

INDONESIAN EDITORIALS' RECOMMENDATIONS ON ERADICATING CORRUPTION: ASSESSING THEIR PERSUASIVE POWER

E. Sunarto

Dosen Program Studi Pendidikan Bahasa Inggris, FKIP, Universitas Sanata Dharma
Alamat korespondensi: Kampus I Mrican, Jl. Affandi, Yogyakarta
Email: emanuelsunarto@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

This research explored overt linguistic expressions of persuasion in editorial texts, the distinctive feature of which is principally argumentative-persuasive. It was specifically aimed at assessing how persuasive their recommendations were. The data comprised nine recommendations of Indonesian editorial texts issued in the mid of December 2006 by nine different daily publishers. The topic addressed was the issue of eradicating corruptive practices. The data search, using read marker technique, was done on the synthetic basis of Biber's framework and Alwi's categorization of Indonesian modality.

The findings show that in the recommendatory parts, various expressions such as conditional sentences and various types of modal expressions (intentional, deontic, epistemic, dynamic) were used as means of forwarding persuasive points. Among modal expressions, those expressing necessity were found to be the most commonly used. The type, variety, and stylistic configuration of the expressions counted in determining how strong the sting, or persuasion, was. In addition to the presence of such overt linguistic expressions, persuasion was augmented by some supporting means such as repetition and verb-passive voicing. Repetition of persuasive expressions, such as modals, intensified the persuasiveness, and was in part concerned with style. Meanwhile, the choice of verb-passive voicing following modals was, in part, concerned with editorial writers' strategy to be action-oriented in forwarding the points of persuasion to the persuadee.

Kata Kunci: Indonesian editorials, Recommendation, Overt linguistic expressions of persuasion

1. INTRODUCTION

Editorials are classified into argumentative type of text, and in terms of purpose, are examples of persuasive genres as are debates, political speeches, etc. (Vestergaard, 2003; Morley, 2004). What matters in persuasion is how to convince somebody to do something, especially by reasoning, pleading, or coaxing somebody of something, to make somebody believe something, especially by giving good reasons for doing so (Microsoft Encarta Dictionary 2009). What makes such a text type persuasive and how it does so is the concern of what to come in the subsequent parts of this report.

Persuasion is, as a matter of fact, linguistically identifiable and explorable. In Biber's account, the signals of persuasion are identifiable in terms of overt linguistic expressions (OLEPs, for short) (Biber 1988,

1995). The presence of OLEPs, in addition to making such text type persuasive, also exemplifies how language demonstrates its instrumental roles a means of influencing, convincing, forming and/or transforming public opinions dealing with the issue being addressed.

This study falls within the area of text studies addressing two main concerns, namely (i) what persuasive markers or OLEPs were found in Indonesian editorials (IEs) addressing the issue of eradicating corruptive practices; and, in turn, (ii) how the OLEPs found in each of the selected IEs were configured to characterize their persuasiveness in addressing the issue.

Exploring what signals IEs' persuasiveness and how they are configured would be insightful for understanding how persuasive text type demonstrates its distinctive features. Knowledge of such features,

in turn, would be instrumental for, among others, developing critical reading ability, doing comparative discourse analysis, and providing a model of how persuasive communication is like.

2. THEORETICAL REVIEW

Editorials are leading articles, or leader(s), expressing publication's opinions, viewpoints; addressing readers, giving comments, or drawing conclusions dealing with current issues (Hicks, 2003: 118; Keeble, 2001: 246; Reah 2002: 45-36). Usually written by editorial staff, such texts are generally institutional reflecting the opinion of that particular newspaper or magazine, and tend to be derived from social representations rather than from the personal experiences or opinions of the editor, and where (dis)agreement is expressed or persuasion enacted (Biber, 2004; Van Dijk, 1995, 1996). Reynolds (2000) adds that such a text is a blend of narrative, description, and argument, in which argument dominates. Being argumentative, editorials are meant to persuade their readers of the correctness of their claims and gain acceptance for their ideas (Hatim and Mason, 1990: 155). Such texts also provide examples of how current events are analyzed and interpreted and, purpose wise, meant to persuade readers to consider different points of view or to adopt a particular standpoint (Hiebert & Gibbons, 2000). In van Dijk's formulation, they are meant to formulate readers' opinion about the events of the world, and play a role in the formation and change of public opinion, in setting the political agenda, and in influencing social debate, decision making, and other forms of social and political action (van Dijk, 1995, 1996).

Editorials have been explored in terms of, among others, their structure (Bolivar, 1996), content (van Dijk, 1995), and language (Le, 2004) (Khabbazi Oskouei, 2011: 24). In this study, what matters is how their persuasiveness is configured. To do so, the approach adopted was that of Le's linguistic aspects, which operationalised Bolivar's triadic model that outlines that editorials generally comprise Situation, Development, and Recommendation (SDR-triad) (Bolivar, 1996: 281-283, 291). In the light of this model, editorial texts display dynamic account or movement from the actual world, a world that is or was, to the world of possibilities, the world that might be, and the world that should be (ibid.). This triadic model is

resembles Dijk's who proposes that such a text type consists of three canonical categories. Each of these categories, by its name, defines the functions of the respective parts of the text, namely (i) the summary of the event, (ii) the evaluation of the event-especially actors and actions, and (iii) pragmatic conclusion (recommendation, advice, or warning) (van Dijk, 1996). In Bolivar's model, it is in the R or the third part where valuate turns, encompassing concluders, prophecies, and directives, generally reside. This R part is found in the last portion of the text, ranging from one to two paragraphs long. For the sake of brevity, Bolivar's R of the triad, in which valuate turns reside, can be roughly equalized to what van Dijk calls pragmatic conclusion incorporating recommendation, advice, or warning. It was in this R or pragmatic conclusion the search of OLEPs was focused and conducted, to explore how the persuasive power of IEs to shape public opinion regarding the eradication of corruptions was linguistically expressed or overtly demonstrated.

Each of the R's valuate turns, namely *concluders*, *prophecies*, and *directives* is understood as follows. Concluders are essentially conclusive sentences after SD parts of the triad are presented. They are observable in the presence of conclusive (discourse or logical) markers such as *in conclusion*, *to sum (marize)*, *finally*, (called sequencers by Williams 1981, 1990, among others; see Khabbazi-Oskouei 2011: 66). Prophecies are sentences expressing predictions of what may or might happen in the future, and are signaled by the presence of, among others, predictive modals such as *will*, *shall* (Quirk et al. 1985: 213-214). The last, directives, are sentences expressing what is or are to be done, or, in van Dijk's terms, what forms of action to take. Bolivar's notion of directives, or van Dijk's notions of recommendation, advice, or warning, is signaled by the presence of what Quirk et al. name suasive verbs such as *allow*, *ask*, *beg*, *concede*, *determine*, *ensure*, *insist*, *intend*, *prefer*, *pronounce*, *propose*, *recommend*, *command*, *propose*, *urge*, *require*, *resolve*, *pledge*, *demand*, *stipulate*, *suggest*, *decide*, etc. Such verbs function as mandative and causative, are normally used to introduce indirect directives or imply an intention to bring about changes in the future, and are followed by 'to infinitive' or that-should clause (Quirk et al, 1985: 1182-1183). In addition to predictive and deontic modals characterizing Bolivar's prophecies and directives respectively, conditional subordination, to-infinitives,

and nominal clauses may also signal persuasiveness (Biber, 1988). Another type of modal, intentional, is worth considering in addition to the three types of modal expressions outlined by Biber above. Intentional modality is concerned with the speaker or writer's stance, attitudes, and involvement with regard to the actualization of nonactual events he or she expresses. Such an attitude or involvement is signaled by the presence of expressions such as *I want, I hope* (Alwi, 1992: 36-37). The presence of modal expressions, be it expressing doubt and probability, such as *may be, possibly, probably, perhaps, may, could*, or epistemic expressions, such as *I think, I believe, I feel, in my opinion* etc. is also linked to the distinction between facts and opinions in such a type of text (Krishna Bal and Saint-Dizier, 2009). The presence and configuration of OLEPs in editorials' R parts make up and constitute what Morley calls 'the sting in the tail' (Morley 2004).

3. RESEARCH METHOD

The data, collected nonrandomly, by purposeful sampling on the basis of topic commonality, comprised nine IEs addressing the topic of corruption. They were issued in the mid of December (11-15) 2006 by Indonesian local and national dailies, namely *Bisnis Indonesia, Jawa Pos, Kompas, Kedaulatan Rakyat, Koran Tempo, Media Indonesia, Seputar Indonesia, Suara Karya, and Suara Merdeka*. Only the recommendatory parts of these nine IEs were analyzed (The titles of nine editorial under scrutiny were at the end of the reference list).

To do determine and analyze the recommendatory parts, each selected text was divided into three parts using Bolivar's triadic model (Situation-Development-Recommendation; SDR, for short) (Bolivar 1996). By length and position, the S part comprises one or two beginning paragraphs of each text, and serves as the opening situation or setting of the topic addressed. The D part follows the S and occupies much longer portion, comprising a good number of paragraphs. The R part resides at the text end, and in terms of length, normally ranges from one to two paragraphs. In addition to the relative proportional division of each text, the identification of each triadic element is based on and guided by the available discourse markers, if any, signaling how

editorial writers logically and macrotextually organized the content (introductory, body, conclusion; sequencing, enumerative, contrastive and comparative, conclusive, etc.).

The search of OLEPs was mainly focused on each R where the valuate turns (encompassing *concluders, prophecies, and directives*) resides. They were operationally detectable in terms of whatever OLEPs were found and how they were configured in such a way to make the recommendation as persuasive as possible.

The search, using a read marker technique, was done under the guidance of Biber's five categories of OLEPs (Biber, 1988, 1995). By this, the search was concerned with whether and how the following signals were found: (i) infinitives, (ii) nominal clauses, (iii) suasive verbs, (iv) conditional clauses, and (v) modal expressions of prediction, necessity and possibility, and intentionality.

Since the data were Indonesian expressions of persuasion, some minor adjustment was made accordingly. Of the four types of expressions, the English infinitive was roughly equated with *untuk + V*. The remaining three types were rendered the same as what Biber proposes above. This is due to the fact that nominal clauses, conditional clauses, modal expressions of prediction, necessity, possibility, and intention are also found in Indonesian. The Indonesian equivalence for the suasive verbs is available (translatable into their Indonesian equivalences). To display or present the data, all identified OLEPs in each R part were printed in bold and italicized within their respective texts. The search result was in turn presented in a cross tabulation and verbal account. What follows is the discussion and conclusion of how persuasive each of nine IEs' recommendations is.

4. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

4.1 The finding of OLEPs Across Nine Recommendations

The search result of OLEPs in all nine recommendations is presented in the following table (notes: other than modals, the numbers recorded show sentence number where the OLEPs concerned were found. For modals, only the modal expressions were recorded).

Linguistic Features of Persuasiveness in Nine Indonesian Editorials' Recommendations

OLEPs	Daily's Name and its Editorial Title								
	BI-Kkm	JP-DLT	K-MKB	KR-MKdSH	KT-JCRD	MI-LPK	SI-JuRD	SK-TMIK	SM-MAk
<i>untuk+(...)V</i>	-	34) (<i>bisa</i>)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Nom.clauses	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-24)?	-
Suasive verbs	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Cond.clauses	-	-	-	46); 47)	-	-	24)	-	33)
Modals:									
intentional	-	-	-	-	-	<i>hendaknya</i>	<i>tidak ingin</i>	-	-
prediction	-	-	-	-	<i>bakal</i>	-	-	-	<i>akan</i>
necessity	<i>harus</i>	<i>harus 2x</i>	-	-	<i>harus</i>	<i>harus, mestinya</i>	-	-	<i>perlu 3x harus</i>
possibility	-	-	-	<i> mungkin, barangkali</i>	-	-	<i>akan 4x</i>	<i>bisa</i>	-
certainty	-	-	-	-	-	-	<i>tentu</i>	-	-
deontic	-	<i>jangan</i>	-	-	-	-	<i>harus 3x</i>	-	-
dynamic	-	34) (<i>bisa</i>)	-	<i>bisa</i>	-	-	-	-	-

Notes: OLEPs: overt linguistic expressions of persuasion; dash (-) means nil.

The cross tabulation reveals the following: (i) eight of nine recommendations contain OLEPs. No OLEPs were found in the recommendatory part of text K-MKB; (ii) there was only one OLEP found in the R of text BI-Kkm and that of SK-TMIK; (iii) more than one OLEPs were found in the recommendation of text JP-DLT, KR-MKdSH, KT-JCRD, MI-LPK, SI-JuRD, and SM-MAk; (iv) no OLEPs of nominal clauses and suasive verbs were found in all nine recommendations; and (v) the OLEP of *untuk+(...)V* (equivalent to English infinitive) was found once in the recommendation of text JP-DLT.

By number of occurrence, OLEPs were most productive in the recommendations of JP-DLT, KR-MKdSH, SI-JuRD, and SM-MAk. In these four, more than one type of OLEPs were found. In JP-DLT, the persuasive expressions includes *untuk+(...)V* (found in stc. 34)); necessity modals of *harus* (three times); deontic modal of *jangan*; and the dynamic modal of *bisa* (found in the construction of *untuk bisa+V*). In KR-MKdSH, three kinds of OLEPs were found, namely two conditional clauses (stc. 46) and 37)); two possibility modals (*mungkin* and *barangkali*); and one dynamic modal (*bisa, can* expressing ability). The most productive occurrence of OLEPs was found in the recommendatory part of text SI-JuRD. In this, the OLEPs found include conditional clause (stc. 24),

(negated) intentional modal *tidak ingin*, possibility modal (*akan*, occurring four times), certainty modal (*tentu*); and deontic modal (*harus*, occurring three times). In the recommendatory part of text SM-MAk, the OLEPs found were conditional clause (stc. 33), prediction modal (*akan*), and necessity modal (*perlu*, occurring three times; and *harus*).

In terms of modal expressions, the search result shows the following: (i) two occurrences of intentional modal expressions were found. The first is *hendaknya* (*it is desirable, it is hoped that*) in the Rp of MI-LPK, and the second is the negated intentional expression *tidak ingin* (*not want*) in the Rp of SI-JuRD. (ii) Two predictive modals were found as follows: the expression of *bakal* (*will*) was found in the recommendatory part of KT-JCRD, and *akan* (*will*) in that of SI-JuRD). (iii) Expressions of necessity modal proved to be the most productive as it was observed in the presence of *harus* (*must*) in the recommendatory parts of, consecutively, BI-Kkm, JP-DLT (twice), MI-LPK (along with *mestinya*), and SM-MAk (in addition to *perlu* (*have to*)), which occurred three times within the same text). (iv) The modal of possibility was observed in various expressions such as *mungkin* (*maybe*) and *barangkali* (*perhaps*) in the recommendation of KR-MKdSH, *akan* (four times) in SI-JuRD, and *bisa* (*can*) in SK-TMIK. (v) The modal

expression of certainty *tentu* (*certainly*) was found only in the recommendation of SI-JuRD. (vi) The deontic modal expressions *jangan* (*don't, on no account*) were found in the recommendation of JP-DLT, while *harus* (deontic *must*) occurs three times in that of SI-JuRD. (vii) The dynamic modal expression *bisa* (*can*) was found twice in the recommendation of JP-DLT and that of KR-MKdSH.

Of all modal categories, the occurrence of necessity modal ranks highest, followed by, consecutively, the modal of possibility, the deontic modal, the modal of prediction, intentional, dynamic, and certainty. This shows that two modal expressions, of necessity and prediction, proved to be the most productive among all modal expressions and OLEPs in general. This finding, however, needs to be reserved to a very limited small size of corpus

(note: they were Indonesian conditional clauses that express future-oriented action or event).

4.2 The Persuasive Power of Each IE's Recommendation

The following section is an account of how persuasive each recommendation is. The persuasive power, or the sting in Morley's term, is discussed in terms of what OLEPs were found and how they were configured. Each recommendation is presented in full and discussed in turn. The presence of OLEPs is marked in bold and italics. Each tabular-verbal presentation encompasses the OLEPs identification (the left column) and how they are present in their context. The discussion of how persuasive each recommendation is follows afterwards.

4.2.1 The Recommendation of Text BI-Kkm

OLEPs identifier	Text
Necessity modal >	27) <i>Karena itu, harian ini berpendapat pemerintahan Presiden Susilo Bambang Yudhoyono harus lebih gigih memberantas praktik korupsi yang sudah merajalela dan merasuk ke hampir semua sektor kehidupan.</i> 28) <i>Apalagi tekad untuk memberantas praktik korupsi merupakan salah satu amanat reformasi yang dicanangkan bangsa ini.</i>

comprising only nine recommendations, and be rendered inconclusive for a larger size of corpora.

Other than modals, the OLEPs search result shows the following: (i) the expression of *untuk+ (...)V* was found only once in the recommendatory part of JP-DLT; (ii) an OLEP of nominal clause was found only in the recommendation of SK-TMIK; (iii) no suasive verbs were found all nine recommendations; and (iv) OLEPs of conditional clauses were found in the recommendation of KR-MKdSH (twice, in two consecutive sentences, 46) and 47)); SI-JuRD (stc. 24)), and SM-MAk (stc. 33)). Of these four types of OLEPs, preference was given to conditional clauses

In this text there is only one signal of persuasion, namely the presence of necessity modal **harus** in stc. 27). The point forwarded is targeted to the would-be subject-agent, that is, Susilo Bambang Yudhoyono's government to be stern and stiff in eradicating pervasively deep-rooted corruptive practices. By the presence of necessity modal **harus**, this portion of the text sounds and conforms, in its truest sense, what van Dijk calls recommendation or advice. The point forwarded and to whom it was targeted were readily identifiable. The sting of persuasion, so to speak, sounds strong and straightforward.

4.2.2 The Recommendation of Text JP-DLT

OLEPs identifier	Text
Necessity modal >	32) <i>Karena itu, jika benar hasil survei tersebut akan dijadikan bahan introspeksi, maka dewan harus melakukan perubahan frontal.</i> 33) <i>Perubahan frontal yang paling bermakna bagi rakyat adalah ketika dewan mau dan mampu membuat sistem yang memungkinkan rakyat bisa menyeleksi dengan ketat siapa saja yang akan duduk di parlemen.</i>
Dynamic & necessity modal > Deontic modal >	34) <i>Untuk bisa melakukan itu, rakyat mutlak harus diberi kewenangan untuk bisa memilih sendiri.</i> 35) <i>Rakyat jangan lagi dijebak untuk memilih kucing dalam karung seperti selama ini.</i>

In the text above, the editorial writer's persuasion points rest in the presence of three different kinds of modal expressions, namely (i) the necessity modal **harus** twice (stc. 32) and 34), (ii) *untuk bisa V* construction (equalized to English infinitive construction) (stc. 34), and (iii) the deontic modal expression **jangan** (stc.35). By the necessity modal **harus**, the persuasion is addressed to the collective subject-agent *dewan* (the house of representatives). The point forwarded to this institution is to make frontal changes, namely, to be willing and able to design a system which enables the people to be thoroughly selective in the upcoming election of members of the house of representatives. The construction *untuk bisa V*, being positioned at the beginning of stc. 34), serves as the adverb of purpose. Information wise, such a position allows the S+V+Complement sequence to be more prominent. Such a construction is meant to highlight the complementary element *untuk bisa memilih sendiri* to be the focused one.

The second necessity modal **harus** found in stc. 34) is, undoubtedly, addressed to the *dewan* too. (This modal expression may be understood deontically; however, such a possibility is reserved because the editorial writer does not hold the position

+ Vpassive) weakens the persuasive power by way of focusing on the action rather than on the doer of *pemberi kewenangan* (giver of authority).

What makes the text sound directive (in its negative sense, prohibitory), or stings strongly, is the presence of deontic modal **jangan** (*shouldn't, on no account*) in stc. 35) *Rakyat jangan lagi dijebak [...]*. However, this persuasive expression is weakened due to the use passive construction in which the targeted would-be subject-agent of the verb *menjebak, to trap* (the active counterpart of the passive verb *dijebak*) is deliberately suppressed, or not mentioned (not mentioning the would be subject-agent, usually marked by *oleh, by-agent*, in a passive construction is common; Quirk et al. 1985: 165-166). By way of transformation (the fronting of subject-experiencer), the subject-experiencer *rakyat* in the passive construction is highlighted at expense of suppressing the targeted would-be subject-agent (of the verb *menjebak*). In short, the addressee, to whom the deontic modal **jangan** is addressed, is suppressed. In such a construction, the shift of sentence subject-hood, from agentivity to experientiality, results in the weakening of persuasive power of the deontic modal.

4.2.3 The Recommendation of Text K-MKB

OLEPs identifier	Text
Nominal phrase >	32) <i>Politik bukanlah the art of the impossible, melainkan the art of the possible, bukan yang tidak mungkin, tetapi yang mungkin.</i>
	33) <i>Jalan dan sikap yang memungkinkan sesuai dengan hukum politik sebagai the art of the possible adalah sikap dan langkah serentak.</i>
Nominal phrase >	34) <i>Langkah pemberantasan korupsi yang konsisten, adil, sehingga tidak memberikan indikator dan kesan "tebang pilih" serta langkah memperbaiki kehidupan rakyat banyak dalam bidang sosial, ekonomi, dan budaya.</i>

of being the deontic source of authority). The use of passive voice verb *diberi* (given), however, shifts the nature of subjecthood. Using such a construction, the editorial writer intentionally shifts the focus of subjecthood from that of agentivity (*dewan*, being the agent of *memberi*) to that of experientiality (*rakyat*, the people). The subject of the passive predicate **harus diberi** (*must be given*) is *rakyat* (the people). By this, the nature and focus of subjecthood is no longer on that of the would-be agent (*dewan*) but on the experiencer or receiver (*rakyat*). With regard to the target of persuasion, the construction (S + **harus**

The OLEPs in the text above take the form of nominal phrases found in stc. 33)-34): *sikap dan langkah serentak, langkah pemberantasan korupsi yang konsisten dan adil* (concurrent, just, and consistent disposition and measures of eradicating corruptive practices). Nominalization sounds impersonal; the impersonalisation is evident in the not mentioning of the targeted would-be subject-agent. In so doing, to whom the point is forwarded is vague. In other words, in terms of OLEPs, to whom the persuasion is targeted, or the one to be stung, remains questionable. Of all nine recommendations

under scrutiny, in terms of OLEPs use, this text seems the least persuasive.

4.2.4 The Recommendation of Text KR-MKdSH

modal *akan*. By two precursory epistemic modals of uncertainty ***mungkin*** and ***barangkali***, the persuasive strength is relativized (the editorial writer's stance of uncertainty is proposed). The presence of two

OLEPs identifier	Text
possibility modal >	43) <i>Lantas, bagaimana caranya?</i>
possibility, dynamic modal; conditional clause >	44) <i>Mungkin</i> dengan memperbaiki sistem birokrasi dan lembaga peradilan? 45) <i>Itulah barangkali yang bisa kita usulkan.</i>
conditional clause >	46) <i>Sebab, jika aparat hu-kum dalam melakukan penegakan berlang-sung secara tegas terhadap setiap koruptor tanpa pandang bulu, hukum akan mem-peroleh kepercayaan yang tinggi dan di-segani.</i>
	47) <i>Akan tetapi, jika lembaga peradilan jus-tru bergairah melakukan korupsi dan tidak bertindak tegas, korupsi akan senantiasa menempel dan sulit diberantas betapapun berkali-kali kita memperingati Hari Anti Korupsi Sedunia.</i>

In the text above, the presence of two modal expressions ***mungkin*** and ***barangkali*** signals of the editorial writer's epistemic stance of uncertainty. Such uncertainty expressions make the recommendation less convincing. In addition, instead of focusing on to whom the point is addressed (the would-be subject-

conditionals in stc. 46) and 47) clearly suggests what the would-be subject-agent should do. The use of predictive modal ***akan***, in terms of persuasive power, negatively strengthens the point being forwarded.

4.2.5 The Recommendation of Text KT-JCRD

OLEPs identifier	Text
Necessity modal >	23) <i>Karena itu, KPK harus bekerja keras dan sungguh-sungguh meng-usut kasus korupsi ini.</i> 24) <i>Komisi ini dikritik kurang serius saat mengusut Menteri Hukum dan Hak Asasi Manusia Hamid Awaludin, yang diduga terlibat korupsi pengadaan segel surat suara saat menjadi anggota Komisi Pemilihan Umum.</i> 25) <i>KPK juga enggan memeriksa Gubernur DKI Suti-yoso dalam kasus penunjukan proyek busway.</i>
Prediction modal >	26) <i>Pamor KPK bakal mengkilap lagi kalau berani menjerat pejabat yang masih berkuasa.</i> 27) <i>Ini demi cita-cita luhur: mewujudkan pemerintahan yang bersih.</i>

doer or agent), the editorial writer forwards the methods of eradicating corruptions by improving the bureaucratic system and law and justice institutions. The point of persuasion is concerned not with the would-be subject-agent, but with the way to take, the condition to fulfill, and competent institutions to support to eradicate such practices.

The next point to note from the text above is concerned with the presence of conditional constructions and the predictive modal ***akan*** (will) in stc. 46) and 47). By these signals, the persuasion of this recommendation emphasizes on (i) the conditions to fulfill to enable and support to eradicate corruptive practices, and (ii) the predictive state to anticipate or conditions to fulfill as it is observed in the predictive

In terms of modal expressions, the persuasiveness of the recommendation above is marked by the presence of necessity modal ***harus*** (*must*, stc.23) and that of predictive one, ***bakal*** (*will*, stc. 26). The addressee, or the would-be subject-agent to whom the persuasion is targeted, is explicitly mentioned (*KPK*). The presence of ***harus*** signals that this commission body is necessitated to work hard and seriously to investigate corruption cases. The persuasiveness of this modal is substantiated by the predictive modal ***bakal***. By this, the point forwarded is concerned with the fulfillment of the designated condition (*berani menjerat pejabat yang masih berkuasa*; dare to tangle on-duty corruptive government officials). This condition to fulfill is stated

in the *kalau* (if) clause: *kalau berani menjerat pejabat yang masih berkuasa*. In sum, the persuasiveness of this text rests primarily in the use of necessity modal **harus**, which is sustained by the predictive modal **bakal** and a conditional clause. The sting of persuasion is explicitly targeted to the KPK.

4.2.6 The Recommendation of Text MI-LPK

OLEPs identifier	Text
intentional modal >	23) Hasil survei Global Corruption Barometer yang dilakukan di 62 negara itu hendaknya semakin memacu pemerintah di bawah kepemimpinan Presiden Susilo Bambang Yudhoyono untuk lebih gigih melakukan gerakan pemberantasan korupsi.
deontic modal >	24) Harus ada ketegaran dan konsistensi, terutama menyentuh jajaran penegak hukum dan sektor pelayanan publik.
necessity modal >	25) Hasil survei itu juga mestinya membuat DPR dan partai politik lebih mawas diri, tepatnya lebih tahu diri, sehingga tidak memercik air di dulang tepercik muka sendiri.

The persuasive power of this text rests in the presence of **hendaknya** (*it would be desirable, or hopefully*), a modal expression showing the speaker/writer's involvement of intention which is targeted to SBY government. The fulfillment does not depend on the subject-speaker/writer but on the targeted agent's willingness or volition to do accordingly. The targeted agent, SBY government, is put at the objective function of the sentence containing the expression, while the point forwarded is that of desiring the government to be stiff in eradicating corruptive practices. In addition to the use of intentional modal expression **hendaknya**, the persuasion is also signaled by the presence of necessity modal **harus** (followed by the existential verb *ada*) and **mestinya**. The use of **harus** is meant to persuade the SBY's government to be stiff and consistent in dealing with corruption. The use of nominalization, however, relativizes the persuasive power. Instead of directly addressing and persuading the targeted agent to be so, the editorial

writer uses the nominal *ketegaran* (stiffness) dan *konsistensi* (consistency) in a necessitated existential sentence. In such a sentence, the persuasion is targeted indirectly to the would-be subject-agent (SBY). To be frank, SBY is persuaded to be stiff and consistent. However, such a straightforward point is suppressed by using existential sentence *harus ada*

(there must be...). The use of nominal-impersonal subject is, surely, not only grammatically motivated. Not pinpointing directly the targeted subject-agent is a matter of avoiding being too straightforward to the targeted subject-agent in such a recommendation.

The presence of the necessity modal **mestinya** is essentially addressed to DPR (house of representatives) and political parties. In this, the editorial writer does not straight-forwardly pinpoint the targeted agent either. It is observed in the use of causative verb *membuat* (*make*), the subject of which is evidently not the targeted agent, but the impersonal subject being the cause itself, *hasil survey itu* (the survey result). In this text the targeted would-be subject-agent of persuasion is explicitly mentioned, but the structuring is strategically designed in such a way (by the use of nominalization and causative verb) to relativize the straightforwardness.

4.2.7 The Recommendation of Text SI-JuRD

OLEPs identifier	Text
deontic modal >	21) Semua warga negara, siapa saja harus patuh pada hukum kalau negara ini mau tertib dan disegani bangsa lain.
deontic modal >	22) Sehingga penyelesaian perkara hukum harus dilakukan melalui jalur hukum.
deontic modal >	23) Penyelesaian perkara politik harus melalui jalur politik.
predictive modal >	24) Kalau perkara hukum diselesaikan dengan jalur politik, semua akan berantakan.
predictive modal >	25) Hukum hanya akan menjadi alat politik.
predictive modal >	26) Siapa yang kuat dia akan menguasai hukum, sebaliknya siapa yang lemah akan menjadi bulan-bulanan hukum.
certainty, intentional >	27) Tentu kita tidak ingin hal itu terjadi lagi.

In the text above, three points pertaining to persuasiveness are worth mentioning, namely (i) in terms of modal, four different types of modal expressions are found, namely (a) the obligatory expression of deontic modal **harus** (*must*); (b) the

of predictive modal expressions, while the intention-sounding rests in the last sentence expressing the subject-speaker/writer's conclusive intention.

4.2.8 The recommendation of text SK-TMIK

OLEPs identifier	Text
Possibility modal >	30) <i>Sekadar masukan bagi semua yang prihatin dengan "industri" korupsi di negara ini; paling penting adalah mencari cara untuk memati-kan "industri" yang satu ini.</i> 31) <i>Sistem hukumnya sudah ada, tetapi semua orang tahu bahwa hukum bisa dibelokkan untuk melindungi koruptor.</i> 32) <i>Cara apa lagi yang paling efektif?</i>

predictive modal **akan** (*will*); (c) the certainty modal **tentu** (*certainly*), and (d) the negated intentional modal expression *tidak ingin* (*not want*); (ii) the presence and persuasive power of modal expressions are intensified by repetition, particularly that of the necessity modal **harus** (repeated three times), and the predictive modal **akan** (four times); (iii) the presence of certainty modal **tentu** in the last sentence resumes the repetitive use of necessity and predictive modals which, in turns, augments and highlights the conclusive expression in the form of negated intentional modal *tidak ingin*.

The persuasive power of this recommendatory text relies on the multitude or varied use and repetitive presence of the two modal expressions making the text sound normative, predictive, and intentional. It sounds normative because the points of persuasion forwarded are addressed not to a particular person but to public in general, namely *semua saja* (*all*), *setiap warganegara* (*any citizen*) to obey what and how *the rules of the game* normally and normatively are. It sounds predictive because of the recursive presence

In this very short recommendatory text, persuasion sounds the least powerful compared to the other eight under scrutiny. Two reasons are responsible for this. First, instead of using any of OLEPs, the editorial writer deliberately uses the word *masukan* (*input, suggestion, look at stc. 30*). This suggests that what is expressed is, in its truest sense, recommendative, or suggestive. Secondly, the recommendative point is encapsulated in the complementative verbal phrase of a nonverbal sentence (*paling penting adalah mencari cara ... (the most important thing is finding ways of ...)*). In such a construction, the targeted subject-agent of *mencari cara* (*finding ways*) is vague, or, straightforwardly speaking, made obscure. In other words, the subject-agentivity, viz. to whom persuasion is addressed, is not the editorial writer's main concern. Instead, what matters is the *cara* or methods of eradicating corruptive practices. This text demonstrates that what is called *valuate turns* by Bolivar turns out or proves to sound recommendative in van Dijk's account.

4.2.9 The recommendation of text SM-MAK

OLEPs identifier	Text
necessity modal >	28) <i>Masyarakat perlu mendukung kampanye antikorupsi dan itu tidak terbatas pada saat mem-peringati hari antikorupsi agar tidak terjebak pada seremoni belaka.</i>
necessity modal >	29) <i>Kampanye perlu dilakukan sepa-njang tahun dan itu melibatkan berbagai elemen masyarakat.</i>
necessity modal >	30) <i>Juga perlu disentuh lewat jalur pen-didikan.</i>
necessity modal >	31) <i>Namun sekali lagi yang lebih penting adalah bukti nyata berupa pengungkapan kasus korupsi tanpa pandang bulu.</i>
predictive modal >	32) <i>Se-makin banyak koruptor yang dihukum itu merupakan bukti yang akan menjadi kampanye positif.</i>
necessity modal >	33) <i>Sebaliknya, kalau masih banyak koruptor yang lolos maka itu meru-pakan kampanye negatif.</i>
necessity modal >	34) <i>Dari segi ini masih berat tugas yang harus diselesaikan.</i>

In the recommendatory text above, persuasiveness is signaled by the presence of two types of modal expressions, namely the necessity modal *perlu* (*necessarily*) and *harus* (*must*), and the predictive modal *akan* (*will*). The necessity modal is repeated four times (consecutively, in stc. 28), 29), 30), and 34). Repetition intensifies the persuasive power of the text, sounding much stronger than that of the presence of modal *akan*.

In addition to repetition, the use of different voice is worth considering. In stc. 28), the modal *perlu* is followed by *V-mendukung* (supporting, active). The second *perlu* in stc. 29) is followed by *V-disentuh* (touched upon, passive). In stc. 34) the modal expression *harus* is followed by *V-diselesaikan* (to be accomplished, passive). The necessity modal *perlu* +V active is essentially addressed to public (*masyarakat*), while the second and third, followed by V passive, indicate that the focus is not on the targeted subject-agent or persuadee but on the designated course of actions. Focus may also be given to the designated action, time, and mode or means (*dilakukan sepanjang tahun, melibatkan berbagai elemen masyarakat; disentuh lewat jalur pendidikan; done all year long, involving any public elements, and to be dealt with by involving education sector*). In passive, the subject of a passive verb is usually the person or thing that is affected by the action of the verb. The subject-actor or doer of the passive verb (*oleh+subjek pelaku, the by agent*, however, is of minor importance (Swan 2002: xxv, 408)). In other words, verb-passive voicing is meant to remove the entity performing the action (the agent) from the centre of attention (Trask, 2007: 320). This means that the point to persuade is not addressed to the persuadee, but on the action designated by the verbs that follow the modal expressions. In this respect, avoidance of mentioning the source reflects the editorial writers' strategy of attributing indirectly or being 'anonymous attributor', or to be on the safe side (Williams, 1990: 126, in Khabbazi-Oskouei 2011: 114).

The persuasiveness of this text, in sum, rests in the repetitive occurrence of necessity modal *perlu*, and, with respect to the passive verb forms following the modal, is focused not on the would-be subject-agent but on the actions designated by the corresponding verbs. The presence of predictive and necessity modal *akan* and *harus* respectively at the text end bonds and affirms what is previously

necessitated by the three consecutive occurrences of the modal expression *perlu*.

5. CONCLUSION

The persuasive power of nine IE's recommendations shows the following. First, recommendatory persuasive power, or the sting, in Morley's term, is determined by whether or not OLEPs are present. In the absence of OLEPs, the persuasive power sounds weak, or the least stinging, so to speak, as in that of SK-TMIK.

Second, in addition to the presence of OLEPs, the persuasive power is determined by how many types of OLEPs are employed and, in turn, strategically configured so as to bear optimum persuasive effect on the targeted readers or persuadee. The persuasive power will also intensify if the persuadee or specified would-be subject-agent is pinpointed.

Third, the search result of OLEPs shows that, among modal categories, necessity modals prove to be the most commonly used. In terms of their persuasiveness, predictive modals sound less powerful than necessity and deontic modals do. Deontic modals, however, were rarely found except in the Rp of JP-DLT and SI-JuRD. Preference seems to be given to the use of necessity modal expressions.

Next, the repetitive presence of OLEPs, modals in particular, also intensify the sting power or persuasiveness. Repetition is not only a matter of style but also a means of putting more emphasis or showing importance of a particular point to persuade.

Lastly, verb-passive voicing after modal expressions also counts. It is concerned with agentivity pertaining to the persuadee, namely, a personage, body, or institution being the target of the editorials writers' persuasive remarks. In forwarding a point to persuade, the use of passive construction is a matter of choice of whether, in Trask's formulation, to make the entity undergoing the action the centre of attention, or to remove the entity performing the action (the agent) from the centre of attention. In other words, it signals the editorial writer's strategy of whether to suppress or to make prominent, or pinpoint (*ad hominem*) the persuadee to be the would-be agent of the designated course of action.

REFERENCES

- Alwi, Hasan. 1992. *Modalitas dalam Bahasa Indonesia*. Seri ILDEP. Yogyakarta: Kanisius.
- Ansary, Hasan dan Esmat Babaii. 2004. "The Generic Integrity of Newspaper Editorials: A Systemic Functional Perspective". *Asian EFL Journal* Vol. 6. Issue 3 Article 6 (online journal: http://www.asian-efl-journal.com/september_04_ha_php)
- Biber, D. 1988. *Variation across speech and writing*. Cambridge: CUP.
- Biber, D. 1995. *Dimensions of register variation: A cross-linguistic comparison*. Cambridge: CUP. London.
- Biber, D & Keck, M.C. 2004. "Modal use in spoken and written university registers: A corpus-based study". In Facchinetti, R & Palmer, F (Eds.). *English Modality in Perspective: Genre Analysis and Contrastive Studies*. Berlin, Newyork, Oxford: Perter Lang.
- Bolivar, A. 1994. "The structure of newspaper editorials". In M. Coulthard (ed.), *Advances in written text analysis*. London: Routledge, 276-294.
- Bonyadi, Alireza. 2011. "Linguistic Manifestations of Modality in Newspaper Editorials". In *International Journal of Linguistics* 2011 vol. 3, no.1 .E30. Macrothink Institute. URL: <http://dx.doi.org/10.5296/ijl.v3il.799>; www.macrothink.org/ijl access date: 10 May 2012: 19.50.
- Hatim, B. and I. Mason.1990. *Discourse and the translator*. London, NY: Longman.
- Hicks, Wynford. 2003. *English for Journalists*. London: Routledge.
- Hieberts & Gibbons. 2000. *Exploring mass media for a changing world*. Philadelphia: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Keeble, Richard. 2001. *The Newspapers Handbook*. London: Routledge.
- Khabbazi Oskouei, Leila. 2011. *Interactional Variation in English and Persian: A Comparative Analysis of Metadiscourse Features in Magazine Editorials*. Doctoral thesis, School of Language and Communication Studies. Norwich: University of East Anglia.
- Kridalaksana, Harimurti. 2008. *Kamus Linguistik*. Jakarta: Gramedia Pustaka Utama.
- Krishna Bal, Bal, and Saint-Dizier, Patrick. *Towards an Analysis of Argumentation Structure and the Strength of Arguments in News Editorials* www.aisb.org.uk/convention/aisb09/.../BalB.pdf . date of access: August 15, 2013: 9.54.
- Microsoft Encarta Dictionary 2009 © 1993-2008 Microsoft Corporation.
- McEnery, Tony dan Kifle, Nazareth Amselom. 2002. "Epistemic modality in argumentative essays of second-language writers". In Flowerdew, John (ed.). *Academic Discourse*. London: Pearson Education.
- Morley, John. 2004. "The Sting in the Tail: Persuasion in English Editorial Discourse". In A Partington, B. Morley, dan Louann Haarman (ed.). *Corpora and discourse*. Camerino University. Peter Lang. 239-255.
- Morley, J. 2004. "Modals in persuasive journalism: An example from the Economist". In Facchinetti, R & Palmer, F (Eds.), *English Modality in Perspective: Genre Analysis and Contrastive Studies*. Berlin, Newyork, Oxford: Perter Lang.
- Palmer, F.R. 2007. *Mood and Modality*. Beijing: World Book Publishing Com.
- Quirk, Randolph, Sidney Greembaum, Geoffrey Leech, dan Jan Svartvik, 1985. *A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language*. Harlow, Essex: Longman.
- Reah, Danuta. 2002. *The Language of Newspapers*. London: Routledge.
- Reynolds, M. 2000. "The blending of narrative and argument in the generic texture of newspaper editorials". *International journal of applied linguistics* 10(1): 25-40.
- Sudaryanto. 1993. *Metode Dan Aneka Teknik Analisis Bahasa: Pengantar Penelitian Wahana Kebudayaan Secara Linguistik*. Yogyakarta: Duta Wacana University Press.
- Sudaryanto. 1995. *Linguistik: Identitasnya, Cara Penanganan Objeknya, Dan Hasil Kajiannya*. Yogyakarta: Duta Wacana University Press.
- Sumadiria, Haris. 2004. *Menulis Artikel dan Tajuk Rencana: Panduan Praktis Penulis & Jurnalis Profesional*. Bandung: Simbiosis Rekatama Media.

- Stevens, Alan M., dan Schmidgall-Tellings, A. Ed. 2008. *Kamus Lengkap Indonesia-Inggris*. Bandung: PT. Mizan Pustaka.
- Trask, R.L. 2007. *Language and Linguistics: The Key Concepts*. New York: Routledge.
- Van Dijk, T.A. 1985. *Discourse and Communication: New Approach to the Analysis of Mass Media and Communication*. Berlin, Newyork: Walter De Gruyter.
- Van Dijk, Teun A. 1995. *Opinions and Ideologies in Editorials. Paper for the 4th International Symposium of Critical Discourse Analysis: Language, Social Life, and Critical Thoughts*. Athens, 14-16 December.
- Van Dijk, T.A. 1996. "Opinions and ideologies in Editorials (2nd draft)". *Paper for the 4th International Symposium of Critical Discourse Analysis, Language, Social Life and Critical Thought*, Athens, 14-16 December, 1995.
- Vestergaard, T. 2000. "That's not news: Persuasive and Expository genres in Press". In Trosborg, A (ed.), *Analyzing professional genres*. Amsterdam: Benjamin.
- The nine editorials' recommendations were taken from the following Indonesian dailies, *BISNIS INDONESIA*, 12 Desember 2006: Korupsi kian mengerikan (BI-Kkm)
- JAWA POS*, 13 Desember 2006: Dewan Lembaga Terkorup (JP-DLT)
- KEDAULATAN RAKYAT*, 13 Desember 2006: Memberantas Korupsi dengan Sepenuh Hati (KR-MKdSH)
- KOMPAS*, 11 Desember 2006: Memberantas Korupsi Berat! (K-MKB).
- KORAN TEMPO*, 12 Desember 2006: Jangan Cuma Rokhmin Dahuri (KT-JCRD).
- MEDIA INDONESIA*, 11 Desember 2006: Lembaga Paling Korup (MI-LPK).
- SEPUTAR INDONESIA*, 15 Desember 2006: Jaminan untuk Rokhmin Dahuri (SI-JuRD).
- SUARA KARYA*, 13 Desember 2006: Terpenting Mematikan "Industri" Korupsi (SK-TMIK).
- SUARA MERDEKA*, 15 Desember 2006: Mengampanyekan Antikorupsi (SM-MAk)