1995. *Isu Linguistik: Pengajaran bahasa dan Sastra*. Surabaya: Airlangga University Press.

190 *BAHASA DAN SENI, Tahun 34, Nomor 2, Agustus 2006*

article abstract, 174

contrastive rhetoric, 174

Indonesian rhetoric, 174, 183