

ATTITUDINAL FORMS OF IDEOLOGICAL POSITIONING: A JUDGMENT ANALYSIS OF FOUR EDITORIALS FROM TWO MAINSTREAM PRINT MEDIA IN KENYA

Anne A. Ingutia, Prof. Peter M. Matu, and Prof. Omondi Oketch

¹Ng'iya Girls' High School, Kenya

²Department of Language & Communication Studies

Technical University of Kenya

Corresponding Author: Prof. Peter M. Matu

ABSTRACT

This article examines the application of judgment concept; a sub-system of appraisal theory's attitude component. This concept is used to illustrate how two mainstream newspaper editorials portrayed presidential aspirants and their associates in the run-up to the 2007 general elections in Kenya. In addition, the paper analyzes how Kenya's mainstream print media presented presidential aspirants, thus revealing the media groups' ideological leaning about the politicians. The paper further illustrates how the judgment concept can be handy in unraveling explicit and implicit mediation processes and practices that are often unconsciously used in the evaluation of political participants in the campaign period. The article is limited to the exploration of judgment appraisal resources as used in four editorials' coverage of presidential aspirants and their associates in the run-up to 2007 general elections in Kenya. The four editorials were selected through stratified random sampling from 38 *Standard* and 36 *Nation* newspaper editorials that had commentary on political election campaigns between September and December 2007. The study reveals that in newspaper editorials, coverage is rarely neutral. Editorials can favourably or otherwise create a particular image for a candidate by bringing out some personality traits. Since elections are significant events that determine how a country is governed afterwards, and media groups have vested interests in political activities in a country, readers of editorial newspapers need to hone their skills of critical reading to be able to make informed choices of their political leaders. By illustrating how judgment as a linguistic resource can be used as a strategy for alignment, the paper sensitizes the readers to be keen when reading newspaper editorials. The article also gives editors insight on how partiality in coverage comes about.

© Ideal True Scholar

KEYWORDS: ideology, judgment, attitude, editorial, Kenya

INTRODUCTION

This article explores the application of judgment, a concept of attitude subsystem of appraisal theory in the evaluative editorial texts in the print media. The data studied consists of editorials extracted from the reportage of the run into the 2007 general elections in Kenya (cf. Ingutia, 2012).

The analysis aims to identify and explain how *The Standard* and *Daily Nation* newspaper editorials attempted to shape the perception and attitude of the readers towards the presidential aspirants and political groupings in the run-up to the 2007 general elections in Kenya. It identifies the categories of judgmental appraisal lexical items, clauses and sentences used in *The Standard* and *Daily Nation* newspaper editorials. It also explains how judgmental appraisal lexical items, clauses and sentences were used in *The Standard* and *Daily Nation* newspaper editorials to guide the reader's perception and attitude towards presidential aspirants and their associates.

This article is divided into five sections. The first section gives the background of the mainstream print media from which the data was extracted. The second section addresses characteristics of editorial as a genre. Section three briefly explains the concept used for analysis namely the judgment subsystem of attitude component of appraisal theory. This is followed by data analysis. The last section concludes by giving a summary of the analysis.

HISTORY OF THE PRINT MEDIA IN KENYA

The operation of the print media in Kenya started back in the colonial times. The white Christian Missionaries introduced the first print media in Kenya towards the end of the 19th century. The earliest regular publication in Kenya was *Taveta Chronicle* that was first published in 1895 by Reverend Albert Stegal of the Church Missionary Society (CMS). It was circulated among Europeans in the local area and a few copies sent to Britain. The leading news generally reflected the perspective of the white man and supported greatly the interests of the white settler (Karanja, 2000).

In 1902, A.M. Jeevanjee set up *The African Standard* which was a monthly publication in Mombasa. W.H. Tiller (an English man) became its first editor. However, the editor's cruel criticism of the British colonial policy made Jeevanjee to sell the ownership of the paper to Anderson and Mayer who changed its name to *East African Standard*. But unlike the progenitor, the *East African Standard* was sympathetic to the white settler course.

In 1928, *Muiguithania* edited by Jomo Kenyatta and established in Nairobi became the first newspaper owned and edited by Africans. In 1939, the *East African Standard* launched *Baraza*, a Swahili news weekly under the editorship of R. Hayward. In 1958, Charles Hayes founded *Taifa*, a Swahili weekly, in Nairobi. *Taifa* was edited at different times by Boaz Omari, George Githii, John Abuoga, George Mbugguss, Joram Amadi and Harry Sambo (Ochieng', 1992).

In 1959, Michael Curtis set up, on behalf of the Aga Khan, East African newspapers (nation series) Company. The company took over *Taifa* from Hayes who then became its editor. Unlike *The Standard*, *Taifa* was liberal and pro-nationalist (Ochieng', 1992). Other publications set up by nationalist leaders included *Uhuru*, *Afrika*, *Kali*, *Kilio cha Mfanyi Kazi*, *Wathiomu Mukinyu*, *Ramogi*, and *Sauti ya Mwafrica*. These publications largely expressed the African perspective (Abuoga & Mutere, 1988).

According to Wanyande (1995), the relationship of conflict and unease between the state and the print media in Kenya has not changed since the colonial times. The press has continuously felt that the government is intent on gagging it. On the other hand, the government has cited what it curiously refers to as irresponsible reporting by the press. Sometimes, it has accused the press of serving interests of the "west".

During one party rule in Kenya, activities of the mass media, women groups and ethnic welfare associations were often monitored on political matters. The one party rule encouraged only a media system that championed the government's agenda while overlooking the government's limitations. The media was expected to express only those views perceived to favour state ideology.

However, this changed in the 1990s. Media criticism of the state began to grow with mainstream media houses such as *The Standard* and *The Nation* leading the way. In response and by decree of section 88 of the old constitution of Kenya (Mute, 2000), the state occasionally banned the publication of certain newspapers, detained editors, seized or destroyed equipment belonging to media houses seen as anti-government. The then Education Minister and KANU Secretary General even threatened to ban the *East African Standard* and the *Nation* newspapers for being

hostile to KANU government by publishing stories in favour of the opposition.

The Media Owners Association (MOA) together with the Kenya Editors Guild campaigned against the oppressive section 88 in vain. In 2009, a blow was dealt to this campaign when the president of Kenya assented to the Kenya Communications (Amendment) Act in January 2009 with the purpose of piling more restrictions on the media. The media owners and editors were unanimous that the act was a bad law that would strip the media of its independence. One reporter said '...the president agreed with parliament and put into doubt the freedom enjoyed by media houses to determine editorial content independently' (*Sunday Nation*, 4-1-2009:5).

Editorial Genre

In newspapers, the major genres are editorials and news reports. News reports are divided into hard news, feature articles and special topic news which include sports, finance, and arts among others. Editorials generally rely on the news reports to supply the reader with information about which the editor gives the official position of the organization on an issue (Newsom & Wollert, 1988).

Editorials play an important role in conveying a message to the readers (Morrish, 1986; Westin, 2002). They are usually printed on their own page in a newspaper or magazine. Sometimes they appear in a column marked-off and labeled as 'editorial'. Normally, editorials cover topical issues that represent the collective voice of the newspaper or magazine. The opinions expressed in editorials are often taken as the official position of the organization on a given issue. According to Newsom & Wollert (1988), the editorials reflect the management's attitude expressed through the editorial-page editor. Editorials may try to get people to think or do something specific, pose problems or offer solutions or persuade readers to support political candidates with the objective of getting voters to vote in a certain way. Studies indicate that editorials have long-range effect when they focus on a subject of importance over a period of time (Newsom & Wollert, 1988).

The editorial content is usually similar to that of one or more news reports in a given day's issue of the newspaper. The genre expresses views, opinions, predictions, suggestions on current issues as identified in newspaper articles and its purpose is to convince or influence the reader. An editorial can also comment on something that is important even if it is not timely. Opinion editorial is more than just an expression of judgment but generally an effort to pursue other people to share that opinion (Goatley, in Pennock & Pennock, 2000).

The ownership of a newspaper has a bearing on reportage. Whoever owns the majority of shares of a media company gets to influence its policy. Every

newspaper owner has an idea of what latitude they want their publications to have. Analysis of editorials can therefore reveal politically or ideologically based opinions and attitudes. The reader consciously or unconsciously supports the opinions expressed in an editorial from the linguistic choices made in the text (Thompson & de Klerk, 2002).

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

Appraisal theory is located within the framework of Systemic Functional Grammar (SFG/ SFL). It is an extension of M.A.K. Halliday's interpersonal metafunction. Appraisal framework was originally developed by Martin (1997) and White (1997). It has been improved on by linguists such as Hope and Read (2006), Coffin (1998) as well as its founders, as seen in Martin (2004) and White (2005). Appraisal (evaluation) is a strategy for influencing decision and choice. It is concerned with the linguistic resources by which a text / speaker comes to express, negotiate and naturalize particular inter-subjective and ultimately ideological positions (Butt, Fahey, Feez, Spinks & Yallop, 2000). The theory describes how social relationships are negotiated through evaluation of self, others and artifacts. Appraisal's concern is with the linguistic construction of conveying emotions and opinions. Appraisal looks into how writers align their authorial personae with the stance of others, and how they manipulate their writings to convey greater or lesser degree of strength and conviction in their presentation of propositions. Different appraisal motifs build up patterns across whole texts. The patterns align speakers and listeners around a set of values to produce a sense of belonging and community. Speakers and writers are able to spread appraisal meanings across whole texts so that the audience is drawn to a particular point of view or interpretation of the content which seems natural (Butt, Farey, Feez, Spinks, & Yallop, 1999).

In White (2005)'s view, appraisal is a cover-all term that encompasses all evaluative uses of language and includes those value positions or stances by which speakers/writers negotiate the stances with actual or potential respondents. White says that appraisal performs two major functions: attitudinal positioning and dialogistic positioning. Attitudinal positioning is concerned with 'praising' or 'blaming'- meaning by which writers / speakers indicate positive or negative assessment of people, things, happenings and states of affairs. Attitude component of appraisal theory is concerned with ways of feeling (White 2005). It addresses values by which speakers pass judgment and associate emotional responses with participants and processes. Attitude can be explicitly inscribed or implicitly invoked (Hope & Read, 2006). Attitude is divided into three sub-systems: affect, judgment and appreciation (White, 2005). The judgment concept of attitude is used in this paper to assess how evaluation of presidential aspirants and their associates was done by the mainstream newspaper editorials in the run-up to the 2007 general elections in Kenya.

According to White (2005), Judgment, as an aspect of attitudinal positioning, includes meaning which evaluates human behaviour positively or negatively by reference to a set of institutionalized norms. Based on judgment, behaviour may be assessed as moral or immoral, as legal or illegal, as socially acceptable or unacceptable, as laudable or deplorable, normal or abnormal. Values of judgment have either positive or negative status.

White (2005) breaks Judgment into two categories: judgment of social esteem and judgment of social sanction. He posits that Judgment of *social sanction* involves an assertion that some set of rules or regulations codified by the culture are at issue. The rules may be legal or moral and they address the questions of legality or morality. From a religious perspective for instance, breaches of social sanction are seen as sins; from the legal viewpoint, they are understood as crimes. To breach social sanction therefore is to risk legal or religious punishment. Social sanction itself is divided into two categories: *veracity* (truth) and *propriety* (ethics). Veracity is concerned with how truthful one is while propriety is concerned with ones' level of ethical characteristics. White (2005) further explains that Judgment of *social esteem* involves evaluations under which the person involved will be lowered or raised in the esteem of their community, but which do not carry legal or moral implications. Therefore negative values of social esteem will be seen as dysfunctional or inappropriate and will be discouraged but will not be assessed as sins or crimes. Social esteem is divided into three sub-categories: *normality*, *capacity*, and *tenacity*. Normality or custom expresses how usual someone is or how customary their behaviour is. Capacity shows how capable someone is while tenacity expresses how dependable one is or how well they are disposed emotionally or in terms of their intentionality (White 2005).

The concept of Judgment is appropriate for use in the analysis of data in this study. It is used in the identification of positive and negative evaluative lexical items and sentences that were used in the selected editorials to assess politicians and their associates in the run up to 2007 general elections in Kenya.

THE DATA AND THE DISCUSSION

The data analyzed in this section was obtained from selected editorials commenting on the activities of political aspirants in the run-up to (September - December 2007) general elections in Kenya. As explained in the introduction, editorials represent the standpoint as well as the ideological position of the newspaper. Four such editorials constitute the data for this study; two from *The Standard* (text A1 and text A2) and two from *Daily Nation* (text B1, B2). During the period (September-December 2007) *The*

Standard produced 38 editorials and *Daily Nation* 36 editorials commenting on the activities of political aspirants. 5% of each of these figures (38 and 36) has been randomly sampled for close analysis in this study. This is according to Altheide (1996) who proposes a sample size of 5%-10% is appropriate for this kind of study. This has given rise to approximately two editorials per publication.

The data presented below under TEXT A1, A2, B1 and B2 are sentences that contain Judgment appraisal lexical items and/or clauses extracted from the four randomly sampled editorials from the 38 and 36 *Standard* and *Nation* editorials respectively. The italicized are the judgment lexical items and clauses identified by the researchers in the extracted sentences. The words in brackets elaborate the Appraisal theory classification of the identified/italicized judgment lexical items and clauses.

From the *Standard*

TEXT A1

- 1 The altercation between the government spokesman and the opposition is *unnecessary and intrusive* (attitude: judgment : social sanction: propriety: negative)
- 2 *The problem is how those in government treat such claims* (attitude: judgment: social esteem: normality: negative)
- 3 The government spokesman *defended the exploitation* of the incumbency by comparing with President Bush and Air Force One (attitude: judgment : social sanction : propriety: negative)
- 4 It is therefore in the interest of the government to listen and act on the claims by *those who seek to remove it through legitimate means* (attitude: judgment : social sanction : propriety: positive)
- 5 To dismiss the claims by the opposition off-hand is to be insensitive (attitude: judgment : social sanction : propriety: negative) to *those who in the name of democracy chose to oppose this administration* (attitude: judgment : social sanction : propriety: positive)
- 6 It also is *arrogant and boisterous* of a government that claims to listen (attitude: judgment : social sanction : propriety : negative)
- 7 *Looked at against the fact that the president is campaigning on the platform of good development record, the line between what the two are doing and saying is in the least translucent* (attitude: Social esteem: tenacity: negative)
- 8 The questions the spokesman shot at the opposition sprung either from *condescending attitude or a skewed notion of government*

(attitude: judgment : social sanction : propriety: negative)

- 9 After listing the vehicles either sold or in the process he went *ballistic* (attitude: Social esteem: tenacity: negative)

- 10 *The language and general disposition is demeaning* (attitude: judgment: social esteem: normality: negative)

TEXT A1, from which examples 1-10 were sampled, is an editorial commentary about the government spokesman's speech at a press conference in which the spokesman tried to exonerate the government from blame by ODM¹ political grouping that had accused the government of misusing public resources in PNU² political campaigns.

In example 1, the altercation between the government spokesman and the opposition is *unnecessary and intrusive*; the adjectives *unnecessary and intrusive* present a negative picture of the government spokesman. Being *intrusive* means putting oneself into a place where one is neither welcome nor suitable. *Unnecessary* means that which can be done without. The two words portray the spokesman's character as unethical and as one who indulges in matters that do not concern him. On this account, according to White (2005) he breaches the social sanction value of propriety by behaving in unethical manner by intruding unnecessarily. Since it is the responsibility of the government spokesman to explain matters in favour of the government (or PNU in this circumstance), a negative description of him in the media could be understood as an attempt to discredit him and the party he appears to defend with the effect that the reader judges negatively those who associate with him.

The simple declarative sentence (in example 2), *the problem is how those in government treat such claims* is judgment implicitly coded in terms of social esteem values where those in government are assessed as behaving inappropriately and in a way that is questionable. Those in government are viewed as engaging in problematic behavior in addressing issues. Because of this, they fail the normality test as far as societal expectations are concerned. This assessment of government attracts a negative judgment of it by the reader with the possibility that they may chose not to vote for PNU which identifies with the government.

From example 3 in Text A1, the government spokesman *defended the exploitation* of the incumbency by comparing with President Bush and Air Force One. The verb *defended* and the noun *the exploitation* portrays the spokesman and those in government in corrupt terms. The government perpetuates exploitation

¹ ODM refers to Orange Democratic Movement party. ODM was the opposition in the 2007 general elections of Kenya.

² PNU refers to the Party of National Unity. PNU brought together parties sympathetic to the incumbent.

but the spokesman defends it for it. Both the verb and the noun as used assign explicit negative propriety judgment of the government and those associated with it. They are unethical due to their exploitation and their unusual defense of it.

The adjectival clause *those who seek to remove it through legitimate means* (example 4) makes judgment by reference to socially determined ethics about behavior that addresses what is wrong and what is right. The clause is a positive evaluation of the opposition (ODM) that had raised complaints. The clause characterizes the ODM party as law abiding and ethical. ODM is therefore portrayed favourably in terms of the social sanction value of propriety. In clauses such as this, the editorial writer is persuading the reader into viewing the ODM party positively.

In example 5 (to dismiss the claims by the opposition off-hand is to be insensitive to *those who in the name of democracy chose to oppose this administration*) the italicized clause again portrays the ODM party as upholding the standards of social sanction by favouring democracy and fairness while remaining vigilant to unethical practices. The government is labeled insensitive while ODM is associated with exercising the legal means of opposing the incumbent. The reader is therefore left with the impression that the government is bad but ODM is good thereby deserving their vote.

The adjectives *arrogant* and *boisterous* (See - It also is *arrogant and boisterous* of a government that claims to listen, in example 6) presents the government side as intolerant and insensitive thereby contravening the social sanction standards of propriety. Unlike the opposition, the government takes the negative reputation; an image that could possibly swing opinions or even votes against it.

The simple declarative sentence *looked at against the fact that the president is campaigning on the platform of good development record, the line between what the two are doing and saying is in the least translucent* (example 7) depicts the president and the government spokesman as uncoordinated in their activities. Since the two seem to talk at cross-purposes on the same issue, they are lacking in the social esteem value of tenacity. This negative judgment has the potential of turning readers away from them and their associates.

As attested in example 8, the adjectives *condescending* and *skewed* explicitly evaluate the government spokesman as patronizing, biased and discriminative against the opposition. His conduct is therefore unethical and in breach of the social sanctions standards of propriety. As in the previous illustrations, such negative attribution is likely to influence the reader against the government spokesman together with the government for which he speaks for.

The descriptive adjective *ballistic*, in example 9, gives the government spokesman the reputation of an angry man who is easily overcome by emotion on matters of public concern. On account of this, he is attributed in low social esteem terms. Since he lacks the capacity to hold himself together in the face of stress, he falls foul of the tenacity test. He is therefore too yielding in the eye of the reader. Naturally, the government and the PNU party get to share this negative reputation with him.

Similarly, when the spokesman responds to claims about the misuse of public resources by the government in the manner illustrated in example 10 of Text A1, his *disposition* is in breach of the social esteem value of normality. For a spokesman of his stature, he does the unexpected, thereby contravening the social norms. He therefore risks lowering the esteem with which members of the community regard his office. Again, the PNU and the government turn out badly.

TEXT A2

1. The minister's council was *the infamous promotion* of warlike activities that landed a former cabinet member in jail for four years (attitude: judgment : social sanction : propriety: negative)
2. The minister is *unapologetic* (attitude: judgment: social esteem: normality: negative)
3. *With the wave of the hand, he made nonsense of the laws of the land and its dedicated wing of law enforcement* (attitude: judgment : social sanction : propriety: negative)
4. His statement and action was *an indictment* of the nation and its laws (attitude: judgment : social sanction : propriety: negative)

TEXT A2 from which examples 1- 4 above were drawn is a commentary on the attack of ODM leaders by a group of youth at a fund-raising in South Mugirango constituency on 22nd September, 2007. The fund-raising was presided over by Simeon Nyachae who was then a minister in government and a strong ally of the PNU party. From example 1, *the infamous promotion* (of warlike activities) noun phrase gives the minister and his associates a violent image. Due to the negative attribution, his side is viewed as unethical. It also lacks the social sanction value of propriety. It does not help matters that the minister is *unapologetic* (see example 2) over his remarks. By use of the adjective *unapologetic*, the minister, his party and the government they serve are lowered in social esteem. They are also found to be deficient in normality with respect to societal norms and expectations.

The compound sentence (in example 3) *with the wave of the hand, he made nonsense of the laws of the land, and its dedicated wing of law enforcement*, further earns the minister a negative portrayal. He disregards the law and could be punished for the offence. As

attested from example 4, his statement and action is an *indictment* of the nation and its laws. The minister is therefore in breach of social sanction values of propriety.

Text B1 and B2 present data collected from the two *Nation* newspaper editorials sampled from the 36 that commented on elections in 2007 general elections in Kenya. Judgment lexical items and sentences are the ones in italics. They illustrate how the political aspirants were described then.

From *The Nation*

TEXT B1

1. The ban and spectre of confrontation, in any case, only play directly into the hands of the opposition, for they will *grab* the opportunity to make the Government look bad without really trying hard (attitude: judgment : social sanction : propriety: negative)
2. Any ham-fisted attempts to bar opposition meetings for no good reason will be *seized* on with glee and *exploited* to the maximum political advantage (attitude: judgment : social sanction : propriety: negative)

TEXT B1 (examples 1 and 2) is a commentary on Nairobi City Council's plan to bar ODM party from holding a meeting at Uhuru Park³.

Example 1 projects the government as some kind of a victim of the opposition who is made to appear vindictive and opportunistic. The impression left with the reader is that the opposition has a tendency to *grab* opportunities so the government needs to be wary of it. Due to this negative attribution, the ODM party is in breach of social sanction values of propriety. A similar situation obtains in example 2 where the verbs *seized* and *exploited* are used to give the ODM party a negative reputation. By being opportunistic and acting in bad faith, the ODM is again in breach of the social sanction virtue of propriety. In this regard, the opposition falls out of favour with the reader.

TEXT B2

1. Such accusations have been made by *no less authority* than finance minister Amos Kimunya and the Nairobi Stock Exchange (NSE) chairman Jimnah Mbaru. (attitude: judgment : social esteem: capacity: positive)
2. *That Mr. Odinga felt it necessary to go to the market floor and explain himself is itself an indication that there is a very serious issue at hand* (attitude: judgment : social sanction : propriety: negative)
3. Yet he (Raila) is facing *some serious accusations* (attitude: judgment : social sanction : propriety: negative)

4. *Yesterday president Kibaki rose above the crowd when he declined to divide Nyanza into two* (attitude: judgment : social sanction : propriety: positive)
5. *But president Kibaki Must have seen through the veil and rejected the proposal* (attitude: judgment : social esteem : capacity: positive)
6. *Conversely, national leaders must guard against falling into the trap of short sighted politicians who make illogical demands on them* (attitude: judgment: social esteem: capacity: positive)

TEXT B2 (examples, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 and 6) dwelt on two issues. The first section comments on a visit to the Nairobi Stock Exchange (NSE) by Raila Odinga⁴ following claims made by then Finance Minister (Amos Kimunya) and Mr. Jimnah Mbaru (then Chairman of the Nairobi bourse) to the effect that fears of a Raila win was the reason for the dip in the Stock Exchange market. The second section is coverage of Mwai Kibaki's tour of Nyanza Province⁵ on 15th October, 2007.

From 1, the description of the Finance Minister, a PNU allied politician as *no less authority* should be sufficient proof to the reader that the claims made by him about NSE are true. The judgment packaged by the writer in the *no less authority* noun phrase bestows the positive virtues of high social esteem and capacity upon the Finance Minister. The reader could possibly get inclined towards the opinion that the Finance Minister holds with respect to the Stock Exchange claims.

By *explaining himself* at the market floor before investors (example 2), Raila is made to bear the guilt of what his win could cost the stock market. The writer's description of him also paints the picture of a person whose morality is questionable with respect to propriety. Social sanction therefore accords him a negative image before the reader.

In example 3, the noun phrase *some serious accusations* depicts Raila as one whose morality is in doubt and could therefore be in breach of social sanction values of propriety. This judgment puts him in bad stead in the eyes of the readers who would not wish to elect a leader who is facing serious accusations and whose morality is questionable.

By contrast, the complex sentence (see example 4) gives President Kibaki a positive judgment. Since he *rose above the crowd and declined to divide Nyanza*, he scores high in the social esteem value of capacity. Further, he is able to *see through evil* (example 5) and also resists *the trap of short sighted politicians who*

⁴ Raila Odinga was the presidential candidate for the ODM party in the 2007 general elections.

⁵ The ODM party for which Raila was candidate drew its largest support from Nyanza Province.

³ Uhuru Park is the largest public utility park in Nairobi City.

make illogical demands on him (example 6). These positive renditions by the writer have endeared to the reader to the disadvantage of the opposition.

CONCLUSION

On the basis of the data and the discussion above, it may be concluded that *The Standard* used more instances of the judgment sub-system to negatively describe PNU/government presidential aspirant and/or his associates. The *Daily Nation* on the other hand used judgment to assess PNU/government presidential aspirant and/or his associates positively and almost an equal number to assess ODM presidential aspirant and/or his associates negatively. Judgment was mainly expressed through adjectives and noun phrases. This illustrates that through negative or positive explicit and implicit judgmental words, phrases or sentences, a newspaper can attempt to position the readers towards the political ideological standing of the media group.

REFERENCES

Abuoga, J.B. & Mutere, A.A. (1988). *The History of the Press in Kenya, Africa Media Monograph series No.5*. Nairobi: The African Council on communication.

Altheide, L.D. (1996). *Qualitative Media Analysis: Qualitative Research Methods series 3*. London: Sage.

Butt, D., Fahey, R., Feez, S., Spinks, S., & Yallop, C. (2000). *Using Functional Grammar: An Explorer's Guide*. Sydney: National Centre for English Language Teaching and Research.

Coffin, C. (1998). *The Voices of History: Theorizing the Interpersonal Semantics of Historical Discourse*. Paper presented at the 10th Euro-International Systemic Functional Workshop, July 1998, Liverpool.

Hope, D. & Read, J. (2006). *Appraisal: The Language of Emotions, Ethics and Aesthetics*. <http://www.cogs.susex.ac.uk/users/jlr2/presentations/appraisaltheory.ppt>. (Retrieved on 19 November 2008).

Ingutia, A.A. (2012) *Lexico-grammatical Analysis of Newspaper Editorials in the run-up to the 2007 General Elections in Kenya: Perception and Attitude in the Standard and Daily Nation*, Unpublished Research Thesis, Maseno University, Kenya.

Karanja, M. (2000). Growth of Print Media in Kenya. In: E. Kamweru and M. Odero (eds) *Media Culture and Performance in Kenya*. Nairobi: East African Media Institute Kenya Chapter and Friedrich Ebert Stiftung, 27-39.

Martin, J.R. (1997) Analysing Genre: Functional Parameters. In Christine F. & Martin, J.R. (eds) *Genre and Institutions: Social Processes in the Workplace and School*. London: Cassell, p3-39.

Martin, J.R. (2004). Mourning: How we Get Aligned. In *Discourse and Society* 15(2-3): 321-344.

Morrish, J. (1986). *Magazine Editing*. Iowa: WC Brown.

Mute, M.L. (2000). Media Policy in Kenya. In: E. Kamweru and M. Odero.2000. (eds) *Media Culture and Performance*. Nairobi: East Africa Media Institute Kenya Chapter and Friedrich Ebert Stiftung, 141-156.

Newsom, D. & Wollert, J.A. (1988). *Media Writing: Preparing Information for the Mass Media*. Belmont: Wadsworth Publishing Company.

Ochieng', P. (1992). *I Accuse the Press*. Nairobi: Initiative Publishers.

Pennock, B. & Pennock, B.F. (2000). *Genre Approach to Re-entry Patterns in Editorials*. Universitat de Valencia.

Thompson, S. & de Klerk, V. (2002). *Dear Readers: A Textual Analysis of Magazine Editorials*.

To Press for Freedom. (2009, January 4). *Sunday Nation*, p5

Wanyande, P. (1995). Mass Media-State Relations in Post-colonial Kenya. *Africa Media Review* 9(13), 54-75.

Westin, I. (2002). *Language Change in English Newspaper Editorials*. Amsterdam: Rodopi.

White, P.R.R. (1997). *The Grammar of Fact and Opinion: Authorial Stance and the Construction of Media Objectivity*. Paper presented at the 24th International Systemic Functional Conference, Toronto.

White, P.R.R. (2005). *The Language of Attitude, Arguability and Interpersonal Positioning*. <http://www.grammatics.com/Appraisal/AppraisalGuide/Framed/Appraisal> (Retrieved on 31 October 2008).