ARGUMENTATIVE STATEMENTS IN THE 2016 PRESIDENTIAL DEBATES OF THE U.S: A CRITICAL DISCOURSE ANALYSIS

Andini Khoirunisa & Rohmani Nur Indah
UIN Maulana Malik Ibrahim Malang, Indonesia
andinikhoir@gmail.com & indah@bsi.uin-malang.ac.id

Abstract: This study investigates the argumentative statements of Hillary Clinton and Donald Trump during the debates. By employing two theories, Van Dijk's Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) and Toulmin's model of argument, it aims to expose how various ideologies are expressed in the structure of arguments. It uses Toulmin (2003) model of argument to analyze the structures of argumentation during the debates constituting six elements (i.e. claim, data, warrant, backing, qualifier, and rebuttal). While Van Dijk's framework covering three levels of discourse structure (the meaning, the argumentation and the rhetoric) is used to analyze the reproduction of racism, manipulation, and Islamophobia. The result indicates the discourse of the candidates contributes the reproduction of manipulation by focusing on the positive self-presentation of "us" (civilized) and negative other-presentationof "them" (terrorists) as a mind control of the audience.

Keywords: Argumentation, Critical Discourse Analysis, Debate

INTRODUCTION

As a social creature, human requires social process through argumentation which involves two or more individuals responding one another's claim. A claim can be admitted to support an argument only if its statement achieves the standard of argument (Toulmin, 2003). This standard requires the arguer to control a significant extent of authority in a culture showingthat the arguer is educated and having power (Schroeder, 1997). Arguing involves a verbal, social, and rational activity which aims to convince a reasonable critic of the

standpoint by putting forward the propositions to be justified (Eemren & Grootendorst, 2004). In political debates, for instance, argumentation plays as a communicative process to present and test the acceptability of the arguer's standpoint. It means argumentation emerges when two or more individuals express a different point of views and then construct a reason to test their standpoint.

As a matter of fact, political debate has constructed various purposes of argumentation. In this case, the argumentative indicators are used as a sign that a particular argumentative move might be in progress and to ensure that the judgment is based on correct understanding of the argumentative process (Eemeren et al., 2007). Nevertheless, during the process of argumentation in political debate, some various ideologies including racism, manipulation, and discrimination are occasionally prepared, transmitted, and even legitimized by means of discourse (Reisigl & Wodak, 2005). It means these forms of social power abuse reproduce domination, orientalism, and Islamophobia through positive self-presentation and negative other-representation. Moreover, a particular group has turned and used it to construct as a positive self-identity as a basis for political resistance (Miles, 1993 in Reisigl & Wodak, 2005).

According to this rationale, this study aims to investigate argumentative statement in the 2016 Presidential Debates of the U.S. which focuses on some linguistic features implying manipulation during the debates. The debates are taken from the last two sessions during the general election which qualifies Hillary Clinton and Donald Trump, i.e, second presidential debates on 9 October 2016, and third presidential debate on 19 October 2016. The main reason to select these debates is because of twofold; 1) this study is conducted in democratic culture in which arguments are frequently used, because in democracy the ability to argue effectively always turns out to be the central of public participation, 2) these debates coincide the growth of terrorism abroad which threats American national security and it encourages the candidates to solve this problem. During the debates, the candidates frequently express a manipulative message

that America is under an unpredicted threat from the Iranian nuclear program and it might come close to the nuclear war with Iran. Hence, both candidates, Donald Trump and Hillary Clinton, frequently emphasize positive self-presentation about 'us' (civilized and peaceful) and negative other-presentation about 'them' (barbarian and terrorist) as a manipulative control to the audience's mind. Thus, by employing two theories, Van Dijk's Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) and Toulmin's model of argumentation, this study aims to expose how those various ideologies, particularly racism, manipulation, and Islamophobia, are expressed in the structure of the debates related to the Muslim world trough the way they formulate the arguments.

LITERATURE REVIEW
Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA)

CDA is a form of discourse analysis that studies the relationship between discourse and ideology (a set of beliefs, attitudes, and behaviors that constitute a perspective on the world). It needs to be understood as both a theory and a method (Chouliaraki & Fairclough, 1999), which offers both the interpretation of discourses in social contexts and its explanation on why and how discourses work (Rogers, 2004). It also investigates critically social inequality as it is expressed, signaled, constituted, and legitimized, and so on by language use (Wodak, 2004, as cited in Pascale, 2012). It examines how discursive sources are sustained and reproduced within specific social, political, economic, and historical contexts.

CDA may concern with several discourse contexts. At the macro level, the analysis of context assesses the relationship between the text and broader social processes and ideologies; for example, what social issue is of particular importance at the time the text was created. At the Meso level, the analysis focuses on the context of production and reception of the text; where was the text made? Who was it written by? What perspective might this person want to promote? What kind of person might read this text? Finally, the micro level of discourse simply looks the lexical choices indicating the level

of authority in the text in which the author often seek to influence the audience through claims to having power over them (Fairclough, 1995a, as cited in Behnam & Mahmoudy, 2013). Thus CDA can be used to analyze texts covering a wide range of topics which is suitable with this study, for example, racism, sexism, homophobia, politics, immigration, crime and much more.

Van Dijk's Critical Discourse Analysis

In his framework, Van Dijk (2006) elaborates some ideological categories among the fundamental contrast of "positive self-representation" and "other negative representation" which is prominent. Positive self-representation (or in-group favoritism) is a semantic macro- strategy used for the purpose of "face-keeping" or "impression management". Negative other- representation is another semantic macro strategy works to marginalize groups, these macro-strategies are formulated by "ideological square":

- Emphasize/Include *Our* good things or actions
- Emphasize /Include *Their* bad things or actions
- De-emphasize/Exclude *Our* bad things or actions
- De-emphasize /Exclude *Their* good things or actions

These four possibilities form are conceptual squares that may be applied to the analysis of all levels of discourse structures. Generally, according to its content, "strategies of manipulative discourse appear to be largely semantic, i.e. focused on manipulating the 'content' of text and talk" (Dijk, 2006, p. 376). Thus, this framework is suitable to be applied in this study which aims to reveal some ideologies during the debates.

For the analysis, Van Dijk has elaborated contextual overview which covers three levels including meaning, argumentation and rhetorical level. The meaning level deals with ideological categories as 'disclaimer' and 'lexicalization'. In the argumentation level, he focuses on such ideological categories 'fallacies' and 'generalization'. The rhetorical level covers such ideological categories as 'hyperbole' and 'repetition'.

Meaning level: disclaimer & lexicalization

Disclaimer is used to represent the positive description about somebody, then rejecting it by using coordinating conjunctions 'but' in the second sentence. Disclaimers briefly save face by mentioning his other positive characteristics but then focusing on other negative attributes to avoid being described as racism by the recipients. These are form of disclaimers according to Van Dijk (2000, p. 92); Apparent Concession "they are not all criminal, but...", Apparent Empathy "they have had many difficulties in their own country, but...", Apparent Excuse "I am sorry, but..." Reversal (blaming the victim), and Transfer "I have no problem with X, but my clients..." Apparent Ignorance "I do not know, but...", and others.

Lexicalization can be considered as an overall ideological strategy for negative other-representation through the semantic features of "the selection of (strongly) negative words to describe the actions of the others: terrorism, destroy, extremist, jihadist, etc." (Dijk, 1995, p. 154). If the lexicalization of the conceptual meanings is analyzed, indeed, some properties of discourse will reveal racial opinions such the words which are chosen to describe them and their actions.

Argumentation level: fallacies & generalization

Van Dijk argues that "The study of numerous argumentative fallacies has shown that powerful arguers may manipulate their audience by making self-serving arguments more explicit and prominent, whereas other arguments may be left implicit" (Dijk, 2005, p. 29). The arguer manipulates the argument when they violate argumentation principles and rules by different types of fallacy such as false analogies, provoking sentiments,blaming the victims.

According to Van Dijk (1995, p. 15) generalization is "a strategy that allows writers to go from concrete events and persons to more embracing and hence more persuasive statements about other groups and categories of people". In racist context, generalization is

used to express bias and stereotype about generalized negative characteristics of others. In this case, it is called "the fallacy of generalization in which it has made an impact on people's mental models, generalized to more general knowledge or attitudes, or even fundamental ideologies" (Dijk, 2006, p. 370).

Rhetoric level: hyperbole & repetition

Van Dijk defines hyperbole as "A description of an event or action in strongly exaggerated terms" (Dijk, 1995, p. 154). He emphasizes that rhetorical hyperbole is used to point out strongly negative ideological meanings. It means if opponents' negative actions are to be exaggerated, the speakers' negative action needs to be softened.

Repetition is considered as one of the major strategies to draw attention to preferred meanings and to enhance construction of such meanings in mental models which attempt to persuade the audience's memorization (Dijk, 1997). Thus the repetition is encoded in syntactical patterns to develop a system of beliefs or ideologies to emphasize speakers' good things and other bad ones.

Toulmin's Model of Argument

According to Renkema (2004), a significant stimulus for contemporary argumentation study was the publication of Stephen Toulmin, an English philosopher, who proposed a model to analyze argumentation in everyday language. Moreover, Toulmin's model also provides a useful understanding of reasoning in outlining informal human argument. This approach provides the actual logics, a critic of formal logic, to deal with something as dynamic as human thought.

Toulmin proposes a layout containing six interrelated components to analyze arguments; Claim, Data, Warrant, Backing, Rebuttal, and Qualifier (Toulmin, 2003, p.89). The first three elements, "Claim", "Data", "Warrant", belong to the essential components of the practical argument. While the second triad, "Backing", "Rebuttal",

"Qualifier", are the complement and might not be equipped in particular circumstances. Thus the simplified version of Toulmin's model is written in Table 1 as follows.

Table 1 Toulmin's Model of Argumentation

Argumentative Elements	Definition and criteria
Claim	• An assertion in response to a contentious topic or problem • In sorts of opinion, attitude, or controversial statement that needs further evidence or needs to be defended. • Usually it is a kind of complete declarative statements. • It is the essence of every argument • It has linguistic indicators: therefore, consequently, in brief, it can be concluded that. • It is in the form of fact conclusion (factual claim), judgment (value claim), or an advice, solution of a certain problem (policy claim)
Data	• It is in the form of a fact that can be observed objectively, an observation result, a conclusion, information, narrative, literal and figurative comparisons, and statistical data. • It functions as claim supporters so that it can be accepted. • It has linguistic indicators: for, because, due to the fact that, that…, since
Warrant	• It is a general principle, principle of a particular field (formula, theory, and manual), nature law, constitution or formal resolution. • It is the connector between the claim and the data (ground).
Backing	• It is the result of study, observation, interview, historical facts, or experts' opinion. • It supports and completes data. • It strengthens warrant

Qualifier	• It shows certainty or possibility. • Such words or phrases include possible, probably, certainly, presumably, as far as the evidence goes, necessarily, usually, and of course.
Rebuttal	• It can be conditions which strengthen or weaken a claim. • There are linguistic indicators such as: unless, if…so…

The theory of Toulmin's model of argument has, thus far, been used to analyzed many rhetorical argument analyses, such as Qin and Karabacak (2010); Cahyono (2016); Stapleton and Wu (2015); Becker (2016). Qin and Karabacak (2010), for example, analyze structures of argumentative papers written by second language (L2) university students. It shows the result that an average paper had at least one claim supported by four pieces of data. Stalepton and Wu (2015) who conduct the deeper analysis found several patterns of inadequacies in the reasoning of the six cases, exposing the need to bring greater attention to the quality of reasoning in students' persuasive writing. While Cahyono (2016) on his work implies that Toulmin's theory of argumentation has a crucial factor that helps the students in convincing the argument. Whereas, Becker (2016) improves on his work that there are some tendencies in the correlations between argument components (such as premises and conclusions) and Situation Entity (SE) types, as well as between argumentative functions (such as support and rebuttal) and SE types. The observed tendencies can be deployed for automatic recognition and fine-grained classification of argumentative text passages.

METHOD

This study is conducted in qualitative study because it investigates language phenomena happened during the debates. The main data of this study is the transcribed of the 2016 presidential debate of the U.S. during the general election. It stands between Donald Trump and Hillary Clinton with selected topic of the debate.

The transcripts include second presidential debate on Sunday, October 4, 2016, and final presidential debate on Wednesday, October 19, 2016. The transcripts of the data are downloaded from *www.nytimes.com* as the main source of the study.

FINDINGS & DISCUSSION

Starting from Trump utterance, the Islamophobia issue emerges from the question of an audience member who identified herself as a Muslim. She asked the importance of resolving the negative treatment experienced by American Muslims. Then Trump begins to respond the question by stating his claim:

> *"Well, you're right about Islamophobia, and that's a shame. But one thing we have to do is we have to make sure that — because there is a problem. And we have to be sure that Muslims come in and report when they see something going on. When they see hatred going on, they have to report it."* *(DT-T2: P1, L10).*

The Trump's utterance above is the claim of value, which is expressing an evaluation that encourages the speaker to make a valuable judgment. In this claim, he evaluates the social condition in America in which Islamophobia is on the rise. He describes Islamophobia as a "shame" but immediately moves on to accuse American Muslim due to not reporting hatred activity which was estimated as "Radical Islamic Terror".

In his claim, Trump uses a disclaimer of apparent admission, which is a strategy of defense presupposing explicit or implicit accusation, as a semantic manipulative technique. In the first part of this disclaimer, he apparently recognizes that Islamophobia is a "shame". By this statement, he tries sending many implicit messages as face keeping and positive impression management. First, to avoid being labeled as Islamophobic in the eyes of the American public after his temporary ban on Muslim immigration to the U.S. in last

December. Second, to disguise his recurrent anti-Muslim racism which accused Muslim-Americans of protecting terrorists.

In the second part of the disclaimer introduced by coordinating conjunction, "*but*" presents Trump's views on fighting terror threat in America. He emphasizes that the Muslims must report any "hatred activity" that they see in their communities across the nation. It implicitly infers a message as negative-other representation: he blames that millions of Muslim-Americans are keeping secrets to protect terrorists within their communities which make government difficult to identify them. This Trump's falsification argument can be easily refuted if the audience were aware that this accusation is patently false. FBI Director, James Comey, even <u>said</u> that Muslims in the U.S. do report when they see evidence of extremism.

Then to support his statement above, Trump presents the data:

> "*As an example, in San Bernardino, many people saw the bombs all over the apartment of the two people that killed 14 and wounded many, many people. Horribly wounded.*" (DT-T2: P1, L15)

Trump uses the example above to support his claim that all Muslims keep secret in that suspicious activity. This example refers to the criminal attack in San Bernardino including a mass shooting and an attempted bombing which caused 14 people died and 22 others were seriously injured on early December 2015. This data is in the form of a fact that can be observed objectively. However, this Trump's statement is not relevant due to the way he presents the data. He uses the words "many people" in "many people saw the bombs" which refers to the Muslim-Americans. It is obviously irrelevant due to the fact that the religion of that "many people" who saw this case was unknown.

In this data, Trump violates the argumentation principle by fallacy while using the wrong phrase of "many people" to represent Muslim-Americans, which leads to the wrong conclusion and racist action. There is no evidence in San Bernardino case. The neighbors of

San Bernardino shooters noticed suspicious activity but did not report anything due to fear of doing racial profiling. The religion of this neighbor is unknown, but seemingly a fear of racial profiling would suggest the neighbor was not Muslim. Then Trump goes on to use this that Muslim-Americans needs to do more when they see such suspicious activity, something he has said in his claim. He attempts to serve the audience with this invalid data to persuade them to follow his ideology.

Then he states the warrant:

"...because you look at Orlando and you look at San Bernardino and you look at the World Trade Center. Go outside. Look at Paris. Look at that horrible − these are radical Islamic terrorists." (DT-T2: P1, L19)

This warrant belongs to motivational warrant in which it is based on the needs and values of the audience after listening to the newscast at that time. In this warrant, Trump gives the further example of recent attacks in Orlando, San Bernardino, and the World Trade Center which are the major hot topics that happened at that time. This type of warrant offers a claim while at the same time supports the claim. However, in this context, Trump does not provide the backing to support her warrant that makes this warrant unreliable.

In this warrant, Trump uses negative lexicalization of "radical" and "terrorist" to highlight the recurrence of Islam and Muslim image in the Western media. In western media, Muslims are represented as violent people who are fanatic with a holy war against Western democracy under the rule of Shari'ah law. The use of such lexicalization aims to make the audience trust that all Muslim engage in violence due to their religion which based on violence and hatred. Thus encouraging the audience's anti-Muslim racism is similar to the case while against communist in the 1950s. Moreover, Trump applies generalization strategy in the words "radical Islamic terrorist" in

which he associates the words "radical terrorist" with "Islam" to presuppose that all Muslim as the same as homogenized into one radical and extremist group. He also generalizes to presuppose that all Muslims' negative activities are caused by the Islamic religion. Then he repeats his warrant in utterance:

> *"But the name is there. It's radical Islamic terror." (DT-T2: P13, L26)*

In the above utterance, Trump relies on repeating the negative choice of lexical expression by blaming Muslim nations as radical groups. He keeps associating the word "radical" with "Islam" and describes this case as "radical Islamic terror" many times during this debate. He repeats the stereotyped image of Muslim who are labeled as extremist and radicals to enhance the denigrating of Muslim which implies Muslim groups is very dangerous and a threat to America.

Then to avoid his conclusion being overturned, he rebuts:

> *If they don't do that, it's a very difficult situation for our country, (DT-T2: P1, L18)*

Trump precedes his rebuttal above with argumentative indicator "if" to avoid the condition in which the conclusion can be overturned. The pronoun *"they"* here refers to the Muslim-Americans. Since he acknowledges that there will be consequences for them when they do not report, he stresses the word "if" at the beginning of his rebuttal. In this context, Trump does not present backing and qualifier, he only presents three major elements and one supporting elements.

After Trump explained his vision, Clinton counters her opponent's claim by stating a different opinion:

> *"We need American Muslims to be part of our eyes and ears on our front lines." (HC-T2: P14, L5)*

The Clinton's claim above is the claim of policy because she provides a solution responding to the problem about working with Muslim nations. Clinton uses the pronoun "we" in this claim which means she and Obama's administration are the same in setting up the government plan about working with Muslim nations.

In this claim, Clinton manipulatively emphasizes the negative characteristics of the out-group which is expressed in euphemism. She uses the metaphorical expression *"our eyes and our ears"* to describe the hidden movement of the American-Muslim. These words imply that Clinton portrayed many Muslim Americans as a potential jihadist who can help the government's anti-terror efforts.

Then to support her claim, she states the data:

> *"I've worked with a lot of different Muslim groups around America. I've met with a lot of them, and I've heard how important it is for them to feel that they are wanted and included and part of our country, part of our homeland security, and that's what I want to see." (HC-T2: P14, L6)*

She provides the data about her experience from the sentence "I've worked with a lot of different Muslim groups around America. I've met with a lot of them" and to develop her data, she describes how discriminatory policies have been accompanied them such as exclusionary immigration policies targeting people based on their faith and national origin. Therefore, she emphasizes the sentence "they are wanted and included and part of our country" to invites audiences' sympathy. In this data, Clinton presupposes in the use of the words "Muslim groups around America" that "we" as a modernized and powerful nation who can help "others" such as "Muslim minorities".

In that case, to connect the data with her claim, she states the warrant:

> *"It's also important I intend to defeat ISIS, to do so in a coalition with majority Muslim nations. Right now, a lot of*

> *those nations are hearing what Donald says and wondering,*
> *why should we cooperate with the Americans? And this is a*
> *gift to ISIS and the terrorists, violent jihadist terrorists."*
> (HC-T2: P14, L10)

The Clinton's warrant above belongs to sign warrant, which is a substantive warrant based on the belief that an observable datum is an indicator of a particular condition. In this warrant, she believes that cooperating with Muslim nations is an indicator to knock out ISIS and the terrorist. Through this warrant, Clinton tries to express that working with Muslim nations is her diplomatic strategy to take out ISIS's stronghold in Iraq and Syria. However, Clinton does not attach her warrant with the backing that makes this warrant unreliable.

In this warrant, Clinton uses the lexicalization of "terrorist" to represent people who use violence in their resistance against the U.S. However, she applies argumentative fallacy of generalization strategy in this warrant to take the negative action of certain extremist to be generalized through the whole world of Islam. She associates the words "majority Muslim nations" with "violent jihadist terrorists" to presuppose that all Muslims are the same of doing negative activities such as violence to fight people who oppose their faith. She excludes the fact that mostly the majority of Muslims is moderate. She also avoids mentioning the U.S. role of provoking radicalization in some Muslim by racist policies and excessive violence of the U.S. police force against Muslim-Americans.

Then to avoid her claim being rebutted, she states:

> *"If you're willing to work hard, you do your part, you*
> *contribute to the community." (HC-T2: P14, L1)*

This rebuttal is preceded by linguistic indicator "if". Clinton states this rebuttal above because she is aware of the risk of working with Muslim nations related to the Muslim history. Then to acknowledge the limitation of her warrant, she rebuts that the American need to support her vision in the words "*you do your part*".

In this context, the Clinton presents three major elements and only one supporting elements. Thus, both candidates frequently use three major elements of Toulmin's model in their argumentation. However, the three additional model, *backing, qualifier, and rebuttal,* are hardly considered by these candidates due to its extremely low frequencies in their argumentative statements.

When the candidates state the contextual feature, the most common contextual feature which is expressed by these candidates is ideological meaning maneuver which is labeled as "apparent disclaimer". The remarkable of this feature is combining two opposed ideological aims, namely the humanitarian value of tolerance on the one hand, and the reasonable values of practicality on the other (Dijk, 1997). The uses of apparent disclaimer during the presidential debate are varied. In Islamophobia and Syrian refugee issue, Trump begins her statements by using disclaimer of apparent admission (Utterance DT-T2: P13, L11). Then he also uses disclaimer of reversal in Syrian refugee issue (Utterance DT-T2: P15, L3). While Clinton once uses disclaimer in Syrian refugee issue which is disclaimer of apparent excuse (Utterance HC-T2: P15, L12). In the next issue, these candidates once uses disclaimer. Trump states disclaimer of apparent excuse in the war in Syria issue (Utterance DT-T2: P23, L13), while Clinton uses disclaimer of apparent denial in the ISIS issue (Utterance HC-T3: P29, L27).

The second contextual feature which is occasionally used by these candidates is negative lexicalization. Both candidates adopt the intensive use of stereotypical negative lexicalization such as "terrorist", "jihadist", "extremist", "bad people", etc. These words are continuously associated with Muslim world, resistance movement, and defying political leader. Trump uses this negative lexicalization to represent Muslim world in Islamophobia issue (Utterance DT-T2: P13, L20). While Clinton uses this negative lexicalization in Syria issue to manipulate the audience's perspective about the war in Syria (Utterance HC-T3: P30, L3). Thus the level of discourse which is frequently used by these candidates is meaning level.

CONCLUSION

There are three results of this study covering the way Hillary Clinton and Donald Trump use argumentative statements, the way they formulate their arguments, and the way they present some various ideologies during the presidential debates. The first result concerns on the use of argumentative statements. The result indicates that the use of argumentative statements between Hillary Clinton and Donald Trump are significantly similar. Among the six elements of argumentative statements, both frequently attribute their arguments with three major elements of arguments including claim, data, and warrant. Nevertheless, Toulmin's model, backing and qualifier, are hardly considered by these candidates due to its extremely low frequencies in their argumentative statements.

The second result indicates that the way these candidates formulates their argumentative statement are obviously different. While on the quality of claim, Trump typically presents personal opinion in his arguments due to the irrelevant data and fallacious arguments. On the other hand, Clinton frequently states the claim because her arguments are followed by valid data. The last result shows that various ideologies including racism, manipulation, and Islamophobia, are prepared, transmitted, and even legitimized by means of discourse. The candidates serve ideologically positive self-representation and negative other-representation to emphasize the distinction between in-group (the West) and the out-group (the East). Clinton focuses on derogating the Syrian government and its allies, Russia and Iran, as the U.S. enemies. While Trump focuses on emphasizing negative acts of Muslim in America. Thus both candidates emphasize these strategies as a means to control the audience mind to maintain manipulation, inequality, and exclusion.

After doing this study, the results point several directions for further study in both political and non-political context. First, the specific models of the relation between major elements and additional elements of argumentative statements during the debates are worth

further exploration. This further analysis needs to be conducted to prove whether or not the additional elements of argumentation support the major elements. This kind of study can enhance the students' argumentations and debates skills in analysis, study, presentation, and cross-examination. Moreover, this study can be advantageous for a public speaker to consider the use of argumentative statements accurately.

Moreover, the result shows that CDA provides a great opportunity to discover the realities which have been distorted in microstructure element. Thus for the next researcher who conducts the study under the context of CDA, this study is worth further exploration for the other elements of CDA, including macrostructure or superstructure. Therefore it can help critical discourse scholars to make a more specific contribution to get more insights into the crucial role of discourse in the reproduction of dominance and inequality.

REFERENCES

Becker, M. (2016). Argumentative texts and clause types. *Science Direct*, 38 (3), 444-456. doi: 10.1016.2010.06.012

Behnam, B., & Mahmoudy, B. (2013). A critical discourse analysis of the reports issued by the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) director general on Iran's nuclear program during the last decade. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies, 3*(12), 2196-2201. doi:10.4304/tpls.3.12.2196-2201

Cahyono, B. B. (2016). Rhetorical strategies used in Indonesian persuasive essays written by students majoring in Indonesian and in English. *Jurnal Ilmu Pendidikan, 7*(3), 13-57.

Chouliaraki, Lilie; Fairclough, Norman. (1999). *Discourse in late modernity; Rethinking critical discourse analysis.* Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Dijk, T. A. (1995). Ideological discourse analysis. Retrieved from http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/summary?doi=10.1.1.65 2.4149

Dijk, T. A. (1997). What is political discourse analysis. *Belgian Journal of Linguistics, 11*(1), 11-52. doi:10.1075/bjl.11.03dij

Dijk, T. A. (2000). *On the analysis of parliamentary debates on immigration.* In Reisigl, M., & Wodak, R (Eds.), *The semiotics of racism: Approaches in critical discourse analysis* (pp. 85-104). Wien: Passagen

Dijk, T. A. (2005). Discourse Analysis as Ideology analysis. In C. Schĩfner, & A. Wenden, *Language and peace* (pp. 17-33). Amsterdam: Harwood Academic.

Dijk, T. A. (2006). Discourse and manipulation. *Discourse and Society, 17*(3), 359-383. doi:10.1177/0957926506060250

Eemeren, F. H., & Grootendorst, R. (2004). *A systematic theory of argumentation : the pragma-dialectical approach.* New York: Cambridge University Press.

Eemeren, F.H., Henkemans, A.F.S., & Houtlosser, P. (2007). *Argumentative indicators in discourse: A pragma-dialectical study.* Dordrecht: Springer.

Hendrikus, D. W. (1991). *Retorika Terampil Berpidato, berdiskusi, berargumentasi, bernegosiasi.* Yogyakarta: Kanisius

Indah, R. N. (2007). *Claims of fact in the argumentation on issues of Islamic countries in Newsweek international magazine. Jurnal Kajian Linguistik & Kebahasaan, 19*(1), 51-60. ISSN 0852-9604

Jaffe, C. I. (2016). *Public speaking: Concepts and skills for a diverse society.* Boston, MA: Cengage Learning.

Pascale, C.M. (Ed.). (2012). *Social inequality & the politics of representation: A global landscape.* London: SAGE Publications.

Qin, J., & Karabacak, E. (2010).The analysis of Toulmin elements in Chinese EFL university argumentative writing.*Science Direct*, 38(3), 444-456. doi: 10.1016.2010.06.012

Reisigl, M., & Wodak, R. (2005). *Discourse and discrimination : rhetorics of racism and antisemitism.* London: Routledge.

Renkema, J. (2004). *Introduction to discourse studies.* Amsterdam: John Benjamins Pub Co.

Rogers, R. (2004). *An introduction to critical discourse analysis in education.* New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Rosyidah, N. (2008). *A discourse analysis on argumentative statements delivered by democratic presidential nominees in the 2008 presidential debates of USA during primary elections season.* Unpublished Thesis. Malang: Post Graduate Program of the State Islamic University Malang.

Schroeder, C. (1997). Knowledge and power, logic and rhetoric, and other reflections in the Toulminian mirror: A ritical consideration of Stephen Toulmin's contributions to composition. *Jac: A Journal of Composition Theory, 17*(1), 95-107. doi:10.2307/20866113

Stapleton, P. (2001). Assessing critical thinking in the writing of Japanese university students: Insights about assumptions, content familiarity and biology. *Written Communication, 18* (4), 506-548.doi: 10.1177/0741088301018004004

Stapleton, P., & Wu, Y. A. (2015).Assessing the quality of arguments in students' persuasive writing: A case study analyzing the relationship between surface structure and substance. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, *17*, 12-23.

Toulmin, S. E. (2003). *The uses of argument.* New York: Cambridge University Press.