

# CHAPTER 1

## INTRODUCTION

This is an analytical and descriptive linguistic study on pragmatic interpretation of selected political utterances on hate speech in Kenya. This chapter contains background information upon which the study is anchored. It further exposes the problem under investigation; objectives of the study; research questions guiding the study; the scope and significance of the study and the theoretical framework.

### **1.1 Background to the study**

This study is motivated by the raging debate between the speaker and the hearer of political utterances on mutually acceptable interpretations of meaning in political utterances on hate speech in Kenya. This debate between the speaker and hearer of political utterances on hate speech reflects a variance on interpretation of meaning in political utterances on hate speech. This study sheds light on this variance by offering a pragmatic interpretation of political utterances on hate speech in Kenya.

#### **1.1.1 The domain of the study**

Pragmatics is a subfield of linguistics concerned with the study of intended speaker meaning (Yule, 1996). It is the study of invisible meaning or how we recognise what is meant even when it is not actually said (or written). For this to happen, the speaker or writer must be able to depend on a lot of shared assumptions and expectations. An investigation of these assumptions and expectations provides us with some insights into how more information gets communicated than is said. According to Jaszczolt (2002), pragmatics is the study of how hearers add contextual information to the semantic structure of a linguistic expression and how they draw inferences from what a speaker has said. Indede (2003) looks at pragmatics as a discipline that is

concerned with the meaning of the utterance, how what is said was meant by the speaker, and how the utterance is to be interpreted by the audience. Fromkin, Rodman & Hyams (2007) precisely explain that pragmatics is the linguistic study of how context affects meaning. Bublitz & Norrick (2011) add that pragmatics can be understood as the systematic investigation of what and how people mean when they use language as a vehicle of action in a particular context and with a particular goal in mind. These definitions imply the context-dependency of utterance meaning as a central component of pragmatics and they capture the subject matter of this study. Xu (2013) appears to consolidate the above varied definitions by observing that pragmatics is the study of the context-dependent aspects of utterance interpretation. The goal of pragmatics is to show how linguistic meaning interacts with contextual assumptions during utterance comprehension. In what sounds like giving justification for this study, Xu (2013) goes further to say that in order to achieve the goal of pragmatics, researchers or linguists must not only deepen their theoretical understanding of pragmatics, but need to carry out detailed investigations of utterance interpretation in a wide variety of communication and contexts. It is within this perspective that this study has carried out a pragmatic interpretation of political utterances on hate speech in Kenya.

Hurford & Heasley (1983) state that the context of an utterance is a small sub-part of the universe of discourse that is shared by a speaker and a hearer. In this sense, context includes facts about the topic of the conversation in which the utterance occurs, and also facts about the situation in which the conversation itself takes place. Levinson (1983) says that context is understood to cover several aspects: the identities of participants (as interlocutors), the temporal and spatial parameters of the speech event, and the beliefs, knowledge and intentions of the participants in that speech event. This study looks at these aspects of context identified by

Levinson (1983) as cognitive aspects of utterance (existing in the mind of the interlocutors) and which can be established from through pragmatic interpretation of the linguistic context of an utterance.

Wilson & Sperber (1995) claim that the contexts of an utterance are not established independently of the comprehension process (going on in the mind of the hearer). The contexts of an utterance are retrieved guided by the constructed assumptions during the interpretation process and they will include both linguistically and extra-linguistically driven contexts. The interpretation of an utterance in a communicative process is based on the shared knowledge of the interlocutors as the contexts of the utterance. Wilson & Sperber (1995) conclude that, in Relevance Theory, the notion of context of an utterance is “a psychological construct, a subset of the hearer’s assumptions about the world; more especially it is the set of premises used in interpreting that utterance” (Sperber & Wilson,1995, p.15).

Yule (1996) agrees with Sperber & Wilson (1995) by identifying two types of contexts: a linguistic context which is the co-text of the linguistic expression, and a physical context which constitutes time and place in which the linguistic expression has been used. Whereas this study appreciates that a richer pragmatic interpretation of utterance can be arrived at through analysis of both linguistic and physical contexts of an utterance, the study holds that it is possible to pragmatically interpret an utterance by focusing on linguistic context alone. This is because an utterance as a linguistic unit largely relies on its linguistic context for speaker intended meaning; with the physical contexts providing avenues for an enhanced interpretation. The foregoing argument finds justification in Cruise (2000) who adds that the context of an utterance, in inferential pragmatics, constitutes a set of assumptions which yield adequate contextual effects.

Pearson, Nelson, Titsworth & Harter (2003) further adds that context of an utterance is a set of circumstances or a situation in which communication occurs.

This study takes into account interpretations of context as cited above in Hurford & Heasley (1983), Wilson & Sperber (1995), Cruise (2000) and Pearson et al. (2003) as premises used by the hearer in the interpretation of utterance. However, the study goes further to argue that context of utterance also includes assumptions or premises used in encoding speaker meaning in the utterance. Premises existing in the speaker's mind such as historical facts and some other premises intentionally constructed by the speaker to manipulate the context of the utterance such as metaphors and allegories constitute the context of utterance which the hearer needs to exploit in the interpretation of utterance meaning. This interpretation of context by this study is in line with Xu (2013) who explains that context does not only refer to people's assumptions about the world or cognitive environment, but also includes any phenomenon that can enter the mind of the communicators. The notion of context also includes the text surrounding an utterance, which has sometimes been called co-text. Xu (2013) further explains that to interpret the meaning of an utterance, communicators need to form a context accordingly with information they selected. The selection of information is what communicators need to do because they must exclude some information to ensure the least consumption of the processing effort.

This study therefore concludes that context of an utterance constitutes the whole range of information and set of assumptions accompanying the utterance and which interlocutors hold in their mind at the time of the utterance and which are relevant in the construction of meaning in the utterance. As Xu (2013) observes, the context of an utterance is not fixed, but selected, constructed and needs to be supplemented and extended in some cases. The only thing given is relevance; communicators usually first assume that the utterance being processed is relevant to

them before trying to form a context where the interpretation can be achieved. As such, this study interprets political utterances on hate speech as speech events which are relevant to the hearer and whose propositional content is highly dependent on context.

Yule (1996) identifies conversational interactions as a key feature of most speech events and cites Grice (1975) as having developed the Co-operative Principle which attempts to account for conversational exchange between speakers. It is upon the assumptions of the Co-operative Principle (Grice, 1975) that the Relevance Theory by Sperber & Wilson (1986) and its later version by Wilson & Sperber (2004) seem to have been developed to advance some pragmatic understanding of utterance meaning.

According to Wilson & Sperber (2004), there are two models of communication: code model of communication and inferential model of communication. In the code model of communication, the communicator encodes his/her intended message into a signal, which is decoded by the audience using an identical copy of the code. On the other hand, a communicator using the inferential model of communication provides evidence of his/her intention to convey a certain meaning, which is inferred by the audience on the basis of the evidence provided. Wilson & Sperber (2004) assert that both the code model and inferential model of communication are useful in understanding utterance meaning. An utterance is a linguistically coded piece of evidence, but the decoded linguistic meaning is just one of the inputs to a non-demonstrative inference process which yields an interpretation of speaker's meaning. Thus Wilson & Sperber (2004) place the process of interpreting utterance meaning within inferential pragmatics; whose goal is to explain how hearers infer speaker meaning of utterance on the basis of the evidence provided. This discussion now helps to focus the domain of this study: an interpretation of meaning in political utterances on hate speech on the basis of the evidence provided by the

speaker as a context of the utterance. This study, therefore, falls within inferential pragmatics given that political utterances are linguistic expressions in social context.

One important aspect of language in social context is speech which manifests itself as verbal communication. Gregersen (1977) observes that language basically involves vocal communication, and that such devices as writing systems, sign language, and the like only play a complementary role within linguistics as alternative modes of communication. Hudson (1996) argues that speech is a social behaviour and has a social function; both as a means of communication and as a way of identifying social groups. This study looks at politicians as a social group that is identifiable with certain linguistic behaviour evident in their use of speech. Politicians, as a social group within society, use speech which constitutes utterances so as to realise specific social functions related to the play of power and influence in society.

The intention of a speaker, and in this case political speakers, in making utterances at a political rally is to communicate certain messages with the hearer. Political speakers have a goal to fulfil through political utterances as linguistic units containing intended speaker meaning or propositions. Therefore an utterance requires context-dependent interpretation of meaning to establish the intended speaker meaning(s). The context dimension in utterance interpretation easily results into multiple meanings of the utterance which characterise speaker-hearer variance on the mutually acceptable interpretation of an utterance. It is against this background that this study looks at how political utterances on hate speech in Kenya interact with context in the interpretation of the possible intended speaker meaning(s) containing hate speech connotations. This study argues that the variance between the speaker of political utterances on hate speech and the hearer is not due to misinterpretation of the utterances but due to the ability of the utterances to generate multiple pragmatic interpretations influenced by certain linguistic

strategies used by the speaker in encoding utterance mean. The linguistic strategies used in these utterances are strongly hinged on the context of the utterance which advances the intention of the speaker.

### **1.1.2 Language and politics in Kenya**

Language and politics are two social activities that are inextricably interwoven in the sense that politics is realized through language. According to Ramney (1996), politics is an engagement that focuses on acquisition and control of power and it employs several tactics such as lobbying, working inside political parties and mass propaganda. Such tactics are made functional by use of language in one way or another, for instance, mass propaganda is aimed at cultivating mass public opinion through public relation operations such as public rallies, mass media and banners. In reinforcing the relationship between language and politics, Habwe (1999) notes that politics has had an overwhelming importance in people's lives and it relates with people directly and immediately while displaying a complex language matrix on which politicians depend for persuading, commanding, threatening, bargaining, reassuring, imposing and reasoning. Wilson (2008) reaffirms that language is the prime vehicle for politics to the extent that politics cannot exist without language. Sperber & Wilson (1986), Habwe (1999), Wodak (2007), Wilson (2008) and Bayram (2010) describe the language of politics as political discourse. This study is interested in political utterances on hate speech which form part of political discourse.

The operation of language within social groupings, such as the one constituting politicians, results into context-dependent discourses (Wodak, 2007) such as political discourse. Such context-dependent discourses develop ideologies which are reflected in a social-group's perceptions, argument patterns and impact on their listeners, viewers and readers (Eagleton,

2000). In the context of this study, politicians in Kenya constitute a social group which displays a context-dependent discourse described as political utterances in this study.

As observed by Birner (2013), utterances are context-dependent units of speech operating within a linguistic and physical context. Birner (2013) further explains that, as a feature of utterances, an utterance will mean different things in different contexts, and will even mean different things to different people. The context-dependency feature of utterances explains why this study focused on political utterances rendered at political rallies so as to restrict the context of the utterances under investigation in this study. The context-dependent dimension of utterances partly accounts for the choice by this study to apply Relevance Theory by Sperber & Wilson (1986; 1995) and Wilson & Sperber (2004) in the interpretation and analysis of data of political utterances.

In Kenya, it is in the public domain that political utterances, and therefore political discourses, are used to incite and provoke people into acts which propagate either hatred or love in the community. This has resulted into attempts by Kenyans to classify the language of politicians into hate speech and, by insinuation, 'love speech'. To curb the perceived negative effects of hate speech on the Kenyan people, the Kenya government has enacted legislations to provide a legal framework on how to deal with peddlers of hate speech. In his preface to a paper by The Kenya National Cohesion and Integration Commission (NCIC) (2010) on 'Guidelines for monitoring hate speech in Kenya', Dr. Mzalendo Kibunjia observes that:

“...Following the national widespread violence of 2008, Kenya realized the danger she faces in becoming a failed democracy through ethnic hatred and it is in this backdrop that the National Cohesion and Integration Act addresses negative ethnicity and criminalizes hate speech...” (p.3)



The creation of NCIC and the enactment of legislations to tame peddling of hate speech have partly led to politicians denying interpretations given to their utterances especially when the interpretations are not in agreement with the law or threaten the politician's political fortunes. These denials by politicians of some utterance interpretations has sparked a debate on mutually acceptable interpretations of political utterances especially those deemed to contain hate speech messages. It is within the context of this debate that this study sought to investigate how context is utilized in encoding and decoding of meaning in political utterances on hate speech in Kenya.

The notion of hate speech and the concerns over it are a global issue. According to walker (1994), the concept of hate speech dates back to 1920s and it emerged in America from the use of words such as 'nigger', 'wop', 'mick' and 'spic'. These are words which carry the baggage of centuries of racism degenerating into hate; words which are often aimed at people like bullets. Perlmutter (1999) has described hate speech as speech which consists of verbal and non-verbal expressions that demean, oppress or promote violence against someone on the basis of their membership in a social or ethnic group. Odongo (2010) observes that unlike in the instances of most internationally recognized offences, there is no universally agreed definition of what the term hate speech means. However, she says that hate speech refers to words of incitement and hatred against individuals based on certain group characteristics they share. It includes speech that advocates or encourages violent acts against a specific group and creates a climate of hate or prejudice which may in turn foster the commission of hate crimes. In a paper on 'Guidelines for Monitoring Hate Speech in Kenya', The National Cohesion and Integration Commission (NCIC) (2010) observes that hate speech is a term which refers to a whole spectrum of negative discourse, stretching from hate or prejudice and incitement to hatred. Hate speech is designed to degrade, intimidate, or incite violence or prejudicial action against a person or group of people

based on their race, ethnicity, nationality, religion, language ability, or appearance (such as height, weight, and hair color). Although hate speech, as described above, is termed as “speech”, NCIC notes that hate speech covers not only oral or written communication but also any other form of expression such as movies, arts and gestures (symbolic speech). In hate speech, words are not merely “only words”, but “words that wound” which lead to harm and violence.

This study has adopted the above definitions of hate speech and looks at hate speech as any form of manipulative expressions with offensive messages that are:

- i. Created by people who are part of one group and are directed towards people who are not part of their group.
- ii. Designed to degrade, discriminate against or otherwise harm the target for some reason.
- iii. Designed to advocate or encourage violent acts against a specific person or group of people and creates a climate of hate or prejudice against the target.

In Kenya, according to Kenya National Commission on Human Rights (KNCHR), the 2005 National Referendum was characterized by deception, chauvinism and hate speech which enhanced feelings of ethnic hatred among Kenyans. The concept of hate speech then started receiving some attention from the Kenyan people and focus on it became more pronounced after the 2007/2008 Post-Election Violence (PEV) in Kenya. One of the speculated causes for the PEV in Kenya was perpetuation of hate speech by members of the political class. A report on the monitoring of the 2007 elections also revealed that the campaigns were riddled with political propaganda and hate speech (NCIC, 2010). The manner in which politicians handled campaigns contributed to the climate of heightened ethnic hatred that resulted into the infamous 2007/2008 Post-Election Violence in Kenya.

The preceding lines of thought resulted into the enactment of legislation to try and restrain the spread of hate speech. The Constitution of Kenya (Revised Edition, 2010) Article 33 provides a clause to limit freedom of expression and states that:

“The right to freedom of expression does not extend to

- a. Propaganda for war
- b. Incitement to violence
- c. Hate speech or
- d. Advocacy of hatred that:
  - i. Constitutes ethnic incitement, vilification of others or incitement to cause harm; or
  - ii. Is based on any ground of discrimination specified in article 27 (4):  
The state shall not discriminate directly or indirectly against any person on any ground including race, sex, pregnancy, marital status, health status, ethnic or social origin, color, age, disability, religion, conscience, belief, culture, dress, language or birth.” (The Constitution of Kenya, 2010, p.26)

The National Cohesion and Integration Act, Section 13, interprets Article 33 of The Constitution of Kenya (2010) by setting a threshold for hate speech that is underlined by proof that the speech or expression on hate is one that threatens, abuses or insults others based on their ethnicity, and must be backed up by intention to stir up ethnic hatred, hostility or violence.

The foregoing discussion is important to this study since it enabled the study to understand what hate speech is perceived to mean. The discussion further provided necessary background

information on why hate speech as a genre within political discourse in Kenya has come to attract a lot of attention worth being studied. The legal attachments on it help to justify why politicians in Kenya frequently deny some interpretations of meaning given to political utterances they make resulting into the debate on the mutually acceptable interpretations of the utterances on hate speech.

This study was motivated by this linguistic scenario in the Kenyan political scene to establish certain linguistic realities about the nature of political utterances on hate speech in Kenya. The objects of analysis for the study were utterances as units of communication in political discourse between the politicians as speakers and members of the public as hearers of political discourse in Kenya. The study identified political utterances containing hate speech propositions and analysed them to how speakers utilized context to enhance relevance of the utterance. The study further sought to establish linguistic strategies used encoding utterance meaning and the ostensive stimuli used to direct the hearer on the possible speaker meaning in the utterance.

The following discussion on the notion of utterance has assisted the study to understand what an utterance is as the unit of communication whose meanings are high context-dependent and as such politicians in Kenya find it easy to deny some of the interpretations.

### **1.1.3 The notion of utterance**

The notion of utterance is rather elusive. Brown & Yule (1983) make a distinction between utterance and sentence. They hold that utterance is segment of spoken language while sentence is a unit of written language. Thus, in comparison with sentence, utterance is much more flexible, it can be a word, a phrase, a sentence or a set of sentences and transforms a valuable communicative meaning in ordinary language-behavior. Levinson (1983) describes utterance as

the issuance of a sentence, a sentence analogue, or sentence fragment, in an actual context. Utterance is a unit of speech upon which aspects of context play a very important role in its production and interpretation. However, Bakhtin's (1986a) theory of utterance highlights properties of utterance that can be used as guidelines in determining the nature of utterance. The theory spells out that an utterance is a response to a previous utterance. According to Bakhtin (1986b), actual utterances must take into account the already linguistically shaped context into which they exist. Characteristically, any concrete utterance is a link in the chain of speech communication. The very boundaries of the utterance are determined by a change of speech subjects. Utterances are not indifferent to one another, and are not self-sufficient; they are aware of and mutually reflect one another.

Sperber & Wilson (1986) and Blass (1990) support Bakhtin (1986a) by observing that an utterance exists within a linguistic context of other utterances. Therefore, every utterance must be regarded as primarily a response to preceding utterances and that each utterance refutes, affirms, supplements, and relies upon the others, presupposes them to be known, and somehow takes them into account. In other words, an utterance has at least these two properties: boundaries, and responsivity or dialogicality (Bakhtin, 1986a).

The other property that an utterance must have according to Bakhtin's (1986a) theory of utterance is finalization. That is, whenever there is change of speaking subject to mark the end of a speaker's utterance, this end is realized because the speaker has said everything he/she wishes to say at a particular moment or under particular circumstances. When listening to a speaker, listeners clearly sense the end of the utterance, as if they hear the speaker's concluding signal. This is an inherent property of utterance described by Bakhtin (1986a) as finalization. This

property of utterance is useful to this study in identifying units of utterances when listening to recorded tapes of political speeches.

The fourth property of an utterance is generic form. Bakhtin's (1986a) theory of utterance says that the choice of speech genre is determined by the specific nature of the given sphere of speech communication, semantic (thematic) considerations, the concrete situation of the speech communication, the personal composition of its participants among other related factors. It is in the understanding of this property of utterance that this study classifies the object of investigation as political utterances. Eugene (2004) supports Bakhtin (1986a) by observing that the notion of utterance does not have a precise linguistic definition but says that phonetically an utterance is a unit of speech bounded by silence. Eugene (2004) goes further to elaborate that an utterance is a natural unit of speech bounded by breaths or pauses. In dialogue, each turn by a speaker may be considered an utterance. Therefore Bakhtin's (1986a) theory of utterance and assertions by Eugene (2004) provided critical linguistic guidelines that enabled this study to understand the nature of utterance leading to identification of political utterance on hate speech as an object of investigation in this study.

Guided by the notions of Bakhtin (1986a) and Eugene (2004), utterances can be identified as units within which messages are encoded. Therefore political speeches at political rallies contain utterances that carry political messages from politicians. This study therefore sought to account for the variance between speaker's and hearer's interpretation of political utterances on hate speech in Kenya. Thus, when politicians in Kenya deny interpretations given to their political speeches that lean towards hate speech, in reality, what is denied is the utterance which contained the hate speech message. Whereas the data that was collected in this study constituted a body of utterances, what was finally subjected to analysis on paper were sentence-like

structures as transcribed form of the utterances. It is therefore important to establish the relationship between utterance, sentence and proposition.

Potts (2005) attempts to draw a distinction between utterances, sentences and propositions. An utterance is a physical event, located in space and time. The occurrence of an utterance involves two participants; an agent who produces a linguistic object and that linguistic object itself. Potts (2005) describes a sentence as some abstract entity produced by the grammar of a language while a proposition is basically some sort of idea that can be specified with language. Potts (2005) goes further and adds that a single sentence as a grammatical entity can be used in multiple utterances because utterances are rendered within specific occasions each occurring within a unique set of space and time (what Sperber & Wilson (1986) and Blass (1990) describe as physical context of an utterance). For instance, the sentence [I want you to come here] can be used in multiple utterances depending on where the speaker is and on who and where the addressee is. Similarly, as noted by Potts (2005), a single utterance can contain multiple sentences. The utterance “I like him: he’s nice” contains the sentences [I like him] and [he’s nice].

In drawing a relationship between utterance and proposition, Potts (2005) says a given proposition can be expressed in multiple utterances. For instance, the proposition *Peter fooled all of you!* can be expressed by the utterances “Peter fooled all of you!” or “I fooled all of you” (spoken by Peter). Similarly, a single utterance can correspond to more than one proposition. For instance the utterance “It’s cold in here” corresponds to both propositions *It’s cold in here* and *Someone should close the window*. In the understanding of this study, Potts’ ideas on an utterance, its proposition(s) and its syntactic representation(s) are important to this study

especially in making clear the units of analysis of political utterances from a pragmatic perspective. From this discussion, it is clear that utterances are verbal entities which are perceived as sentence-like structures. Thus after an utterance has been rendered by a speaker what exists thereafter is its representation in form of a sentence-like structure which can have multiple meanings. This discussion reveals the fluid nature of utterance; that an utterance is such a fluid verbal linguistic unit with multiple pragmatic interpretations that a speaker can easily deny some interpretations. Therefore the preceding discussion enables us conceptualize the research problem in this study. The denial of one utterance meaning while accepting a different interpretation has characterized political discourse in Kenya resulting into the debate on the mutually acceptable interpretation of political utterance on hate speech as a context-dependent linguistic unit of communication.

## **1.2 Statement of the problem**

Utterances as units of communication in verbal renditions are emitted by a speaker in a communication process as concrete and natural units of speech and directed to a hearer as the recipient of the linguistic item. They are context-dependent linguistic units of communication which refutes, affirms or supplements, and relies upon other utterances, presupposes them to be known, and somehow takes them into account. As speech events, utterances are thematic in nature resulting into classification of utterances into genres such as political, romantic, prophetic and military. In Kenya, political utterances have attracted a lot of attention from the media, government and general public due to their perceived negative perlocutionary effect on the hearer. A trend has emerged where some of the interpretations of meaning given to political utterances by hearers are often denied by politicians especially when the interpretations of the political utterances by the hearer are incongruent with the law, lean towards hate speech or



endanger the politician's fortunes. This scenario reflects a variance between the hearer's and speaker's interpretation of intended speaker meaning in political utterances and, in particular, those containing hate speech messages. This variance has not been sufficiently accounted for thereby creating a knowledge gap. This study sought to account for the variance between the speaker's and the hearer's interpretation of meaning in political utterances by carrying out a pragmatic interpretation of selected political utterances on hate speech in Kenya. Political utterances on hate speech were preferred in this study because such utterances are more prone to misinterpretations than utterances in other genres given their fluidity in eliciting multiple pragmatic interpretations.

### **1.3 Research questions**

- i. How do politicians manipulate context so as to conform to hearer's expectation of relevance when encoding hate speech messages in political utterances?
- ii. What linguistic strategies do politicians use in making utterances containing hate speech utterances?
- iii. How do these linguistic strategies obscure meaning in political utterances with hate speech messages?
- iv. What kind of ostensive stimuli do politicians use to focus the hearer on the possible intended speaker meaning in political utterances on hate speech?

### **1.4 Objectives of the study**

The study sought to carry out a pragmatic interpretation of selected political utterances on hate speech in Kenya. The following objectives guided this study in carrying out the analysis:

- i. To establish how political speakers manipulate context to conform to hearer's expectation of relevance when encoding hate speech messages in political utterances.

- ii. To establish the linguistic strategies that politicians use when making utterances containing hate speech messages.
- iii. To describe how linguistic strategies are used by politicians to obscure meaning in political utterances containing hate speech messages.
- iv. To determine the kind of ostensive stimuli that politicians use to focus the hearer on the possible intended speaker meaning in the political utterances on hate speech.

### **1.5 Scope of the study**

Linguistics as a field of knowledge has several sub-fields within which the structure of a language can be studied. This study falls largely within the sub-field of pragmatics which interprets meaning of a linguistic unit with regard to the context in which it exists. In the process of analysing data of political utterances on hate speech, the study makes recourse to other levels of language analysis only when such analysis enhances pragmatic understanding of the language structure in focus. In this approach, the study investigated language use beyond sentential confines by considering the context of language use and rules of interpretation.

There are two sets of context that can affect the meaning of an utterance: linguistic context and physical context. This study analysed political utterances on hate speech as linguistic forms identifiable as units of communication existing within a linguistic context. It is because of the study's focus on interpretation of how linguistic context affects meaning of political utterances on hate speech that the study chose to apply guidelines contained in Relevance Theory by Dan Sperber and Deirdre Wilson.

There are different types of discourses such as medical, legal and educational discourses (Van Dijk, 1997) alongside political discourse. Within political discourse, politicians have several media in which they can encode political messages such as written, oral, visual and electronic

media among others (Habwe, 1999). Oral medium of communication involves use of verbal linguistic signals which are perceived as utterances. The study specifically analyses utterances on hate speech in political speeches as a form of political discourse between politicians (as speakers) and members of the public (as hearers) during the official pre-election campaign period for the March 2013 General Elections in Kenya. The data of political utterances used in this study was extracted from oral political speeches rendered during political campaign rallies.

Kenya is a multilingual state with over forty two local languages spoken in addition to the two national languages, English and Kiswahili and other foreign languages (Were, 1969; Itebete, 1974; Makila, 1978). Speakers at political rallies have the latitude to decide on the language to use depending on the kind of audience they are addressing. This study was only interested in political utterances on hate speech in speeches delivered in either of the two national languages in Kenya; English and Kiswahili. This is because most of the audiences to political messages are multi-ethnic and therefore political speakers usually prefer to use either or both of these two national languages so as to cut across the different speech communities.

In the Kenyan case, political rallies do not have a specific time of the year when they can be held. With legal notifications to the agents of law and order, such rallies can be held whenever politicians find it necessary to do so depending on the political agenda at hand. However, this study was interested in collecting corpora of utterances on hate speech spoken by politicians in Kenya during the official pre-election campaign period for the March, 2013 general elections in Kenya. This period was preferred for the study because, as it has been during past general elections, politicians were expected to be in numerous political activities culminating into a series of political rallies across the country with a view of endearing themselves to members of the public so as to win the general elections. Given the new constitutional dispensation in Kenya

heralding a new system of central and devolved governments, this period of time was expected to present a unique context in terms of political environment. This also explains why one of the objectives of the study was to find out how politicians utilise context to encode messages with hate speech undertones in their utterances.

### **1.6 Limitations of the study**

The study investigated political utterances on hate speech as units of communication to provide a linguistic account on the variance between speaker's and hearer's interpretation of meaning in political utterances on hate speech in Kenya. The data that was analysed in this study was extracted from media-recorded political speeches that were rendered during the official pre-election campaign period to the 2013 General Elections in Kenya. A comprehensive interpretation of any utterance as a unit of communication requires both the physical and linguistic context of the utterance. A major limitation to this study was due to the fact that the utterances that constituted study corpus were not captured within their actual physical environment in which they were rendered given that the utterances were extracted from recorded texts at the media houses. However, this discrepancy was minimized by restricting the study to the analysis of political utterances as linguistic forms existing within their linguistic environment. Further, the study maintained a common political environment of election campaigns for the 2013 General Election in Kenya. The study assumed that having election campaign-mood as a common political environment served as a common extra-linguistic context that constrained the intention, goal and propositional content of the utterances made by politicians.

## **1.7 Significance of the study**

This study is an approach to studying language as a system that performs communicative function in society; what Stacks & Hocking (1999) refer to as communication research. A communication research investigates new things about communication and it operates from the premise that in order for one to be a good consumer of knowledge, one needs to know how that knowledge was generated. To investigate new things about communication involves investigating issues on language use as a medium of communication. As a communication research, this study analyses political utterances as linguistic context-dependent units of communication. The study is therefore significant since it generates knowledge on pragmatic interpretation of political utterances on hate speech showing how linguistic context and linguistic strategies are utilized in encoding and decoding of hate messages in these utterances. The study further reveals how linguistic strategies result into multiple pragmatic interpretations of the utterances as the underlying factor behind the debate on the mutually acceptable interpretation of political utterances on hate speech in Kenya.

In the Kenyan case, hate speech has attracted a lot of interest from members of government, the legal fraternity, politicians and members of the civil society. This study is significant since its findings will inform people on certain realities regarding the structure of hate speech language and how politicians encode hate messages in their utterances. As captured in a paper on ‘Monitoring Hate Speech in Kenya’ (2010), The Kenya National Cohesion and Integration Commission (NCIC) notes that the greatest problem with combating hate speech is not the law, which is quite sufficient but its observance and application by the organs. Therefore, the inability to effectively combat hate speech mongering by relevant authorities in Kenya is caused partly by the lack of sound and evidence-based linguistic knowledge on the analysis of utterances on hate

speech. This study is therefore important since it provides highlights on a linguistic approach on the interpretation of political utterances on hate speech. The findings in this study will inform the organs of government and other interested parties on providing empirical evidence-based argument to prosecute hate-speech mongers.

Language as a medium of communication is central in human life. Habwe (1999) observes that language use shapes personality and has created icons such as Mahatma Gandhi and Dr. Martin Luther King Junior. In addition, language use creates social classes in society resulting into linguistic genres such as political discourse and police discourse among others. In political discourse, Wodak (2007) cites Anton Pelinka as having noted that human life is potentially political and that language is an indicator of social and political situation; it is an in-put and as well as out-put factor of political systems; it is an instrument for or against enlightenment, emancipation, democracy and human rights. Therefore, the centrality of language in human life is motivation enough for such a study to establish certain realities on how language operates in society. The study provides an alternative dimension of understanding the nature of a Kenyan politician from a linguistic perspective.

Politics is of central importance to humans and dictates how societies design their whole life. Characteristically, man is a political animal (Habwe, 1999). At the centre of political activities is language as one of the tools man uses in the struggles to win power and exercise control over fellow men. Bayram (2010) observes that in political processes, language plays a crucial role; for every political action is prepared, accompanied, influenced and played by language. Bayram's assertions in themselves reveal the importance of language not only in politics but in human activities in general. In Kenya, language of politics has been perceived as a powerful tool of influencing how people react to their immediate world. However, what still needs elaborate

explanation are the different assumptions people hold regarding hate speech utterances by politicians in Kenya. This study finds it significant enough to shed light on hate speech utterances by politicians in Kenya for the benefit of those interested in utterances as a political discourse in Kenya.

### **1.8 Theoretical framework**

This study was guided by principles and guidelines contained in Relevance Theory advanced by Deirdre Wilson and Dan Sperber on how to understand and analyse utterances. According to Wilson & Sperber (2004), Relevance Theory may be seen as an attempt to improve on one of Grice's central claims: that an essential feature of most human communication, both verbal and non-verbal, is the expression and recognition of intentions (Grice, 1989). In developing this claim, Grice laid the foundations for an inferential model of communication which has formed the basis for Relevance Theory.

Relevance Theory has been developed in several stages. The initial version of Relevance Theory is spelt out in Sperber & Wilson (1986) and later expounded in Sperber & Wilson (1995) and in Wilson & Sperber (2004). Relevance Theory is a cognitive-pragmatic communication model for interpreting and understanding utterances. It is an inferential approach to pragmatics that is based on the concept of relevance in life. In inferential pragmatics, the analyst seeks to explain how the hearer infers the speaker's meaning on the basis of the evidence provided. The hearer searches for the speaker's meaning by looking for relevance in the speaker's utterance using the available contextual information as evidence.

The theory proposes that understanding and comprehension are directed and channelled by the innate principle of relevance. Sperber & Wilson (1986;1995) and Wilson & Sperber (2004) argue

that humans tend to pay attention to what is relevant to them and that humans form the most relevant possible representations of phenomena and process them in a context that maximises their relevance. The principle of relevance works like a filter in the mind of the communicators so that only the information that is selected by that principle leads to understanding of the meaning of the utterance. It is on the basis of this general principle of relevance that this study sought to find out how politicians conform to the hearers expectation of relevance when making political utterances. The principle implies that utterances which hearers do not find relevant to them are not processed for meaning in their mind. Relevance Theory operates on three tenets which include the notion of context, the principle of relevance for communication and the comprehension procedure of Relevance Theory:

a) The notion of context

The search for relevance in an utterance is a psychological process guided by the mental context of the communicators. Sperber & Wilson (1995:15) define context as a psychological construct and a subset of the hearer's assumptions about the world. Schroder (2008) simplifies this as referring to some kind of encyclopaedia about the world which contains the values and norms of a society, personal belief system and cultural norms. Context constitutes all the knowledge that the communicators will have stored in their mind at the time they enter a conversation. Context plays a key role in the interpretation of utterances. There are two kinds of contexts relevant for the interpretation of speech event: the linguistic context and the situational or physical context. Blass (1990) describes a linguistic context as including linguistic information that precedes the speech event while the situational context includes virtually everything non-linguistic in the environment of the speaker. The notion of context as described in Relevance Theory provides important guidelines for understanding the context of an utterance. This study sought to find out



how politicians in Kenya utilize the context of an utterance to encode hate speech messages at political rallies while at the same time fulfilling the principle of relevance.

b) The principle of relevance for communication

According to Relevance Theory, utterances raise expectations of relevance because the search for relevance is a basic feature of human cognition, which communicators may exploit. Intuitively, an input such as a sight, a sound, an utterance or a memory is relevant to an individual when it connects with background information (linguistic context) he has available to yield conclusions that matter to him: say, by answering a question he had in mind, improving his knowledge on a certain topic, settling a doubt, confirming a suspicion, or correcting a mistaken impression. This principle of Relevance Theory has guided the study in interpreting political utterances by politicians in Kenya to establish how the utterances on hate speech conform to the hearer's expectation of relevance. An utterance that is relevant to the hearer is one that produces contextual implications such as settling a doubt in the mind of hearer.

Wilson & Sperber (2004:612) provide the following principle of relevance as being the basis for Relevance Theory as a theory of inferential communication:

“Every act of ostensive communication communicates the presumption of its own optimal relevance.”

This means that by saying something in the normal course of human interaction, one is telling the hearer not only that he/she thinks that what is being said is worth the time and effort the hearer will take to process it, but also that no more easily processed utterance would give the same result (utterance meaning). Thus, the principle of relevance for communication operates on the basis of cost and benefit in the mind of the communicators and it is guided by two aspects:

The first aspect of the principle of relevance for communication is the cognitive principle. The cognitive principle of relevance enables the hearer to single out one possible interpretation as interpretation of communicated utterances, thoughts, gestures and perceptions when information is channelled through it. From the research questions, this study assumes that political utterances on hate speech can yield multiple pragmatic interpretations given their fluid nature. Therefore, the cognitive principle of relevance enables the study to single out the likely interpretation of the utterance that reflects the intended speaker's meaning. Wilson & Sperber (2004:610) states that the cognitive principle of relevance is:

“Human cognition tends to be geared to maximization of relevance.”

This principle has two components: an informative component and an intentional component. The informative component is also referred to as ‘inferential communication’ in relevance-theoretical terms. It communicates the content of the message arrived at through processes such as implicatures, explicatures, disambiguation and enrichment. In this study, the informative component of the cognitive principle of relevance has provided important guidelines on linguistic strategies politicians use when making hate speech utterances such as implicatures and explicatures. These linguistic strategies yield multiple pragmatic interpretations of an utterance when given contextual interpretation.

The intentional component of cognitive principle of relevance communicates the intention of the speaker. It consists of verbal and non-verbal cues that a speaker builds around his/her message so that the hearer understands the message as intended by the speaker. Due to the informative component's ability to generate multiple pragmatic interpretations from an utterance, further interpretation of that utterance basing on the accompanying intentional component enables the hearer to arrive at the possible intended speaker meaning. This is because intentional component

contains ostensive stimuli from the speaker that guides the hearer towards the intended message. It is due to these components of cognitive principle of Relevance Theory, informative and intentional, that this study sought to determine the kind of ostensive stimuli politicians use to capture the attention of the hearer and guide the hearer to the possible intended speaker meaning.

The two components work simultaneously in the mind of the hearer and they are processed or monitored against a presumed shared context between the speaker and the hearer. The shared context constitutes the socio-cultural norms and the knowledge of the world. When the hearer fails to establish a shared context with the speaker, then the information is interpreted against the hearer's context. Of interest to this study is to establish how politicians utilize context to encode hate speech messages in their utterances.

When the mind of a hearer is processing an utterance against a context, the mind searches for all the mental representations for understanding of the message. This mental search is aimed at establishing the appropriate cognitive effects relevant to the information received from the speaker. Cognitive effects are as a result of the hearer's mind trying to integrate the content of the information represented by the utterance into his/her existing mental representations. If the message meets some shared context (older knowledge), then the understanding is high (as the cognitive effect due to the utterance) and this would then mean that the message was relevant to the hearer and it is therefore sent or integrated into the mental lexicon. However, if there is no shared background knowledge between the speaker and the hearer, then little or no understanding takes place. The new information is then either rejected and thus not stored in the mind of the hearer or it is misinterpreted and stored in the mind of the hearer if deemed relevant. In this study, political utterances are analysed to determine if they were relevant to the hearer. Such a conclusion is arrived at after determining the possible contextual effects that an utterance

generates in the mind of a hearer. As outlined by Relevance Theory, cognitive effects can be either positive or negative.

A positive cognitive effect is a worthwhile difference to the individual's representation of the world such as a true conclusion from the speaker's information which gets integrated in the hearer's mental lexicon. False conclusions are not worth having. They are cognitive effects but not positive ones (Sperber & Wilson, 1995). Positive cognitive effects may lead to:

- i. Building contextual implications; a conclusion deducible from the input and the context together, but from neither input nor context alone.
- ii. Strengthening an existing assumption
- iii. Contradicting and eliminating an existing assumption

(Wilson & Sperber, 2004:612)

The second aspect of the principle of relevance for communication is the communicative principle. The communicative principle of relevance states that:

“Every act of ostensive communication communicates a presumption of its own optimal relevance.” (Wilson & Sperber, 2004:612)

This principle means that when communicators talk to each other, the relevant theoretical processes of understanding is initiated. Every successful communication relies on the shared background assumptions between the interlocutors. However, the sharing of background assumptions surrounding an utterance alone is not sufficient enough for a hearer to arrive at the intended speaker meaning. This study analyses political utterances on hate speech as linguistic units of communication that have multiple pragmatic interpretations. Thus, in order to arrive at the intended speaker meaning, the study has had to apply the communicative principle of

relevance to identify aspects of ostensive stimuli used by politicians to enhance communication with the hearers. The ostensive stimuli used by politicians include linguistic aspects of speech rendition that politicians use to establish a shared context so as to drive the hearer to the intended speaker meaning.

c) The comprehension procedure of Relevance Theory

The comprehension procedure of Relevance Theory is based on the balance between effort and relevance. According to Wilson & Sperber (2004:612) a hearer processes information by:

- i. Following a path of least effort in computing cognitive effects,
- ii. While testing his/her interpretive hypothesis in the order of accessibility,
- iii. Then stops the processing of information when his/her expectations of relevance are satisfied at the point the mind establishes a positive cognitive effect.

The specific sub-tasks of comprehension procedure involve interpreting the information by constructing an appropriate hypothesis about explicit content via decoding, disambiguation, reference resolution and other pragmatic enrichment processes. The hearer's mind then establishes explicatures by constructing another appropriate hypothesis about the intended contextual assumption, and establishes implicatures by constructing an appropriate hypothesis about the intended contextual implication (Wilson & Sperber, 2004). These concepts on relevance and communication are quite insightful to this study. Though, presumably this comprehension procedure simplifies the mental processes of understanding the meaning of an utterance in the mind of the hearer, it offers this study with a guided procedure on how to carry out a pragmatic interpretation on utterances.

Relevance Theory by Dan Sperber and Deirdre Wilson offers crucial insights on the pragmatic interpretation of political utterances on hate speech. This theory has enabled the study to answer the research questions and shed light on how politicians in Kenya make use of context to encode hate speech messages in utterances that can receive multiple pragmatic interpretations; some of which they are able to easily deny.

## **CHAPTER 2**

### **LITERATURE REVIEW**

#### **2.1 Introduction**

This chapter presents literature review on utterances and their dependency on context for the interpretation of meaning. It further provides literature on how meaning is constructed in utterances and on ostensive-inferential model of communication. The chapter also presents information on political discourse, hate speech in Kenya and on studies in which Relevance Theory has been applied. The purpose of this section is to shed light on some key concepts in the study, place the study in its context and highlight the gaps investigated.

#### **2.2 Utterance context-sensitivity and context manipulation**

The literature review in this section has helped the study to gather relevant information on objective one of the study: To establish how political speakers manipulate context to conform to hearer's expectation of relevance when encoding hate speech messages in political utterances.

Sperber & Wilson (1986;1995) and Wilson & Sperber (2004) in Relevance Theory attempt to provide an account for pragmatic interpretation of utterance as unit of communication. The comprehension of an utterance is a cognitive process that is driven by the context of the utterance. Cognitive context of an utterance is a psychological construct including not only the context of an utterance but also the contextual factors such as the immediate physical environment, the participant's background knowledge, the known facts, assumptions, beliefs, and cognitive abilities. It is a set of contextual assumptions that are stored in the brain of human being. But these assumptions are incomplete; a complete cognitive context can be formed only from inference which makes the participants achieve the pragmatic meaning in the variable communicative situations. Each assumption is not independent from each other since information

is stored in the brain in the form of relevant group. Sperber & Wilson (1986) claim that a set of facts that an individual can understand construct cognitive context, as a result, these facts will influence the discourse production and interpretation. Cognitive context factors do more than serving as interface between event models and semantic representations; they also seem to regulate the very structures of meaning. The information presented here from Sperber & Wilson (1986) and expounded on in Wilson & Sperber (2004) enhanced the understanding of context and how it exists during comprehension of utterances. However, Sperber & Wilson (1986:1995) and Wilson & Sperber (2004) do not provide information on how a speaker can manipulate the very context to encode intended speaker meaning. This study went ahead to investigate how politicians in Kenya manipulate context to communicate hate speech messages in political utterances.

Roberts (2006) observes that pragmatics, as a branch of linguistics, studies utterances as expressions for communication. Pragmatics attempts to explain what someone meant by saying what he/she said on a particular occasion by providing an account of studying the way context of utterance influences the interpretation of the utterance. The notion of context of an utterance can be understood in three different ways:

- i. As the actual discourse event of verbal exchange (or monologue). In this sense, Robert (2006) says context is associated with a very concrete situation including the speaker, the addressee(s), the actual sound waves, a physical locale, and things pointed out in the utterance or by the speaker.
- ii. As the linguistic content of the verbal exchange; that is, what is actually said. Robert (2006) explains that, in this sense, context may be characterised as a



linguistic string under a syntactic analysis with associated syntactic and prosodic structures.

- iii. As the structure of the information that is presupposed and/or conveyed by the interlocutors in the exchange.

The three ways of characterizing discourse context; as the event of verbal exchange, as the linguistic content of the exchange and as the structure of the information involved, are not mutually exclusive; there is no verbal exchange without linguistic content, and the linguistic content itself is an aspect of the abstract information structure of the exchange.

Roberts (2006) concludes that it is convenient to characterize context in which an utterance is made in terms of information structure in conventionally given ways; and to study how that information structure interacts with the information contributed by the utterance itself to efficiently convey the intended meaning. The context-dependence of interpretation is most obvious when phenomena like anaphora, ellipsis and deixis are involved. Such phenomena leave the semantic interpretation of utterance incomplete and the truth-conditions can only be determined on the basis of contextual clues. According to Roberts (2006), the context of an utterance interacts with the semantic content of the utterance in two fundamental ways; contextual felicity and context update.

Context felicity refers to the aptness of an utterance to express a proposition that one can take to be reasonable and relevant given the context (Roberts, 2006). To evaluate felicity as condition for utterance context-dependence, context then must be considered so as to determine what was expressed; either because the utterance was incomplete by using structural elements like anaphora, ellipsis and deixis or because the *prima facie* interpretation of the utterance appears

irrelevant or infelicitous. The information presented in this section was important to this study because it enabled the study to understand how context interacts with utterances. Given the genre of the utterances under investigation in this study, and the general extra-linguistic environment of political campaigns for the 2013 general elections in Kenya, the study assumed that the political utterances under investigation were felicitous to the context and the hearer. In relevance theoretical terms, utterances that fulfil the felicity condition can be interpreted to fulfil the expectations of relevance to the hearer. However, Roberts (2006) does not explain how infelicitous utterances can be made to sound felicitous by a speaker manipulating context of the utterance. As such, this study went ahead to investigate how politicians manipulated context to make utterances that conformed to the hearer's expectation of relevance; thereby fulfilling the felicity condition in the utterance. Further, the information in this section provided crucial insights on some of the possible linguistic strategies (such as ellipsis and deixis) that politicians use to encode hate speech messages in political utterances while fulfilling the hearer's expectation of relevance (utterance felicity condition). Such information enabled the study to understand structural aspects of political utterance as linguistic expressions used to communicate political messages.

Another way in which the context of an utterance interacts with the semantic content of the utterance during utterance interpretation is by inducing context update. When this happens, the facts of each utterance in a discourse and the content of the utterance itself get added to the information contextually available to the interlocutors. Roberts (2006) notes that in instances where the interlocutors are generally cooperating with each other, the addressee (hearer) after hearing an utterance may reject the speaker's implicit claim on the cooperation, if not rejected, the hearer may hand the speaker some relevant information or unless rejecting the utterance, the

hearer may be taken as rude or infelicitous by saying something that does not address the utterance. Thus requests, commands, questions and assertions can contribute towards satisfying the presuppositions of subsequent utterances, and hence providing context update. Still, Roberts (2006) does not provide information on how a speaker can manipulate context to achieve context update so as to conform to the hearer's expectation of relevance. This study sought to establish how politicians in Kenya manipulate context to conform to hearer's expectation of relevance. Manipulation of context may involve or result into context update which may make the hearer to reject the implicit claim in the utterance, provide some relevant information to the speaker or say something that does not address the utterance.

Shen (2012) observes that texts produced by humans for communication are produced and interpreted in certain context. Context can be classified into co-text, situational context and cultural context. In communication, context determines text and text reflects context. Shen (2012) goes further to note that the function of language is to organize people's common activities and one has to know how to say and what to say in order to communicate successfully. One has to understand why people say what they say and how they say it in a specific circumstance according to different aspects in the cognitive context.

Shen (2012) further argues that that context is an indispensable notion that makes pragmatics as it is. At present, the study of pragmatics mainly includes five aspects: deixis, conversational implicature, presupposition, speech acts and conversational structure. All these five aspects are actually involved in the problem of context as a very important factor in the production and interpretation of the utterances. When analyzing a text or a discourse, context is set up and determined in advance of a comprehension process.

Shen (2012) supports Sperber & Wilson (1986) on the claim that context is a psychological construct and a subset of the assumptions about the world. The context of an utterance is not limited to information about the immediate physical environment or the immediately preceding utterances, context includes all those factors that affect the interpretation of utterance such as expectations about the future, scientific hypotheses or religious beliefs, anecdotal memories, general cultural assumptions, beliefs about the mental state of the speakers, may all play a role in interpretation. Thus, in verbal communication, significant to the interpretation of the utterance is not the immediate concrete environment but a series of assumptions that make up of the cognitive context. A communicator develops an assumption in the expectation that he/she will be able to combine it with existing assumptions to derive a new assumption, which will yield what Sperber & Wilson (1986) describe as contextual effects. Contextual effects are exhibited in the form of the assumption that:

- i. Strengthen existing assumptions
- ii. Contradict with the existing assumptions
- iii. Combine with existing assumptions to yield contextual implications as conclusions derivable from input and context together, but from neither input nor context alone.

Shen (2012) explains that it is because of the diversity of the cognitive context that makes the interpretation of utterance difficult. Although people never share their total cognitive environments there is still intersection, that is, there are a set of facts and assumptions manifest to them both. But this interesting part remains insignificant unless it is mutually manifest. That is to say, in a mutual cognitive environment, for every manifest assumption, the fact that it is manifest to the people who share this environment is itself manifest. Shen (2012) has provided

crucial insights on pragmatic context to this study. Whereas one may argue that hate speech implications in political utterances may vary depending on an individual's assumptions, Shen (2012) provided very important perspectives on context to this study: that context is set up before a comprehension process and although people never share their total cognitive environments, there are a set of facts and assumptions that the individuals within a mutual cognitive environment will share. However, Shen (2012) does not provide information on how speakers manipulate context to provide a pre-set context for the hearer to interpret an utterance. Therefore, this study went ahead to investigate pragmatic interpretation of political utterances on hate speech to establish how context was manipulated by speakers to encode hate speech messages. Having conceptualized what context in this study means, it is then important to understand the notion of manipulation because the objective being explored in this section of literature review is on manipulation of context.

Sparks (2004) says that manipulation does not constitute a linguistically distinct type of communication. Rather than being a linguistic distinction, the intuitive notions of manipulation actually depends on the correlation between speaker belief and speaker meaning, which is a consideration of a fact in the world that is independent of the linguistic form of the utterance. Sparks (2004) suggest that deception is a clear case of manipulation. Sparks (2004) provides the following illustration of a manipulative scenario of quoted remarks by Wells Fargo CEO John Stumpf to multiple audiences:

Mr. Stumpf: "We are Americans first, and we are bankers second."

Spark (2004) explains that Mr. Stumpf's intentions in uttering these words could have been to inform the audiences that them as CEOs have the best interests of the country as a higher ranked

priority than their own banks' profitability; to inform the audiences that the CEOs would not take advantage of the American people. However, it is possible that Mr. Stumpf sincerely believes the message that he is trying to communicate to his various audiences. It is also possible that he does not believe the assumptions that he is trying to communicate; to the extent that he does not believe what he intended his audiences to believe in which case his utterance could be considered manipulative.

Spark (2004) further notes that each individual can have a different perception of the degree to which a stimulus is manipulative. For example in the above illustration, Mr. Stumpf might personally believe that which he intended his audience to believe. Yet the other CEOs might believe that he is merely purporting to believe it even though he probably does not. In such a case, Mr. Stumpf would view his utterance as non-manipulative, while the Representatives would view it as (at least somewhat) manipulative.

Sparks (2004) identifies two ways of presenting manipulation; a manipulative stimulus might be offered either ostensibly or non-ostensively (covertly). For example, a lie that is ostensibly and intentionally communicated to someone would be out rightly manipulation. In covert communication, part of the speaker's intended meaning is that the hearer would detect a level of ostension different from what the speaker knows to be true. Spark (2004) provides rather debatable hints on manipulation in his attempt to demystify the notion of manipulation in pragmatics. Though his conceptualization of manipulation enriches the understanding of manipulation to this study, he does not explain how manipulation is achieved when speakers make political utterances on hate speech. This study believes that manipulation does not necessarily involve deception. A speaker can produce a manipulative discourse while stating what the hearer knows to be true but merely using the discourse in a context to twist the hearer's

perception so as to achieve speaker goal or intention. Therefore, this study looks at manipulation of context as a phenomenon that goes beyond deception with regard to speaker intention as it is within political discourse.

Rigotti (2005:68) suggests that in manipulation, “what is negative has to be somehow disguised as something positive”, and that manipulation “twists the vision of the world [...] in the mind of the addressee”. Whereas this study agrees with Rigotti (2005), the study considers Rigotti’s interpretation of manipulation to be limiting. The study holds it that not necessarily must a manipulative discourse involve disguising what is negative as something positive. To this study manipulation can also involve stating something as it is to the hearer. The manipulative impact of the discourse to the hearer will be determined by its ability to influence a twist or shift in the perception of the hearer. That aside, this study holds it that manipulation is a purely cognitive affair occurring in the hearer’s mind but influenced by the speaker’s utterances and intentions. As such, Rigotti (2005) does not explain how political speakers employ manipulation in political utterances on hate speech to state what the hearer knows so as to influence perception and influence possible action in the hearer and this particular study has attempted to account for this.

Dijk (2006:360) says that “manipulators make others believe or do things that are in the interest of the manipulator and against the best interests of the manipulated”. According to van Dijk (2006), the exercise of manipulation in communication is premised on social inequality existing in society; that manipulators “need to satisfy personal and social criteria that enable them to influence others in the first place” (Dijk, 2006: 362). Within such set-ups, asymmetrical social conditions of interaction are required for manipulation to take place. Underlying this view is the idea that manipulation exploits these forms of social asymmetry and the associated imbalance in the relations of power and domination in favor of the manipulator. Van Dijk (2006) claims on

manipulation are in line with the dimensions underlying this study; that political utterances as a discourse can be approached within Critical Discourse Analysis which studies language use as an expression of power relations in society. The study therefore assumes that use of manipulation of context in communication is intended by the speaker to maintain ideological control over the hearer by twisted the hearer's perception to look at issues of concern from the perspective of the speaker. To this extend, this study agrees with van Dijk (2006). However, this study goes beyond van Dijk (2006) observation by highlighting how the manipulation of context is achieved by politicians when encoding hate speech messages in political utterances.

Maillat & Oswald (2009) provide a different dimension on the debate on manipulative discourse paralleling their argument against notions in Relevance Theory. They propose that manipulation can be best defined in terms of the constraints it imposes on mental processing. Specifically, manipulation can be defined as a set of constraints limiting the processes of contextual selection. Maillat & Oswald (2009) suggest that it is not necessary to concentrate on the features of the manipulative message by trying to characterize it from the perspective of the manipulator, but to consider manipulation from the perspective of the manipulated. This requires investigating how manipulated hearers are (mis)led to process the information contained in the message in a somewhat restricted way.

From a Relevant Theory perspective by Sperber & Wilson (1995), human communication relies on the assumption that all utterances are optimally relevant within the specific context in which they are produced. Optimal relevance is understood as a cognitive state which corresponds to an optimal ratio between the cognitive efforts required to process the utterance, and the cognitive effects yielded by such an interpretative process. Thus, Maillat & Oswald (2009) argue that a manipulative discourse takes advantage of and exploits the cognitive dynamics which underlie



this mechanism. From an interpretative perspective, manipulative discourse relies on the same context-construction or context selection procedure as in the case of a “normal” utterance. The communicative twist introduced by manipulative discourse lies in the external restrictions or constraints imposed by the manipulator on the interpretative process, even though the process itself remains unchanged.

Maillat & Oswald (2009) conclude that manipulation corresponds to a communicative strategy that relies on the same processes outlined above in Relevance Theory and it as well exploits the cognitive strategies deployed during interpretation in order to optimize the use of resources. In other words, manipulative discourse is a form of communication that puts the addressee in a situation where s/he will be led to shallow-process contextual assumptions of the utterance. Thus, manipulation constitutes a form of cognitive constraint on the selection of contextual assumptions.

Maillat & Oswald (2009) elaborate that manipulative discourse functions as a twofold process that first puts a strong constraint on the selection of contextual assumptions which are accessed to interpret a target utterance  $U$ . This first constraining element ensures that the target utterance is interpreted within a limited context,  $C$ , and – most importantly – it ensures that any alternative set of contextual assumptions,  $C'$ , is *not* accessed. That is to say that manipulative discourse is a form of communicative attempt at blocking the context selection process described by Sperber & Wilson (1995) in the Relevance Theory. Emerging from the preceding arguments, Maillat & Oswald (2009) suggests that in manipulative communication, it is relevance which is first determined by the speaker and then context is designed to be treated as a variable.

Maillat & Oswald (2009) give a very crucial perspective to the notion of manipulation in inferential pragmatics. The ideas advanced by Maillat & Oswald have enhanced the understanding of manipulation by this study especially on the description Manipulation as a strategy that constitutes a form of cognitive constraint on the selection of contextual assumptions. However, whereas to a greater extent this study agrees with Maillat & Oswald (2009), it looks at the comprehension process of an utterance as being majorly a hearer's responsibility. As such, once the a speaker determines the relevance of the utterance which intern influences the speaker to manipulate the context of the utterance, once rendered, the hearer interprets the utterance constrained by the manipulated context to establish the relevance of the utterance and consequently arrive at the speaker intended contextual effects. The comprehension process of such an utterance is a highly complex cognitive process involving simultaneous processes to arrive at the most relevant contextual effects. Thus, within this understanding of the concept of manipulation, this study went ahead to try and understand how political speakers manipulate context to achieve relevance of the utterance to the hearer while at the same time encoding hate speech message in the utterance. Thus, hate speech messages in this study are understood to be contextual implications of political utterances rendered within a manipulated context of designed to satisfy speaker intentions. Within this framework then, hate speech can be classified as a form of manipulative discourse intended to harm an individual.

### **2.3 Linguistic strategies and obscurity of utterance meaning**

The literature review carried out in this section provided information that enabled the study to respond to objectives two and three of the study: to establish the linguistic strategies used by politicians to encode hate speech messages in the political utterances they make and to describe how the linguistic strategies obscure utterance meaning. The two objectives are discussed jointly

in this section to avoid unnecessary repetition of data since information discussed in objective two lays the foundation for the discussion of objective three.

Meaning in utterances is initiated by the speaker's words as units of communication. According to Wilson & Sperber (2004) in Relevance Theory, decoding an utterance containing words and phrases triggers automatically in the hearer's mind both a presumption of optimal relevance and the relevance-theoretic interpreting procedure which will guide the hearer in bridging the gap between what is linguistically encoded and what is communicated both, explicitly and implicitly. Relevance Theory argues that pragmatics does not only operate at sentence level but also at word level in deriving the proposition expressed by the speaker's utterance. Thus, arriving at the meaning intended by the speaker of an utterance involves a simultaneous pragmatic adjustment of word and phrase meaning which takes place during the process of deriving explicit content, context and implicatures. This process continues until the hearer arrives at a combination that satisfies his expectations of relevance. It is the pragmatic meaning of a word resulting from the process of deriving an optimally relevant interpretation that is taken to be the concept the speaker intended as a constituent of the explicatures of her utterance. In this way, the meaning intended by literally, loosely, hyperbolically and metaphorically used words in utterances, can be seen to involve just the same mechanisms as are employed in arriving at the meaning of an utterance. In this study, pragmatic interpretation of political utterances on hate speech was carried out within the overall framework describe here by Wilson and Sperber. The pragmatic interpretation of individual utterances took into account pragmatic interpretation of the individual words within the utterance so as to achieve the objectives of the study.

The above approach to this study found support in Dandi Li (2008) who says that words are rich repositories of semantic information that people use to talk about the world in potentially infinite

number of ways. In oral communication, utterers create meanings by using words in context and it is the role of hearers to interpret the words to get the utterers' meanings. In arriving at the utterer's meaning, the meanings of words that a speaker intends in an utterance can be pragmatically enriched by relevance-driven inferential mechanisms, which take what is linguistically encoded as a guide in inferring speaker's meaning. Words are used purposely for communication and Dandi Li (2008) observes that communication is about intentions and inferences. Recognition of a speaker's intention may lead directly to fulfillment of a communication process: speaker's intention to inform the hearer about something is fulfilled by being recognized by the hearer. Communication is successful not when the hearer recognizes the linguistic meaning of the utterance but when he or she infers the speaker's meaning from it. The pragmatically inferred temporary meanings of a word are just its pragmatic meanings in utterances.

Dandi Li (2008) further posits that utterance comprehension involves two distinct types of cognitive processes: a process of linguistic decoding and a process of pragmatic inference. Utterances are automatically decoded by the language module into a certain semantic representation or logical form (a structured set of encoded concepts), which serves as automatic input to a process of pragmatic inference. Guided by the relevance-theoretic comprehension procedure, the aim of the hearer is to develop this logical form at the explicit level and complement it at the implicit level so as to arrive at a hypothesis about the set of communicated assumptions (explicatures and implicatures) that constitute speaker's meaning. This argument by Dandi Li (2008) shed light on the subject of investigation in this study. The existence of explicatures and implicatures of an utterance that are driven by different cognitive processes alludes to the possibility of an utterance containing multiple interpretations which this study has

investigated. Dandi Li (2008) provides the illustration below from Chinese of a conversation between a student and a teacher to support this argument:

Student A: *Xu jiaoshou, wo keyi qingjiao nin yige wenti ma ?*

A: Xu professor I can ask you a question?

(A: Professor Xu, can I ask you a question?)

Teacher B: *duibuqi, wo bixu zai yinhang guanmen yiqian pao qu qu xie qian.*

B: Sorry, I have to bank close before run to get some money.

(B: Sorry, I have to run to the bank and get some money before it closes.)

The semantic representation of these utterances can be obtained from decoding the teacher's utterance of both what is explicitly and implicitly communicated as shown below:

Explicature: Professor Xu has to run to the bank at that time and [then] get some money before the bank closes.'

Implicature: Professor Xu does not have time to answer student's question at that time.'

Dandi Li (2008) explains that the output of decoding an utterance, such as the one above does not result then in its interpretation. Other pragmatic processes operate in the mind such as disambiguating ambiguous terms in the utterance like 'bank', assigning reference to indexicals like 'I', 'it', and even the mind enriching the proposition expressed by adding extra conceptual material such as (AND [THEN]). In line with this study, the explanation by Dandi Li (2008) presupposes the issues under investigation in this study. Dandi Li's (2008) revelation that there are pragmatic processes such as disambiguation that operate in the mind of the hearer justified the investigation in this study which sought to establish the linguistic strategies the speaker uses

to encode utterance meaning. To support this argument, Dandi Li (2008) cites Wilson & Sperber (1995) as having said that within Relevance Theory, both explicatures and implicatures are derived in parallel by a process of mutual adjustment. The hearer's mind follows a path of least effort, while considering hypotheses about explicit content and implicatures in their order of accessibility until the mind arrives at a combination that satisfies expectations of relevance.

In support of Carston (2002) and Wilson & Sperber (1986), Dandi Li (2008) says that in inferential communication, semantics/pragmatics distinction holds not only at sentence level but also at word level. This hypothesis is grounded both in the idea that the human mind is flexible enough to construct far many more concepts than human languages can linguistically encode. Further, the human mind's inferential mechanisms are powerful enough to construct the concept intended on the basis of the encoded concept and the context in which it is processed. The concept expressed by the use of a familiar word may depart from the concept encoded by the use of that word in various ways as illustrated below:

A: I cannot open the freezer because of the ice

B: (Dentist) Open your mouth

In understanding the above utterances, the hearer, following a path of least effort, starts considering just the first (few) most accessible assumption(s) from the encyclopedic entry of the encoded concept and starts processing them in the wider context of the utterance together with other hypotheses about explicatures and implicatures. The hearer continues deriving cognitive effects from the combination of the hypotheses until he/she arrives at a combination of explicit content, context and implicatures that satisfies the expectations of relevance, at which point the mental search.

The human mind often arrives at an optimally relevant interpretation before processing the encoded concepts to any depth, hence, the resulting concepts may be narrower than, or broader than, or simply overlap with, the original encoded concepts (Dandi Li, 2008). In the utterances above, the encoded concept is automatically narrowed to denote only a subset of particular ways of opening. Concept broadening and narrowing are processes of conceptual adjustment. In this study, interpretation of aspects of lexical meaning as used within utterances involved interpretation of concept broadening and narrowing so as to establish multiple pragmatic interpretations of utterances on hate speech. Dandi Li (2008) cites Carston (2002) as having observed that concept broadening and narrowing are not different processes, but rather different instantiations of a single process of conceptual adjustment, which takes place in deriving the proposition expressed by the speaker's utterance. The new (narrower or broader) concept constructed in this pragmatic meaning is taken to be appropriately close to the one the speaker intended as a constituent of the speaker's thoughts and of the explicature of his/her utterance. The same process of conceptual adjustment is utilized in understanding literal, hyperbolic, loose, and metaphorical uses of utterances. Both literal and non-literal interpretations are context-dependent and pragmatically constructed on-line via relevance-driven inferential mechanisms, which take what is linguistically encoded (the logical form and its constituent concepts) as merely a guide in inferring speaker meaning. This process of pragmatically fine-tuning the encoded concepts takes place as a natural by-product of the search for an optimally relevant interpretation, which can be attributed as a speaker's meaning. It is within this framework that this study sought to establish kinds of ostensive stimuli, as approaches of fine-tuning the pragmatically encoded concepts, which politicians in Kenya use to focus the hearer on particular

utterance interpretation as speaker meaning within the multiple pragmatic interpretations contained in the utterance on hate speech.

Dandi Li (2008) argues that one important reason why a word is endowed with a pragmatic meaning in an utterance is to communicate a concept which we use in our thought, but for which we have no word in our language. However, unlike metaphors, we can often communicate this concept by modifying a certain word for which we have a stable conceptual representation in memory. When interpreting a word in an utterance, the hearer is encouraged to narrow or broaden the original concept to the point where he/she can derive the set of implications we intend to communicate. The pragmatic meaning of words that a speaker intends to convey in an utterance is pragmatically contracted on-line by relevance-driven inferential mechanisms. The adjusted words meaning (and not the concepts encoded by these words in their original form) are taken by the hearer to be a constituent of the speaker's thoughts and of the proposition expressed by the speaker's utterance.

Dandi Li's (2008) ideas have enriched this study by shedding light on the interpretation of pragmatic meaning of words as linguistic units in utterances. They have enabled this study to carry out interpretation of political utterances in Kenya while paying attention to pragmatic aspects of individual words within an utterance. The identification of disambiguation and reference assignment as some of the processes that the hearer's mind undergoes to arrive at implicatures that reflect the possible intended speaker meaning pre-empted speaker's linguistic strategies used to encode utterance meaning that this study was interested in. This helped answer the study's research question and realize the study objectives on establishing speaker's linguistic strategies used by politicians in Kenya to encode hate speech messages. Further, the identification by Dandi Li (2008) of mental concept adjustment process (narrowing and



broadening) by a hearer so as to understand words in utterances has given this study a good analytical start-off point in its pragmatic interpretation of political utterances in Kenya.

However, Dandi Li (2008) analysis was approached from the perspective of the hearer of utterances and therefore fails to highlight the linguistic strategies used by the speaker to encode the propositions in words contained in utterances. Similarly, Dandi Li does not explain how context is used by the speaker to encode messages in the utterances. This study went a step further and complemented Dandi Li's (2008) assertions by carrying out a pragmatic interpretation on individual political utterances in Kenya and focused on the utterance to reveal speaker's linguistic strategies and role of context in encoding hate speech messages.

#### **2.4 Ostensive-inferential communication and utterance meaning**

The literature review conducted in this section was aimed at enabling the study to effectively respond to the objective four of the study: to determine the kind of ostensive stimuli used to focus the hearer on the possible intended speaker meaning. As conceptualized in this study, it is important to understand the concept of communication in its general sense before zeroing down on ostensive-inferential communication.

Pearson, Nelson, Titsworth & Harter (2003) define communication as the process by which meaning is exchanged through a common system of symbols, signs and behaviour. They identify four contexts in which communication can occur:

- i. The intrapersonal communication context which involves understanding and sharing meaning within the self. It occurs within the mind of the individual.

- ii. The interpersonal communication context which involves co-ordination of meaning between at least two people in a situation that allows mutual opportunities for both speaking and listening.
- iii. Public communication context which involves generating meanings in a situation where a single speaker source transmits a message to a number of receivers who give non-verbal and, sometimes, question and answer feedback.
- iv. Mass communication context in which communication is mediated between a source and a large number of unseen receivers.

Of relevance to this study is the public communication context. Political rallies are an example of forums in which public communication takes place. As explained by Pearson *et. al.* (2003), in public communication, the source adapts the message to the audience in an attempt to achieve maximum understanding. One way of adapting the message to the audience is by utilising background assumptions that the speaker shares with the audience. In the understanding of Relevance theory (Wilson & Sperber, 2004), this is what is described as contextual assumptions surrounding an utterance. This exploration on the communication and its contexts is very crucial for this study. It has provided hints on the nature of communication; most importantly, that for communication to be effective, communicators may have to adapt the message to the audience. This information alluded to part of the objectives of this study: to establish how politicians manipulate context for make an utterance relevant to the hearer. The manipulation of context as used in this study includes what Pearson *et. al.* (2003) describe as adapting the message to the audience.

Giving support to the assertions stated above is West & Turner (2010) who add that communication is a social process in which individuals employ symbols to establish and

interpret meaning in their environment. When people come to interact, they do so with various intentions, motivations and abilities. As a process, communication is on-going and unending; dynamic, complex and continually changing. West & Turner (2010) emphasise on the dynamics of making meaning between communicators. They point out that amongst the factors that affect meaning are:

- i. Past communication stored in the speaker's and hearer's mind which affect current communications, and
- ii. The speaker's and hearer's individual and cultural changes.

The above factors that affect meaning are understood as aspects of context of an utterance (Sperber & Wilson, 1986; Wilson & Sperber, 2004; Shen, 2012). West & Turner (2010) go further to cite Martin & Nakayama (2008) as having observed that meaning has a cultural consequence. They justify this point by giving an example on President Bush who, when preparing to go to war in Iraq, described the war as 'a crusade'. The Iraqis interpreted this as a religious war though Bush may not have meant this. Therefore the meaning of a message, like that contained in an utterance, may require contextual reference. However, West & Turner (2010) give caution that not all meaning is shared; and that people do not always know what others mean and therefore we must be able to explain, repeat and clarify.

In order to put forward a full framework of communication and show the nature of communication, Sperber & Wilson (1995) provided the concept of Ostensive-Inferential Communication. In communication, the task of the speaker is to produce a stimulus, either verbal or non-verbal, which makes his informative intention mutually manifest. So for the speaker, communication is an act of letting the listener know his intention to express something, which is called ostension; It is the behavior "to make manifest an intention to make something

manifest.”(Sperber & Wilson, 1995. p227). Inference is related to the listener, and is the process of seeking relevance between the utterances and contextual assumptions. The listener’s task is to infer the intention from the evidences presented by the speaker. In this way, the dominant point of communication is Ostensive-Inferential. Communication involves the publication (ostension) and the recognition (inference) of intentions. The speaker’s intention would be known by the audience because they have common cognitive environment, which is a set of facts that are clear enough to enable an individual derive contextual implicatures. To this study, contextual implicatures derived from political utterances are messages that constitute hate speech. It was therefore an objective of the study to establish the kinds of ostensive stimuli provided by politicians as evidence to guide the hearer towards the hate speech message in the utterance. This was a task for the study to fulfill given that utterances are multifaceted in propositional content resulting into multiple pragmatic interpretations.

Xu (2013) applies Relevance Theory by Sperber and Wilson (1986) in a study on advertisements as a means of communication. In this study, Xu uses advertisements as a form of communication to illustrate and simplify the concept of ostensive communication. According to Xu (2013), advertising as a form of communication has its specific features. Advertising is a combination of verbal and non-verbal communication. Language is the most significant vehicle of communication, most advertisements employ language to transmit information. However, under certain circumstances, pictures, music and motions may be more expressive than language itself. In reality, most of the advertisements make use of language and non-language elements simultaneously in order to explicitly transmit the intended information. Advertising is a public communication rather than private one. It is a non-face-to-face and one-way communication. Advertisers must attract as large potential audience as possible, and the advertising

communication is an audience-centered process. Xu (2013) poses the following insightful questions:

- i. How can an advertiser grasp audience's attention as much as possible?
- ii. Once an advertiser attracts the audience's attention, how can he direct the audience to the understanding of his intention and make a lasting impression on the audience?
- iii. And how can the advertiser make full use of the medium (adverts) and language to bring the desired return?
- iv. In easier words, how can the advertising process be an effective communication?

Xu uses Relevance Theory to account for these questions. Relevance Theory emphasizes the interaction between cognitive psychology, mental deductive functions and grammatical processes, and between the effort the audience invests and the yield of information attained. Thus, Relevance Theory provides an ideal tool for analyzing the process of the advertising communication. The two main functions of advertising are to inform and to persuade or influence the audience. The goal of an advert designer is not to make the target audience know more about the world, but to sell a product or service.

In relevance theory terms, communication is successful only when:

- a) It attracts the attention of the target audience,
- b) It indicates that the speaker wishes to convey a message of interest to the hearer,

- c) The audience recognizes the speaker's informative intention and finds it worthwhile to make the effort to understand what the speaker intends to tell them, and
- d) The message received by the hearer is as close as possible to what the speaker has in mind.

A successful process of advertising communication meets all these requirements. All the advertising strategies that an advertiser takes are aimed at attracting the audience's attention and making the audience to realize that he/she needs the product that is promoted, and finally decide to use it. And if the product does sell well, it shows the advertisement is a success.

According to Relevance Theory, it is 'thoughts' that is communicated. Thoughts mean mental representations which the hearer is capable of understanding and believing. In other words, thoughts take the form of sets of assumptions. The ultimate goal of communication is to alter the hearer's thoughts, and that is why an advertiser engages in communication at all.

Xu (2013) observes that advertising communication is highly intentional. Usually, a communicator would offer clear ostension for the information he wants to communicate, and that is his informative intention. The reason why an advertiser is likely to use novel words and attractive linguistic features is the ostensive characteristics of advertising communication. The advertiser provides evidence and direct audience to infer his attention. On the other hand, the audience reading or watching a (TV) advertisement are busy searching for relevance. Both sides communicating are trying to adjust and enlarge the mutual cognitive environment in order to form an effective context.

Xu (2013) explains that the essential role of the advertisement is to attract the people's attention, and then try to find the optimal relevance through the inferring process. A successful communication will lead to the effective persuasion of the promoted products and as a result spread the popularity of the products. On the contrary, if an ad fails to show the advertiser's intention or makes the audience be fed up with it, then it is doomed to gain a negative consequence. Most contemporary ads do not directly ask the audience to buy products. Ads often seem more concerned with amusing the audience by setting a puzzle for the audience to work out, or demonstrating their own sophistication. The aim of doing this is to engage the audience in their structure of meaning to encourage them to participate by deciphering the advertiser's linguistic and visual signs and to enjoy this interpreting activity. In this process, the advertisers should offer the intended ideas in an ostensive way to ensure that the intended message will be adequately relevant to the audience in order to fulfill their real task; to boost the sales of the products. The ostensive behavior in advertising is designed to catch the people's attention and make their attention focus on the advertiser's meaning, because human beings naturally focus on the most relevant things, which is a general cognitive law. So an act of ostension in advertising communication actually is a call for attention. Since processing information requires effort, the request to undertake the task has to be accompanied by reward. By requesting the audience's attention, the advertiser indicates that he is providing some relevant information which will make the audience's effort worthwhile.

Xu (2013) provides crucial insights on how ostension or ostensive stimuli operates in a communication process. Just like advertising communication, political utterances at a rally are highly intentional; to influence the cognitive inclinations of the audience to win political support. To achieve this, a politician has to offer informative intention for what he/she intends to

communicate in the political utterance. The informative intention then becomes the evidence for the audience to infer the speaker's intention. As far as this study was concerned, the speaker's intention in the political utterances was to communicate hate speech message. Therefore, this study was interested in establishing the kind of ostensive stimuli (as the speaker's informative intention) used by political speakers to direct the hearer to the intended message on hate speech in the utterance

## **2.5 Political discourse**

This section presents information contained in research reports on political discourse. The purpose of the literature review in this section is to shed light on political discourse by presenting information related to this study and as well expose the gaps being filled by the study as captured in the study objectives.

The study of political discourse, like that of other areas of discourse analysis, covers a broad range of subject matter and draws a wide range of analytic methods. Studies on political discourse exist in both unpublished and published sources. Literature review on political discourse in Kenya that is related to this study revealed just a handful of studies. Haugerud & Njogu (1991) conducted a research on Kenyan rallies in which they analysed data presented in Embu language. The study investigated aspects of language use such as dialogue and code-switching. This study found out that political language is predominantly implied and political speakers are strategists who get engaged in collusive pretence by conveying their information in such a way that they realise their individual and national goals. The findings by Haugerud & Njogu (1991) have provided crucial hints to this study in terms of general language use by politicians in Kenya. However, the study by Haugerud & Njogu (1991) does not establish some specific linguistic strategies that lead to building of implicatures in political speeches. Further,



Haugerud & Njogu (1991) do not show how politicians in Kenya utilised context to encode messages in their speeches. Whereas this study has specifically investigated encoding of hate messages in political utterances, Haugerud & Njogu (1991) looked at general language use in political speeches. Further, their study differs from this particular one in the sense that while theirs focused on Embu language, this study has investigated language use in political utterances rendered in English and Kiswahili at public rallies in Kenya. However, the study by Haugerud & Njogu (1991) remains an important point of reference on general language use in political speeches.

In a different study, Lwaitama (1995) investigated the presidential styles of oracy using a Critical Language Analysis approach. In this study, Lwaitama studied the speeches of former presidents of Tanzania Julius Nyerere and Ali Hassan Mwinyi focusing on vocabulary types, syntactic formations and extra-linguistic features such as pauses, giggles and chuckles. The study found out that the speaker's choice of vocabulary, type of syntactic formations and use of pronouns reflected the speaker's personal style and was conditioned by context of use. For instance, the second person plural pronoun was only used by both Nyerere and Mwinyi for praise. Whereas Lwaitama's (1995) study offers important highlights on political discourse, it does not reveal how politicians utilise context to encode hate messages while at the same time fulfilling the hearers' expectation of relevance. Still, the study does not reveal some of the linguistic strategies that the politicians use to encode political messages. The use of Critical Language Approach in Lwaitama's (1995) study is a further point of departure from this study which has used Relevance Theory by Sperber & Wilson. Critical Language Analysis approach is a rather general approach to language analysis whereas Relevance Theory is specific in the sense that it spells out clear guidelines on understanding and analysing utterances. In fact a relevance theoretical

language analysis can be undertaken within Critical Language Analysis. That aside this study differs from Lwaitama's (1995) study in the sense that this study has not been investigating presidential styles of oracy but political utterances as a kind of political discourse.

From a rather general perspective, Van Dijk (1997) observes that political discourse is defined by both text and context. Politicians generate political talk only when their talk is contextualized in such communicative events as cabinet meetings, parliamentary sessions, election campaigns, rallies and protest demonstrations. Apart from the crucial contextual dimension in the definition of political discourse and its many sub-genres, there is the element of structures and strategies of political text and talk itself. In analyzing political discourse, there is need to understand that there may be some properties that distinguish political discourse from discourses in other societal domains (like education, business, religion) which enables researchers to differentiate the sub-genres of political text and talk from the other discourses. Further, one needs to be aware of the distinctions within political discourse, for instance a parliamentary speech of a politician and how it differs from a campaign speech of the same politician. This is because discourse structures may have many functions, in many different contexts and in many different genres. Van Dijk (1997) concludes that once particular properties of political contexts have been analyzed, political discourse analysis in many respects will be like any other kind of discourse analysis. The specifics of political discourse analysis therefore should be searched for in the relations between discourse structures and political context structures. Thus, whereas metaphors in classroom discourse may have an educational function, metaphors in politics will function in a political context, for instance in the attack on political opponents, the presentation of policies or the legitimation of political power. An account of the structures and strategies of phonology, graphics, syntax, meaning, speech acts, style or rhetoric, conversational interactions, among

other properties of text and talk is therefore necessarily part of political discourse analysis only if such properties can be politically contextualized. Discourse structures may also satisfy criteria of effectiveness and persuasion. Thus, lexical items may not only be selected because of official criteria of decorum, but also because they effectively emphasize or de-emphasize political attitudes and opinions, garner support, manipulate public opinion, manufacture political consent, or legitimate political power. The same may be true for the selection of topics, for the use of rhetoric figures, the pragmatic management of speech acts, interactional self-presentation, and so on. In other words, the structures of political discourse are seldom exclusive, but typical and effective discourse in political contexts may well have preferred structures and strategies that are functional in the adequate accomplishment of political actions in political contexts. To this study, Van Dijk (1997) provided important hints on political discourse. The study has been carried out cognizance of the existence of several other types of discourses as explained by Van Dijk (1997) and therefore much effort was made to adhere to the scope of this study by restricting the study to political utterances rendered in pre-election campaign speeches for the March, 2013 General Elections in Kenya. Further to this, Van Dijk's ideas guided the study towards realizing its objectives in the identification and interpretation of linguistic strategies used by politicians to encode hate speech messages in political utterances. The study carried out the identification and interpretation of linguistic strategies in political utterances on hate speech in so far as they were used for political purposes since they could as well have been used for other types of purposes in social interactions.

Closely related to the current study is Habwe's (1999) study. The study investigated strategies in Swahili discourse at political rallies in Kenya with particular focus on textual connectivity achieved through cohesive devices, pragmatic meaning and topic coherence within Swahili

political speeches. The study used an eclectic theoretical approach that comprised of Cohesion approach by Halliday and Hasan (1976), Topic Framework approach by Brown and Yule (1983) and Implicature theory by Grice (1975) with reference to the co-operative principle to carry out investigation. The data for analysis was collected from political rallies in the major cities of Nairobi and Mombasa. The main methods of data collection were participant observation and audio-visual recording. The study found out that meaning in political speeches in Kenya is often implied and the strategies used by politicians to achieve implied meaning are metaphors and rhetorical questions. The study also established that implicatures in political speech are generated using code-switching, honorifics, truth, narratives, dialogue humour and politeness. These findings by Habwe's (1999) study offered important insights to this study though they did not address the research questions in this study. The very focus of Habwe's study; attempting to address several issues on textual connectivity issues of cohesive device, pragmatic meaning and topic coherence in Swahili political speeches, denied the study an in-depth study on any one of the aspects of language that it handled. For instance, the issue of pragmatic meaning in political speeches that this study has studied goes beyond mere use of metaphors and rhetoric questions to build implicatures to generate pragmatic meaning. There are other linguistic strategies of generating pragmatic meaning in political speeches such as ambiguity, reference assignment and filling in of ellipsis. This has formed part of the investigations in this study. Unlike Habwe's (1999) study which analysed Swahili speeches at political rallies, this study sought to analyse a more specific aspect of language use at political rallies; that is, political utterances on hate speech rendered in both English and Kiswahili. This specificity in this study to study particular aspect of language use in political utterances in Kenya enabled the study to employ one theory, Relevance Theory, for in-depth analysis.

Wodak (2007) adds that words and phrases in political discourse can receive different interpretations depending on the ideological framework in which they have been used. She explains that ideologies can be equated with intended and non-intended meanings; with illocutionary and perlocutionary forces depending on the context surrounding the discourse. This suggests a context-dependent view of political ideology; that different contexts and different audiences yield ideological dilemmas, basic contradictions and different readings (interpretations) when analysing certain political speeches or genres. These observations on context-dependent view of political discourse are a subject of investigation in this study. Part of the objectives of this study was to investigate how politicians in Kenya manipulate political talk to effectively utilize context to encode hate speech messages. Hate speech messages result into negative ideologies that lead to hate and discrimination against certain individuals or group of people.

The term 'political discourse' is suggestive of two possibilities; first, a discourse which is itself political, and secondly, an analysis of political discourse as simply an example discourse type without explicit reference to political content or political context (Wilson, 2008). However, as Wilson (2008) further observes, it is rather difficult to set clear demarcations between what is political and political discourse since political talk permeates even into domestic contexts.

Wilson (2008) acknowledges Orwell (1969) as having noted in his classic article "Politics and the English language" that political speech and writing are largely the defence of the indefensible. This observation is made in consideration of how language may be used to manipulate thought especially in political language. Wilson (2008) explains that when language is used to manipulate thought in political discourse, what is more important is not simply the occurrence of manipulation but the goal of such manipulation. This is because politicians seem

to want to hide the negative within particular formulations such that the audience may not see the truth or horror before them.

Wilson (2008) goes further to point out the works of the political scientist Murray Edleman (1971, 1977 and 1988) as echoing Orwell's concerns by looking at symbolic manipulation of reality for achievement of political goals. To Edleman, political goals influence the way one uses words, sentences and context to achieve the political goal in focus. This leads to words in one formation being interpreted differently when placed in another formation. Wilson (2008) interprets Edleman's symbolic manipulation as a form of transformation in political language. Wilson explains that transformation occurs when words and phrases receive varied interpretations in different ideological frameworks. These views by Wilson (2008) support earlier observations by Montgomery (1992) that in a political context a speaker who wants people to believe him/her and generally make them view the world in the way most favourable for the attainment of political goals, the speaker's language use must reflect transformation and representation.

Wilson's (2008) observations on political discourse provide important insights to this study as they shed light on what political discourse entails. As noted by Wilson (2008), political discourse as a domain of study can be difficult to set clear-cut demarcations on what it is that is under investigation since political talk permeates even into domestic contexts. However, this is not a problem to this study since the object under investigation is clearly defined as described in the scope of this study. Of great significance to this study were the notions on manipulation, transformation and representation as aspects of language use in political discourse. The discussion on these notions offered insights on the possible linguistic strategies that politicians use to encode messages in political talk. This was within the objectives of this study as it sought

to establish the linguistic strategies used by politicians in Kenya to encode hate speech messages and to investigate how context was used to transform language to represent the politician's thoughts or what they believed in.

From a sociolinguistics perspective, Bayram (2010) argues that the way we perceive language is the foundation of our social construction and individual or group relationships; and studies in sociolinguistics have tried to explain the relationship between the use of language and perceptions. Language use generates discourses which Bayram (2010) defines as a linguistic form of expressing oneself using words. Discourses can be used for asserting power and knowledge, and for resistance and critique. In a discourse, the speaker expresses his/her ideological content in the text as does the linguistic form of the text.

Politics, being a struggle for power to put certain political, economic and social ideas into practice, language plays a crucial role. Every political action is prepared, accompanied, influenced and played by language. The linguistic texts developed to realize political goals are then described as political discourses. Political discourse is therefore a result of politics and it is historically and culturally determined. It fulfils different functions due to different political activities and it has a thematic dimension because its topics are primarily related to politics such as political activities, political ideas and political relations. Language, both in politics and elsewhere, has a key role in the exchange of values in social life and transforming power into right and obedience into duty. It may both create power and become an area where power can be applied. Social values and beliefs are the product of the institutions and organizations around us, and are created and shared through language. The views contained in a linguistic text (or discourse) correspond to the views of the social status of language users, thus providing simple labels which evoke social stereotypes that go far beyond language itself. For instance, listening

to a given variety, acts as a trigger or stimulus that evokes attitudes or prejudices or stereotypes about the community to which the speaker is thought to belong. Bayram (2010) further observes that the manner in which individuals choose and use different language systems varies according to who the speakers are, how they perceive themselves and what identity they want to project. Language use varies according to whether the situation is public or private, formal or informal, who is being addressed and who might be able to overhear. The preceding description fits political discourse; given that politics is concerned with power: the power to make decisions, to control resources, to control other people's behaviour and often to control their values. Bayram (2010) further explains that the main purpose of politicians is to persuade their audience of the validity of their political claims. Political influence flows from employment of resources that shape the beliefs and behaviour of others. Common resources include expert skills, the restriction of information, the ability to confer favours on others or to injure them without physical force, and subtle or crude bribery. Experienced politicians make use of tools such as presuppositions and implicatures in political discourse. Such tools lead the listener to make assumptions about the existence of information that is not made explicit in what is said, but that might be deduced from what was said.

To this study, Bayram's (2010) observations have offered important insights. They have shed light on the nature of language as a system of social construction that is used to carry the intention of the speaker and this has assisted the study to achieve its objectives. Apart from simplifying the notion of political discourse, Bayram's (2010) assertions that language as a system of communication shapes character of a person and builds an ideology that influences behaviour gives support on the motivation behind this study; that political utterances in Kenya, when coded with hate speech messages, triggers the Kenyan people into developing prejudices



and stereotypes that set them against each other. This study has gone further to establish how politicians in Kenya use language and context to achieve this. Bayram's (2010) identification of presuppositions and implicatures as aspects of language use that skilled politicians employ so as to influence the behaviour of their listeners has been a subject of investigation in this study.

From a different theoretical dimension, Habwe (2010) uses the revised Gricean inferential model to discuss the pragmatic role of dialogue structures in Kenyan political harangues. Habwe (2010) observes that Kenya has a political arrangement that is highly replete with class, tribal, political party, religious, cultural and even racist interests. The political system is therefore endemic to a lot of conflict and show of power that usually plays out during rally harangues. Political speech making is a time to calculate, strategize, influence, coerce, promise or even revise and declare party or even government positions. As such, lot of tact and strategy is therefore needed for this purpose. Strategies like use of metaphor, narratives, similes, hyperbolic usage, symbolism, humor and dialogue are extensively used to achieve various goals of speech animators which range from personal, sectional, tribal to national or even international.

Habwe (2010) argues that Kenyan political speech animation can be a tricky affair since partisan, biased and other varied interests have to be served. The paper demonstrates that use of dialogue in political speeches is a very central strategy for engaging the Kenyan audience. Dialogue is technically to be understood as a discourse activity which has two or more participants taking alternating turns. Habwe (2010) notes that most of the dialogue in Kenya begins when the speechmaker salutes the audience. It would seem the greeting or salutation constitutes a formulaic opening in Kenyan speeches. A greeting could be followed by a party slogan or could be used in place of such a slogan. For example:

Speaker: *Hamjambo* (How are you?)

Audience: *Hatujambo!* (Fine!)

This initial interaction sets pace for what follows. The entire speech event has a lot of activity such as storytelling, finger flashing and general signing, praise, singing, shouting background noise and the dialogic channel that is carefully used by both parties. The audience could begin by setting the topic of the day. Let us look at this more recent example:

Speaker: *Sisi tuko namba ngapi?* (What number are we?)

Audience: *Unga! Unga! Unga!* (Flour! Flour! Flour!)

Habwe's (2010) interpretation of this dialogue is that speaker wants to discuss development, which is regarded as a serious issue at one of the rallies in Kibera slum in Nairobi. However, the audience rejects that and instead asks the speaker to discuss issues of inflation that have affected prices of basic commodities like flour. The speaker is compelled to comply with the change of topic and goes ahead to talk about the inflation that has taken maize flour to unaccepted levels beyond abilities of the common person.

Habwe (2010) argues that it is generally assumed in discourse literature that the *ordos naturalis* of a political speech structure is monologic. This means it is expected that one speaker will be taking the floor from the beginning of a speech to the end. However, when we look at the political speeches from Kenya rendered during rallies, we find dialogue like the one referred to above as one of the significant features. The use of the dialogue structure seems a violation of manner of presentation and therefore pointing to some implicature. Habwe's paper illustrates that dialogue structure in political rally speeches in Kenya is a technique that serves several purposes.

Political speakers use dialogue in their political rally speeches as a technique to solicit for support from the audience. This is achieved through the speaker engaging the audience in question and answer dialogue. Given that the audience can make the right inference when a political speaker asks a question, Habwe (2010) argues that it is possible that part of the audience may not believe in what is being said and this constitutes flouting the maxim of quality. However, the politician asks the question in such a way that there can be only one answer in the unfolding context that enhances support for the speaker from the audience.

Political speakers also use dialogue in their speeches to gauge their popularity as politicians. When the audience replies to a politician's question in the affirmative while expressing support for the politician, the reply is interpreted as a confirmation of the politician's popularity. Alternatively, a political speaker may want to monitor or gauge how popular what he/she is saying is and this is achieved through dialogue. Thus, dialogue in this respect becomes quite a resourceful technique for audience-monitoring since it provides a way of looking at the audience. There are cases when the audience may refuse to make a positive response. In such case, a politician might be forced to change information or strategy altogether since political rallies in Kenya have to do with telling the people what they want to hear.

Habwe (2010) goes further to note that the audience most of the time never disagrees with the speaker. However, it is the amount of people answering the question that politicians use as gauge for support. If what the politician is saying is unpopular, then, only a few people would respond. Sometimes there is total silence and this is indicative of non-compliance. If the whole audience is in compliance, then, the response is encouraging. There are instances of coerced support for a politician. Some politicians put their supporters strategically in the crowd to keep cheering the speaker every time he initiates some form of dialogue. Habwe (2010) cites Haugerud & Njogu

(1991) as describing this form of dialogue in political speeches as stage-managed drama. In such kinds of drama, the supporters know that what they are supporting is not necessarily true but it is for popularizing a certain position, agenda, party or political figure as a result of threat, bribery or promise of some favor.

Another function of dialogue in political rally speeches is to retain and sustain the interest of the listeners. There is a high likelihood that the audience could lose interest. To keep the audience alive, happy and make them stay, you have to maintain a continuous dialogue. This way, the audience feels that it is sharing in the role of speech animation. Such a feeling helps to tie together the speaker and the audience. In this way whatever information that is being given is likely to be perceived as coming from the people (Habwe, 2010).

Another strategy for initiating dialogue in political speeches is via rhetorical questions (Habwe, 2010). When it is initiated through rhetorical questions, sometimes it may serve as a politeness strategy. The meaning that is implied in the rhetorical question is later shouted by people. In that way, the speaker manages to observe politeness maxim for not uttering a face-threatening act by him/her. The speaker resorts to the use of the audience to say it as he/she takes cover under the rhetorical question.

This aspect of dialogue may seem like it does not have serious pragmatic implications. However, through it, we are able to tell that a speaker is not a sole speech maker. All he speaks is not new. This is because the audience seems to know what he is saying. Such a position then lends support to what Blommaert (1990) observes that oral speeches do not seem like they are a ground of saying new ideas. They are, rather, grounds for reiterating, repeating, rephrasing, mobilizing and urging people about certain known policies, positions and aspects.

Habwe (2010) concludes that political rallies are not a locus of completely new information but rather a locus of ideas which even the audience is aware of. Political speech making is a venture where the speaker is as important as the listener because they are all involved in the dual process of speaking and listening and a lot of bargain has to be made on both sides of the divide. The speech making therefore demands a lot of tact and strategy to engage the audience in a way that is meaningful and one that would not lead to reprisal from the high handed government of the day and from the audience which the politician has to appease by talking about what they want and in a way they want. The people who would otherwise get bored and leave the rally are perpetually engaged, entertained and appreciated. The dramatic strategy though being of great benefit to the speaker, as he may initiate it himself or let the audience initiate it, most times puts the Kenyan politician at the mercy of the audience who could jeer or cheer him thus calling for great skill in the use of this inferential strategy and skill. The Gricean model provides an understanding of this kind of talk where what is to be said is only implied leaving the audience with varied interpretations.

Habwe (2010) offered some vital insights to this study and as well enhanced this study's understanding of Dandi Li's (2008) ideas on pragmatic interpretation of words in utterances. Habwe (2010) has helped to reveal important background information on the structure of political speeches in Kenya. The identification of dialogue as a technique in political rally speeches was a step in this study's search for linguistic strategies used by politicians in Kenya to encode hate speech messages. However, this study differs from Habwe (2010) in the sense that, unlike this study, Habwe (2010) does not pragmatically identify the individual utterances in political speeches and analyze them to identify the specific linguistic strategies used in making an utterance and how the strategies enhance pragmatic meaning of a political utterance. This

study has gone beyond mere identification of dialogue as a discursive technique in political speech-making and the dialogue structure as a linguistic techniques used to gauge effectiveness of other strategies such as lexical metaphors in communicating the intended hate speech message.

## **2.6 The notion of hate speech**

This section presents information on hate speech as conceptualized globally before narrowing down on how it is perceived within the current legal framework in Kenya. It is important to present the information in this section because hate speech form the genre of utterances under analysis in this study and all the study objectives are investigating a matter on utterances that contain hate speech messages.

The notion of hate speech first rose up in 1920s in America and it continues to influence human perceptions and relationships across the world. As observed by Walker (1994), Perlmutter (1999) and Odongo (2010), there is no universally agreed-on definition of the notion 'hate speech'. However, Walker (1994) says that traditionally, hate speech includes any form of expression deemed offensive to any racial, religious, ethnic or national group of individuals. Similar description of what hate speech is appears some social media sites which prohibit content that is understood to be hate speech; for instance, Facebook prohibits hate speech by describing it as content that attacks people based on their actual or perceived race, ethnicity, national origin, religion, sex, gender, sexual orientation, disability or disease is not allowed. Similarly, YouTube website says it does not permit hate speech and defines it as speech which attacks or demeans a group based on race or ethnic origin, religion, disability, gender, age, veteran status and sexual orientation or gender identity. Google, in its User Content and Conduct Policy, warns (in its veiled description of what is being described as hate speech) that users shall not distribute

content that promotes hatred or violence towards groups of people based on their race or ethnic origin, religion, disability, gender, age, veteran status, or sexual orientation. The Council of Europe's Committee of Ministers' Recommendation 97(20) provides a broader description of the term "hate speech" that the term covers all forms of expression which spread, incite, promote or justify racial hatred, xenophobia, anti-Semitism or other forms of hatred based on intolerance; including intolerance expressed by aggressive nationalism and ethnocentrism, discrimination and hostility against minorities, migrants and people of immigrant origin. This study embraces all these descriptions of hate speech. However, these descriptions of hate speech do not capture the cognitive aspect of what hate speech content does on the mind of the hearer. This study therefore goes further to conceptualize hate speech as a form of manipulative discourse designed to be offensive to someone or a group of people on the basis of ones membership to a race, religion, ethnicity or nationality. Manipulative discourse, in this case, involves expressions which achieve some degree of mental-twist on the hearer by making the hearer to perceive issues from the speaker's perspective.

In a paper on 'Guidelines for Monitoring Hate Speech in Kenya', The National Cohesion and Integration Commission (NCIC) (2010) observes that hate speech is a term which refers to a whole spectrum of negative discourse, stretching from hate or prejudice and inciting to hatred. Hate speech is designed to degrade, intimidate, or incite violence or prejudicial action against a person or group of people based on their race, ethnicity, nationality, religion, language ability, or appearance (such as height, weight, and hair color). Although hate speech, as described here, is termed as "speech", it covers not only oral or written communication but also any other form of expression such as movies, arts, gestures (symbolic speech). In hate speech, words are not "only words", but "words that wound" which lead to harm and violence.

NCIC (2010) cites The Kenya National Commission on Human Rights (KNCHR) as having reported that the 2005 referendum in Kenya was characterized by deception, chauvinism and hate speech which enhanced feelings of ethnic hatred among Kenyans. Monitoring of the 2007 elections by KNHCR also revealed that the campaigns were riddled with political propaganda and hate speech. The way the politicians handled the campaigns contributed to the climate of heightened ethnic hatred that resulted into the infamous 2007-2008 Post-Election Violence in Kenya.

The greatest problem with combating hate speech is not the law; the law is quite sufficient, but its observance and application by organs charged with responsibility of monitoring hate speech is the problem. This problem is caused mainly by the lack of awareness on what hate speech entails and underestimating the dangers of hate speech for the society as a whole (NCIC, 2010). Oginde (2017) augments the observation by NCIC (2010) by noting that applying hate speech laws to mitigate spread of hate speech is futile if real issues are not addressed. However, Oginde does not expound on what he means by 'real issues' and this study takes it that sources of variance in meaning of utterances on hate speech between the speaker and hearer is part of the real issues affecting handling of hate speech in Kenya. These observations by NCIC (2010) open up the knowledge gap under investigation in this study. In an attempt to understand what hate speech is, this study sought to establish aspects of language use in political utterances containing hate speech messages.

Further, NCIC (2010) acknowledges that in implementing the mandate and provisions of the National Cohesion and Integration Act, 2008, NCIC has met a number of challenges. These challenges have arisen due to lack of proper definition of the parameters within which hate speech operates as well as lack of proper guidelines on identification of hate speech. In order to



address these challenges, NCIC has introduced guidelines to streamline classification of speech and information that may qualify as hate speech and thus face exclusion from the freedom of speech principle.

In characterizing what constitutes hate speech, NCIC observes that not all speech or expression with racial or ethnic perspectives amounts to hate speech. In determining whether a certain speech is hate speech, or was intended to stir up or incite ethnic hatred, the inquiry on that aspect of speech is factually driven. A number of factors may have to be considered beyond the mere fact that ‘ethnicity’ formed part of a given speech. In some exceptional circumstances, even somewhat ‘neutral’ statements based on ethnicity may meet the requirements of hate speech. According to NCIC, the following factors may be taken into account in determining a linguistic item on hate speech:

(a) The speech needs to be examined as one whole; merely picking out a section of the speech that is ambiguous and when heard on its own could raise questions about the intention of the speaker does not help in defining hate speech. The entire speech must be taken into account.

(b) Attention may be paid to the actual language (use), tone of the language or expression; this may be supported by examining whether the language intended to inflame or incite hatred or violence. Seeking answers to questions such as:

- i. Was the speaker using allegory in the speech or was it direct?
- ii. Was the tone one intended to fan emotions or was it calm?
- iii. What signs (paralinguistic features) were used in the cause of making the speech and were they violent?

(c) The accuracy of the statement; a speech on a historical or current fact or on a likely interpretation of a clause (for instance, a clause in the constitution) is unlikely to amount to hate speech. However, when the speech contains stereotypes or lies then it is likely to stir up emotions of hate; for example stating that traditionally, members of a certain community were known to be long distance traders may be a historical fact. But stating that members of that community are known to move about aimlessly would be stereotyping which would not be a fact and such an utterance could excite hate against the community.

(d) The totality of the context; the surrounding circumstances in which a statement was made could help define it. For example, if during a debate on whether leaders tend to fan ethnic hatred in their address a statement is made as an example, even though the statement itself may amount to hate, the speaker may not be perpetrating hate speech.

Having applied the factors stated above in analyzing a hate speech linguistic item, NCIC goes further to identify the following indicators of a linguistic item containing hate speech message:

- i. Speeches that cause hatred must be such that it will solicit disdain against a person or group because of their ethnicity
- ii. Speeches or utterances that encourage ethnic, religious or group violence must encourage the audience into some negative action.
- iii. Utterances that depict others as inherently inferior must infer superiority and inferiority to parallel groups.
- iv. Utterances that degrade others must infer or state that another person is a lesser human.

- v. Utterances that dehumanizes must state or infer that the other person is not human, for instance, calling them a weed.
- vi. Use of cultural stereotypes; the generalization or categorization of a group while depicting them in a negative way.
- vii. Utterances that promote discrimination on the basis of tribe, color, ethnic group, religious group.
- viii. Use of abusive, negative and insulting language.
- ix. Use of inciting and/or provocative language.
- x. Use of stories that profile people and communities negatively.
- xi. Use of imagery, poems, metaphor and proverbs which could stir up ethnic hatred.
- xii. Pictures published in media which could lead to ethnic, religious, or racial discrimination.
- xiii. Stories or essays used by the media houses to depict others less inferior or which could be used to propagate hatred.
- xiv. Ridiculing of another on basis of ethnicity, race or religious belief.
- xv. Use of alarming language.

The information on hate speech by NCIC was quite insightful to this study. Apart from providing the study with guidelines on how to identify linguistic items with hate speech messages, it provided a comprehensive framework on what hate speech entails. The guidelines on hate speech stated above by NCIC (2010) were reference points to this study in fulfilling the first objective on identification of political utterances with hate speech messages. The guidelines by NCIC further assisted to contextualize the principles suggested in Relevance Theory on how to

understand utterances. Though not having used the exact technical terms, NCIC (2010) supports the argument that effective analysis of the meaning of an utterance starts with the search for explicatures (interpretation of the language unit as a code for communication) and proceeds with the search for implicatures (which are arrived at by the analysis of context of the utterance). However, NCIC (2010) does not make an explanation on how to arrive at some of the linguistic strategies that peddlers of hate speech use to encode hate messages in their utterances. Still, NCIC (2010) fails to provide an account on how context is utilized by speakers to encode hate speech messages. Further, NCIC (2010) does not make a statement on how politicians in Kenya use linguistic strategies to generate multiple linguistic interpretations in political utterances on hate speech and how such strategies enable them deny certain interpretations of meaning given to their utterances. This study has provided responses to fill these gaps so as to assist agencies fighting against hate speech on how to empirically determine political utterances on hate speech.

## **2.7 Application of Relevance Theory in linguistic studies**

The literature review presented in this section was aimed at providing evidence and support to Relevance Theory as a framework for analysing and interpreting utterances. The key concepts under investigation in the study objectives are linguistic aspects of concern to Relevance Theory and therefore it is important that the study provides evidence on the practicability of the theory in utterance analysis and interpretation.

Kihara & Schroder (2012) observe that Relevance Theory has been applied to many research areas such as humour, media discourse, literature, politeness, translation, language teaching among others. Kihara & Schroder (2012) cites Yus (2010) as having noted that:

“... Research areas which take Relevance Theory as their theoretical framework are evidence of the dynamism and impact of this cognitive pragmatics theory of communication.” (p. 701)

Kihara & Schroder (2012) apply the principles of Relevance Theory in a relevance-theoretical analysis of aspects of ‘mchongoano’. ‘Mchongoano’ is a Kenyan speech event very similar to what Americans call ‘playing the dozens’. ‘Mchongoano’ is a playful teasing game that is based on mutual understanding by the contestants that the created insult is meant to be funny and not to be taken as critique or insult. In a paper on this study, Kihara & Schroder (2012) discuss a pragmatic interpretation of ‘Mchongoano’ using Relevance Theory. The paper argues that humorous effects in ‘mchongoano’ are achieved after the hearer has recognised the intended insult of the joke that is created through the incongruity of events and situations. The incongruity of events and situations in ‘mchongoano’ violates the principle of relevance in Relevance Theory. Therefore the humorous effect of ‘mchongoano’ is realised as a violation of the communicative principle of relevance laid down in Sperber & Wilson (1986;1995;2004). The principle of relevance stipulates that every utterance in communication has its own presumption of relevance. In this study, Kihara & Schroder successfully use Relevance Theory to demonstrate that, in ‘mchongoano’, humour is achieved through entertainment of explicatures, metaphorical extensions and pragmatic recovery of implicatures, stereotypes and metonymies, and the disambiguation of homonyms in explicatures. This discussion by Kihara & Schroder (2010) has assisted this study by identifying metaphorical extensions and ambiguity as possible linguistic strategies identifiable in utterances interpreted through application of principles in Relevance Theory. Further, Kihara & Schroder’s findings on violation of the principle of relevance as discussed in Relevance Theory opened a fresh line of thought for this study that within

Relevance Theory, communication can be effective by violating the tenets of the theory. However, this study is different from Kihara & Schroder (2010) it sought to establish linguistic strategies in political utterances on hate speech; a totally different speech genre on which Kihara & Schroder mentions nothing about.

As a dynamic theory of cognitive pragmatics, Relevance Theory has also been applied in the study of intercultural misunderstandings in global communication to highlight the consequences, in the form of intercultural misunderstanding, which globalization and the information age have to face in intercultural communication (Schroder, 2012). Schroder (2012) discusses the relevance of cultural representations in the minds of individuals as they affect intercultural misunderstandings in the global communication process. Schroder (2012) says that cultural representations are the norms and values of a society which members of that society hold and act upon; and uses Relevance Theory to argue that because not all societies have the same value and norm system, communication problems between different cultures lead to misunderstanding. Cultural assumptions in intercultural global communication work like filters for understanding. The comprehension process that leads to understanding of an utterance takes place in two steps:

- i. Firstly, the information presented to the hearer is interpreted against the hearer's context; which constitutes cultural assumptions in the hearer's mind.
- ii. Secondly, the process of evaluating the information creates cognitive effects which lead to understanding or rejection of the message.

Schroder (2012) concludes that understanding of messages in utterances is higher between people who share cultural assumptions or orientation. However, things get more complicated when people with different thinking patterns due to cultural variations meet each other, as when,

for instance, participating in global communication process. Schroder attributes this scenario, in relevance-theoretical terms, to weak shared assumptions between the speaker and the hearer. The weak shared assumptions are due to difference in cultures between the interlocutors. Different assumptions which communicators hold in cross-cultural conversation are responsible for cross-cultural misunderstanding. Schroder (2012) proposes that successful global communication requires accessing the cultural assumptions of the different parties involved in the communication process. This is because every culture operates on basic assumptions and values that shape and determine the communication process.

The use of Relevance Theory by Schroder (2012) in studying intercultural misunderstandings in global communication is evidence for the versatility of this theory in interpretation of communication processes. The successful application of Relevance Theory in understanding the communication intrigues in a global inter-cultural communication, and to interpret pragmatic implications in 'mchongoano' is evidence enough of the efficacy of this theory in analysing communication events. However, the literature review on studies that have used Relevance Theory has not established any study that has used this theory in pragmatic analysis of political utterances on hate speech in Kenya. Therefore this study has gone ahead to provide such a study.

## **2.8 Conclusion**

This chapter has presented literature review relevant to the objectives of this study. The literature review presented has enhanced the understanding of the study on key notions in the study; context and manipulation, utterance meaning, ostensive stimuli, political discourse and hate speech. Further, the chapter has presented some evidence of studies that have applied Relevance Theory in pragmatic analysis of language as a medium of communication. In an effort to collect to respond to the objectives of the study, the literature review has been able to reveal the gaps

that this study has investigated. It has been established in this chapter that there is a deficit of empirically established knowledge to account to the debate on the interpretation of meaning in utterances on hate speech in Kenya. Thus, this study has gone ahead to investigate this problem.



## **CHAPTER 3**

### **RESEARCH METHODOLOGY**

#### **3.1 Introduction**

The chapter contains information on the research design that the study adopted and how the actual field research was carried out. It discusses the population for the study, sample size and sampling procedure, method of data collection and the procedural details on how data was analysed so as to realise the objectives of this study.

#### **3.2 Research design**

This study used a descriptive research design of a qualitative nature to pragmatically analyse utterances on hate speech in political speeches rendered during the official pre-election campaign period for the 2013 General Elections in Kenya. According to Mugenda & Mugenda (1999), a descriptive research design aims at describing a particular state of affair or an incident and it involves collecting data that attempts to describe human behaviour, attitudes and values. A descriptive research design is qualitative when it involves designs, techniques and measures that do not produce discrete numerical data. Stacks & Hockings (1999) add that qualitative descriptive research employs primarily non-quantitative observation techniques and involves discovering a variable and attempting to define or describe it. According to Babbie (2004), qualitative field research enables researchers to observe social life in its natural habitat by going where the action is and watch. In this study, qualitative data of political utterances on hate speech was identified from campaign speeches rendered during the pre-election period for the 2013 General Elections in Kenya. The utterances were descriptively analysed and interpreted as elements of human behaviour in verbal communication between politicians and members of the public as hearers (in Kenya). The process of identifying political utterances on hate speech, their

analysis and description was guided by descriptive principles of interpreting meaning of utterances as spelt out in the Relevance Theory (Wilson & Sperber, 2004).

### **3.3 Study area**

This study was interested in political utterances in speeches rendered by politicians in Kenya during the official pre-election campaign period for the 2013 General Elections in Kenya. Given that the study was investigating data of linguistic expressions that have already been rendered by politicians, the study area constituted archives of the three leading media houses in Kenya; Kenya Broadcasting Corporation (KBC), Kenya Television Network (KTN) and Royal Media Services (Citizen). These media houses captured and recorded utterances in political speeches rendered during pre-election campaign rallies for 2013 General elections in Kenya and stored them in archives.

### **3.4 Population of study**

The study population constituted a linguistic population of political utterances as a type of political discourse in Kenya. As defined by Wilson (2008), a discourse is considered political if it is produced by political actors (politicians in this case) and is intended to achieve political goals. In this study, politicians in Kenya did not form part of the population of study since the study was purely qualitative being interested in the identification, analysis and description of political utterances as aspects of human behaviour used for communication. As such, the study population constituted one thousand five hundred and forty three (1543) utterances rendered in fifty four (54) speeches delivered at sixteen (16) rallies attended by presidential candidates for the 2013 General Elections in Kenya. These were campaign rallies preceding the General Election held in the months of December 2012, January and February 2013.

### **3.5 Target population**

The study target population contained one hundred and eleven (111) political utterances containing hate speech messages as a linguistic population in fifty four (54) campaign speeches for the 2013 General Elections in Kenya. The study focused on this type of political utterances because of their fluidity in eliciting multiple pragmatic interpretations. It was important for the study to narrow down to a specific genre of utterances because political discourse exists in different genres which cover different topical issues and for different political intentions and purposes. Further, political discourse can be presented in different forms such as journalistic commentaries, parliamentary debates and political conferences (Habwe, 1999), print and electronic media (Wilson, 2008) and it is due to this that the study targeted political utterances on hate speech in pre-election campaign speeches for the 2013 General Elections in Kenya.

### **3.6 Sample size and sampling techniques**

From the target population of one hundred and eleven (111) political utterances on hate speech, the study picked a sample size of eleven (11) utterances as the main hate speech utterances. However, the study established that each of the eleven (11) political utterances with hate speech messages could not be comprehensively analysed without reference to the co-text of utterances surrounding the main hate speech utterance. This resulted into clustering of the utterances into eleven (11) sets of utterances with each set consisting of the main utterance of hate message and supporting utterances. Cumulatively, the main utterances and the supporting utterances resulted into one hundred and nine (109) political utterances on hate speech. The supporting utterances surrounding the main utterance provided a linguistic context upon which the hate message in the main utterance was build. This establishment in the data just confirmed the first principle of utterance as stated in Bakhtin's (1986a) theory of utterance that actual utterance must take into

account the already linguistically shaped context into which it exists; and that any concrete utterance is a link in the chain of speech communication (of other utterances). Therefore, in principle, the study used a sample size of eleven (11) sets of political utterances on hate speech consisting of one hundred and nine (109) individual utterances. The study restricted itself to the eleven (11) sets after it emerged that any further analysis was not generating any new data. This was the saturation point in data collection which Adam (2013) describes as the point when further data analysis does not generate any new information.

The eleven (11) sets of political utterances on hate speech that the study actually studied were identified purposively. Mugenda & Mugenda (1999) says purposive sampling is a sampling technique that allows a researcher to use cases that have the required information with respect to the objectives of the study. Cases of subjects to belong to the sample are hand-picked by the researcher because they are informative or they possess the characteristics required by the study. Babbie (2004) adds that purposive sampling is a type of non-probability sampling in which the researcher selects the units to be observed on the basis of his/her own judgement about which units will be the most useful or representative in the study. The study applied this sampling procedure because not all utterances by a speaker contained hate speech messages to be subjected to a pragmatic analysis to satisfy the objectives of this study. In applying purposive sampling to identify the eleven (11) sets of political utterances on hate speech, the study was guided by the following indicators of linguistic item with hate speech message set out by NCIC (2010.p13-14):

- i. Speeches that cause hatred must be such that it will solicit disdain against a person or group because of their ethnicity

- ii. Speeches or utterances that encourage ethnic, religious or group violence must encourage the audience into some negative action.
- iii. Utterances that depict others as inherently inferior must infer superiority and inferiority to parallel groups.
- iv. Utterances that degrade others must infer or state that another person is a lesser human.
- v. Utterances that dehumanizes must state or infer that the other person is not human, for instance, calling them a weed.
- vi. Use of cultural stereotypes; the generalization or categorization of a group while depicting them in a negative way.
- vii. Utterances that promote discrimination on the basis of tribe, color, ethnic group, religious group.
- viii. Use of abusive, negative and insulting language.
- ix. Use of inciting and/or provocative language.
- x. Use of stories that profile people and communities negatively.
- xi. Use of imagery, poems, metaphor and proverbs which could stir up ethnic hatred.
- xii. Pictures published in media which could lead to ethnic, religious, or racial discrimination.
- xiii. Stories or essays used by the media houses to depict others less inferior or which could be used to propagate hatred.
- xiv. Ridiculing of another on basis of ethnicity, race or religious belief.
- xv. Use of alarming language.

The choice by the study to use the eleven sets of political utterances on hate speech was constrained by the principle of saturation; an utterance identified as part of the sample size was subjected to data analysis and interpretation leading to description of its pragmatic features before identifying the next utterance. This procedure went on until the identification of utterances, their analysis and description stopped revealing any new information. It is at this point that the study assumed that the available data had reached its saturation point.

### **3.7 Piloting of instruments**

The instrument of data collection used in this study (that is, content analysis) and the entire methodology of collecting and interpreting the data were subjected to a pilot study. Calitz (2009) defines a pilot study as a mini-version of a full-scale study or a trial run done in preparation of the complete study. It can also be a specific pre-testing of research instruments, including questionnaires or interview schedules. Thus, a pilot study is carried out after the researcher has developed a clear vision of the research topic and questions, the techniques and methods, which will be applied, and what the research schedule will look like. In the light of this study, the pilot study involved mainly pre-testing of content analysis as instrument of data collection and a trial-out of theory-guided analysis of data applying Relevance Theory by Dan Sperber and Deirdre Wilson.

The piloting of content analysis as an instrument of data collection was carried out on a data of political utterances extracted from political speeches rendered during the by-election campaign for the Senatorial seat in Bungoma County. The by-election was conducted on 19<sup>th</sup> December, 2013 preceded by a one month campaign activities. The political utterances used in the pilot study were extracted from political speeches rendered at a political rally held at Kanduyi stadium. The study chose to pre-test its content analysis as instrument of data collection on these

utterances because they were uttered in political environment that was almost similar to that present during the main data collected in the March, 2013 General Elections. Firstly, the Kanduyi rally was attended by a presidential candidate for the March, 2013 General elections in Kenya and this reflected its political importance. As such the rally was attended by long-serving politicians in the country whom the study considered to have developed some mastery in use of political language. Secondly, because of the political significance of the Kanduyi rally, journalists from a number of media houses attended to record the entire political rally.

The process of data collection was carried out in stages. The first stage involved the researcher attending the political rally in Kanduyi as a participant-observer. The researcher used a high sensitivity microphone to capture the speeches and record them using a digital recorder. This data was stored to be used for corroborative purposes against the data that was collected from media houses.

The second stage of data collection involved the researcher visiting the major media houses that were proposed to provide the data of political utterances for this study. The researcher visited the archives of KTN, KBC and CITIZEN media stations and used content analysis to collect political speeches recorded during the Bungoma Senatorial By-election political rally at Kanduyi Stadium.

The third stage of data collection involved pre-data analysis. This involved corroborating the speeches collected at the media houses against each other. It was established that the speeches from the three media houses exhibited very negligible variations since the speeches had not been edited. This was confirmed by a further corroboration of these speeches against those collected by the researcher using participant observer mode at the venue of the rally. This process

confirmed to this study that the error margin in data collection during the actual study was likely to be negligible and therefore the instrument of data collection in the study was reliable.

The next stage of the pilot study involved actual data analysis using content analysis as an approach of interpreting recorded data in communication research. The utterance below was extracted from a speech collected from the archives at the media houses and was used in the pilot study:

Speaker : *Mheshimiwa SIMBA, wageni wetu, mjue sisi tunabahati mbaya kama Mluhya.*

*Mjaluo hajapigwa na Kiboko vile sisi tumepigwa. Vijana wetu ambao wamesoma (Honourable SIMBA, our visitors, get to know that we have very bad luck as Luhya people. The Luo have not been beaten by Kiboko the way we have been beaten. Our young people who are educated), the top brass of the Luhya nation; engineers, teachers and all of them, they are asking SIMBA why Kiboko alitufuta Kazi. Kiboko amemaliza vijana wetu wote hawako kwa kazi... Mwalimu X... Kiboko amemfuta Kazi... Msichana wetu Y... Kiboko amemfuta kazi... (Kiboko sacked us. Kiboko has dismissed all our young people from jobs... Teacher X... Kiboko has sacked him... Our daughter Y... Kiboko has sacked her.)*

Response: *Aai!* (Expressing surprise with bitterness)

Speaker : *...na wewe Mluhya, kama wewe boda boda, mwenye umetoka class 8; wewe mwenye kukata miwa, umesoma mpaka form four, kama Kiboko anafuta vijana wetu wote ambao wamesoma mpaka vyuo vikuu wakaenda ng'ambo kazi, wewe bodaboda atakuajiri kazi? (... and you Luhya person, if you are a bodaboda rider who has come from class 8; you who is a cane cutter, who*



has read up to form four, if *Kiboko* has sacked all our youth who have studied to university level and even worked abroad, you who is a bodaboda rider, will he employ you?)

Response: *Hapana* (No) (Emphatically with bitterness)

Speaker : This is all about politics of succession. *Kiboko si mjinga* (Kiboko is not a fool).

*Mt. Kenya inajua jamii ambaye ina wanaume ni gani?* (Mt. Kenya knows; which community has men?).

Response: *Mluhya* (Luhya).

The above set of utterances fit into the description of hate speech as given by Perlmutter (1999), NCIC (2010) and Odongo (2010) that hate speech is designed to degrade, intimidate, or incite violence or prejudicial action against a person or group of people based on their race, ethnicity, nationality, religion, language ability, or appearance (such as height, weight, and hair color). It includes speech that advocates or encourages violent acts against a specific group and creates a climate of hate or prejudice which may in turn foster the commission of hate crimes.

The political utterances above were specific on the person and community targeted in the hate speech message; that is they targeted *Kiboko* (*Kiboko* is used here as a name code for the referent) as an individual, and the people living around Mt. Kenya as an ethnic entity. The message in the utterances is clear; *Kiboko* as the newly elected President of the Republic of Kenya had sacked certain members of the public service in Kenya because they do not belong to *Kiboko's* ethnic community. The intention of the speaker was to portray *Kiboko* and his community in the negative sense and this appears to have been achieved by the response given by the hearer to the speaker's question. Therefore, analysed against the indicators of linguistic item by NCIC in 3.6 above, these political utterances qualified as hate speech.

To this extent therefore, the pre-test of the instrument of data collection in this study had proved that the instrument of data collection would provide reliable data. The data would then be subjected to pragmatic interpretation to answer the research questions and achieve the objectives of the study.

### **3.8 Methods of data collection**

The researcher visited leading media houses in Kenya, KBC, KTN and CITIZEN, to collect political utterances recorded as political speeches. The political speeches collected were those stored in archives of the media houses having been recorded during the March, 2013 General Elections in Kenya. The study was only interested in political speeches rendered by politicians in Kenya during the three months official campaign period for the 4<sup>th</sup> March 2013 General Elections in Kenya. The official pre-election campaign period stretched from 1<sup>st</sup> December, 2012 to 2<sup>nd</sup> March, 2013. This period was preferred for the study because with the new constitutional order in Kenya, the period had heightened political activities with massive political rallies being attended by presidential candidates.

The media houses from which data was collected were purposively identified by the researcher based on their perceived popularity among Kenyans and their wide coverage of events in Kenya. The researcher visited the Kenya Television Network (KTN), Kenya Broadcasting Corporation (KBC) and Royal Media Services (CITIZEN) media houses to sample recorded speeches in their archives and collect speeches rendered by politicians in Kenya during the March, 2013 General Election campaigns.

The study collected political speeches that were rendered at rallies attended by presidential candidates for the March, 2013 General Elections in Kenya. The study restricted its data to those

political utterances rendered at political rallies attended by presidential candidates because such rallies were highly charged with political rhetoric to malign rival political outfits. Further, campaign rallies attended by presidential candidates attracted a galaxy of Kenyan politicians who have been players in Kenyan politics for a considerable period of time and such politicians were considered by the study to have acquired some mastery of language use in making political speeches.

The study used content analysis as its instrument for data collection. According to the United States General Accounting Office (1989), content analysis is a set of procedures for collecting and organizing information in a standardized format that allows analysts to make inferences about the characteristics and meaning of written and other recorded material. Simple formats can be developed for summarizing information or counting the frequency of statements. Babbie (2004) adds that content analysis involves the study of recorded human communications such as books, web sites, television and other types of electronic content. CSU Writing Guide (2004) makes it precise by describing content analysis as a research tool used to determine the presence of certain words or concepts within texts or sets of texts. As a research tool, some of the activities that content analysis involves are:

- i. Determining the type of analysis (to be carried out).
- ii. Reducing the text to categories (of relevant data).

In response to these activities, the type of analysis that was carried out in the identification of relevant data was on the identification of political utterances containing hate speech messages from the campaign rally speeches kept in the archives of the media houses. The actual identification of individual utterances on hate speech was guided by indicators of hate speech items as outlined by NCIC (2010).

At the archives of the media houses, the researcher listened to recorded political speeches and identified speeches made at political rallies attended by the March 2013 General Election presidential candidates. The speeches were digitally audio-recorded and the order in which the speeches were identified from the presentation of raw data at the media houses provided an objective sampling frame from which political utterances on hate speech were purposively identified and extracted to constitute the sample size.

### **3.9 Reliability and Validity of instruments**

The instrument of data collection was subjected to validity and reliability tests in order to minimize potential biases in data collection. According to Mugenda & Mugenda (1999), reliability is a measure of the degree to which a research instrument yields consistent data after repeated trials. Reliability in research is influenced by random error. Random error is the deviation from a true measurement due to factors that have not been addressed by the researcher such as inaccurate coding, ambiguous instructions to the subject and fatigue of participant. In this study, a potential source of random error was the likelihood of collecting political utterances that were already edited by journalists in the media houses. To minimize the possibility of a random error due to this and increase reliability of the research instruments, data from one media house was used to check for corroboration against a similar one collected from another media house. Data that had the highest degree of corroboration between at least two media houses was picked for analysis in the study.

Findings from analysis of data were also subjected to a validity test. As explained by Mugenda & Mugenda (1999), validity is the accuracy and meaningfulness of inferences which are based on research results. Validity is the degree to which results obtained from the analysis of the data actually represent the phenomenon under study. Mugenda & Mugenda (1999) go further to

explain that validity has to do with how accurately the data obtained in the study represents the variables of the study. If the data is a true reflection of the variables, then inferences based on such data will be accurate and meaningful. To increase the degree of validity of the findings in the study, the process of identification of utterances as the units of analysis from the corpus of political speeches was guided by properties of utterance spelled out in Bakhtin's (1986a) theory of utterance. Further, the analysis and interpretation of the individual utterances was objectively guided by tenets in Relevance Theory (Wilson & Sperber, 1986;1995;2004) so as to realise the objectives of the study.

### **3.10 Data analysis**

The data that was digitally recorded was subjected to content analysis in several stages. The first stage of analysis was to listen to the digitally recorded speeches to identify political utterances on hate speech to form the sample size. This was guided by the NCIC (2010) indicators of hate speech utterances stated in section 3.6. The texts of utterances on hate speech that were selected into sample size were then transcribed into written texts of sentence-like structures. The transcribed texts were of utterances rendered by speakers in either English or Kiswahili languages and they displayed language use characteristic of both code-switching and code-mixing of the two languages. The use of the two languages by speakers at campaign rallies was in an effort to enhance communication of the messages to the listeners given the multi-lingual composition of audiences at political rallies in Kenya. Thus, the second level of content analysis involved providing English gloss to the texts of transcribed sentence-like structures that were in Kiswahili language. The English gloss of texts in Kiswahili was arrived at through a process of translation. Newmark (1988) identifies several methods of translation such as word-for-word, literal, faithful, semantic, adaptation, free, idiomatic and communicative translation. This study

used communicative translation procedure. As described by Newmark (1988), a communicative translation procedure attempts to render the exact contextual meaning of the original (source language text) into the target language in such a way that both content and language are readily acceptable and comprehensible to the readership.

From the entire body of sentence-like structures, both the Kiswahili text with English gloss and the text rendered in English language, a final analysable corpus of sentence-like structures on hate speech was extracted. This was the third stage of content analysis which involved identification of the specific political utterances containing the hate speech message. This was guided by the NCIC (2010) parameters and it resulted into eleven main utterances on hate speech with several supporting utterances which provided the context for the hate message. The context provided by the supporting utterances provided a linguistic environment for the utterances to be pragmatically analysable.

The fourth stage of content analysis was concerned with pragmatic interpretation of the eleven sets of utterances on hate speech. As an approach towards understanding communication, Stacks & Hocking (1999) says that content analysis is a systematic and rigorous way of analysing messages in communication research. It is a measurement technique involving the systematic study and quantification of content or meaning of communication messages. This being a communication research study, content analysis of the eleven sets of political utterances on hate speech was guided by the following principles of Relevance Theory (Sperber & Wilson, 1986;1995; 2004), viz., the notion of context, the principle of relevance and the intentional component of cognitive principle of relevance.

### **3.11 Ethical considerations**

This study was carried out after having satisfied The Maseno University Ethics Board on its fulfilment of ethical considerations affecting social science research. Babbie (2004) interprets ethics as being concerned with matters of right or wrong. Babbie goes ahead to note that anyone involved in social scientific research needs to be aware or conscious of the general agreements shared by researchers about what is proper and improper in the conduct of scientific inquiry. West & Turner (2010) adds that ethics is the perceived rightness or wrongness of action or behaviour and determining what is right or wrong is influenced by the society to which it is applicable. This study has taken care of ethical considerations within social science research as presented below.

Most importantly, this study does not intrude into people's lives because what the study was investigating was already in public domain and therefore issues of voluntary participation were irrelevant to this study. The study was investigating political utterances which were rendered by politicians during political campaign speeches for the 2013 General Elections in Kenya. The purpose of the politicians in rendering the political utterances was to communicate certain messages; therefore the speaker's intention was to have the message in the utterance understood by the hearer. In this sense, therefore, this study was an effort to understand the speaker's meaning(s) as encoded in the political utterances from a linguistically scientific perspective.

To add weight to the above argument, this study did not involve studying politicians in Kenya as individuals. The study was only interested in political utterances as linguistic units of communication. The identification, analysis and interpretation of the political utterances on hate speech purely focused on the utterance as a linguistic unit existing in time and space disregarding the individual who uttered the utterance.

For purposes of protection of the speakers' of the utterances from possible harm and embarrassment, the presentation and analysis of data in this study used coded names. Use of codes to represent the speakers of the utterances and names of individuals mentioned in the utterances also enhanced anonymity of individuals. However, given that for some utterances the speaker and implied individuals can be identified in retrospect, this is purely coincidental and unavoidable given that this is a social science research. However, this study cannot be produced as evidence against anybody in a court of law since the analyses and interpretations in this study are acceptable within the study conditions stated here-in.

### **3.12 Conclusion**

The research methodology discussed in this chapter has highlighted the study population and target population upon whom the findings of the study will be generalised. Most importantly, the chapter has shown how the sample size was identified, collected and analysed. A pilot study was carried out to test the instruments of data collection. Ethical considerations were given attention in the study as well as data management procedures.



## CHAPTER 4

### DATA PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS

#### 4.1 Introduction

This chapter presents the analysis of data of political utterances on hate speech in Kenya. The utterances analysed were extracted from political speeches delivered by politicians during the official pre-election campaign period for the 2013 General elections in Kenya. The presentation of this data and its analysis has been guided by Relevance Theory (Sperber & Wilson, 1986;1995;2004) so as to achieve the objectives of the study while responding to the research questions.

#### 4.2 Selected utterances containing hate speech messages in the 2013 campaign speeches

This section presents and discusses political utterances that the study interpreted to contain hate speech messages in pre-election campaign speeches for the 2013 General Elections in Kenya. The study objective addressed by this section is implied but not overtly stated in the study objectives. The purpose of this section is to confirm that the study was actually able to identify political utterances on hate speech as relevant data needed for analysis to achieve the objectives of this study.

The identification of political utterances with hate speech messages in the political speeches collected from the archives of the media houses KTN, KBC and Citizen was guided by the NCIC (2010) indicators of linguistic items with hate speech message. According to NCIC (2010. P13), hate speech is designed to degrade, intimidate or incite violence or prejudicial action against a person or a group of people based on their race, ethnicity, nationality, religion, language ability or appearance. Odongo (2010) who echoes the same sentiments as NCIC (2010), generally

describes hate speech as words of incitement and hatred against individuals based on certain group characteristics they share.

Several political utterances in the campaign speeches rendered during the 2013 General Election can be interpreted to contain hate speech messages. Consider the utterances (A) below:

Utterances A.

Speaker 1: *“Nyinyi mlipiga kura kwa fujo kwangu. (You voted for me in large numbers.)*

*(Cheers, ululations, vuvuzela and intense whistling from the crowd) lakini*

*kura ilipofika Nairobi, ikafanyiwa ukarabati mpaka mkasema; no SIMBA...*

*(But when the votes reached Nairobi, they were modified until you said: no*

*SIMBA...)*

Response: No peace

Speaker 1: No SIMBA...

Response: No peace

Speaker 1: *Jamaa wakatoa bunduki. (Fellows produced guns) (A lot of laughter)*

*Wakaanza kupiga watu wetu; damu ilimwagika. Nilikuja hapa Kakamega,*

*nikakuta watu wetu wamelazwa; risasi kwa matumbo; risasi nyingine kwa*

*tumbo; nyingine hapa kwa paja; nyingine hapa kwa mguu. Si ni unyama*

*huo? (They started shooting our people; blood was shed. I came here in*

*Kakamega, I found our people hospitalised; bullets in the stomach, bullets in*

*the thigh, another here in the leg. Isn't that brutality?)*

Response: *ndio* (yes) (emphatically)

In the above utterances, Speaker 1 narrates to the hearer about the shooting of their people when the people demonstrated against manipulation of election results after the 2007 General Elections in Kenya. The use of ‘us against them’ by the speaker is evident in ‘*watu wetu*’ (our people) and was intended to create an impression of two groups against each other. It is noticeable that the speaker does not identify the person who does the shooting of their people. However, the speaker uses a question and answer structure to confirm if the hearer is receiving his message on the implied referent; ‘*Si ni unyama huo?* (Is that not brutality?)

The intention of the speaker in these utterances is to whip up the emotions of the hearer against a perceived enemy. This is to be understood within a linguistic context of utterances (B) that precede these utterances:

#### Utterances B

Speaker 1: *Tarehe nne mwezi wa Machi mwaka huu tutaona kivumbi. Kivumbi ya kuleta Kenya mpya ... Tumekuja manaake sisi kama Wakenya tunataka mabadiliko. Sio?* (On 4th of March this year we shall see a cyclone. A cyclone to bring new Kenya ... we have come because we as Kenyans want change. Isn’t that so?)

Response: *Eeh.* (Yes)

These utterances describe the March 2013 election as a cyclone for change in which the speaker’s political outfit (CORD) is the agent of change while the rival political outfits (JUBILEE and AMANI), by implication, do not want change. In this context therefore it could be concluded that those who do not want change would want to form a government that maintains status quo of what has been established by the outgoing government; and in this

context, manipulation of election results and the shooting of people as was done after the 2007 General Elections. Therefore the hearer should remember that the government agencies (the police) killed their people during the 2008 Post-Election Violence in Kenya. The speaker is asking the hearer, though not overtly stated, to hate or dislike their political rivals or competitors because they killed their people. It is important to notice the role of the possessive phrase 'watu wetu' (our people); this implies that some people in Kenya are not part of them ('watu wetu' [our people]) and it is this group of people that shot 'watu wetu' (our people). Therefore utterances (A) and (B) can be interpreted to contain hate speech message if understood within the description of the indicators of hate speech by NCIC (2010) that hate speech includes utterances that promote discrimination on the basis of tribe, color or membership to a group.

According to the indicators of linguistic item with hate speech by NCIC (2010), such utterances degrade others by inferring or stating that another person is a lesser human. Such utterances also depict others as inherently inferior by inferring superiority and inferiority to parallel groups. On the basis of these two indicators, utterances (C) below can be interpreted to contain hate speech messages:

#### Utterances (C)

Speaker 1: *Sisi tutatekeleza yale ambayo tunasema. Manaake sisi tunasema na kutenda.*

*Sio wale wa kusema na kutenda, kusema na kutenda* (with a sarcastic and derisive laughter); *kuiba ndiyo unajua zaidi halafu unasema kusema na kutenda.* (We shall accomplish that which we are saying. Because, we talk and do. Not like those of 'talk and do', 'talk and do' (sarcastic derisive laughter); stealing is what you know best and then you say 'we talk and do')

Response: (a lot of laughter and blowing of vuvuzela to cheer and show support)

The utterances (C) above are based on a popular slogan '*Kusema na Kutenda*' (To talk and to do) that was associated with the JUBILEE Coalition presidential running-mate; indeed it was adopted as a slogan for the politician's political party. Therefore, within the context of the Kenyan politics, a mention of the slogan was synonymous with the politician who coined the slogan. The main utterance containing the hate message is the sentence-like structure

*"...sio wale wa kusema na kutenda, kusema na kutenda; kuiba ndiyo unajua zaidi halafu unasema kusema na kutenda..."* (not like those of 'talk and do', 'talk and do'; stealing is what you know best and then you say 'we talk and do')

This utterance refers to the politician who is associated with the slogan '*kusema na kutenda*' (to talk and to do). However, the speaker does not mention the politician because the hearer understands who the referent is from the context. The speaker is demeaning the character of the referent by implying that the referent is a thief. This interpretation is reinforced by the sarcastic and derisive laughter from the speaker which attracts heavy cheering, shouting and blowing of vuvuzela from the hearers as a way of expressing acknowledgement. The intention of the speaker to portray the rival political coalition as a composition of untrustworthy politicians seems to have been achieved.

NCIC (2010) also indicates that hate speech includes use of stories which profile people and communities negatively. Utterances (D) below can illustrate this aspect:

#### Utterances D

Speaker 1: *Unajua ngiri? Anafanana na nguruwe; anasahau mingi sana. Akitoka hapa anafika pale amesahau. Sio?* (Do you know warthog? It resembles a pig; It is

so forgetful. It leaves here, reaches there and has already forgotten. Is it not so?

Response: (a chorus of laughter because the message is understood)

Speaker 1: *Sio?* (Is it not so?)

Response: *Eeh* (affirmative) (Yes)

Speaker 1: *Nimeona juzi ngiri anafanya mambo mazuri na mwenzake mpaka wanaandikiana. Baadaye, ngiri anasema eti shetani ndio alinipeleka huko.*  
(The other day warthog did good things with his colleague which they put in writing. Later, warthog says it was the devil that took him there.) (Derisive laughter)

Response: (A lot of laughter, cheering, whistling and blowing of vuvuzela)

Speaker 1: *Sisi hatuna kitu kama hiyo. Sisi tunasema na tunatenda.* (We do not have anything like that. We talk and do)

In these utterances, the speaker tells a short story about a wild animal called '*ngiri*' (warthog). The story says that '*ngiri*' (warthog) is a very forgetful animal so much so that when it is beaten at one spot, a little distance away it forgets and comes back to the same spot. In the political context in Kenya, '*ngiri*' (warthog) refers to an individual in the political circles in Kenya that is well known by the audience. This is explained by the laughter and cheering that the utterance elicits from the audience. As a lexical unit, the form '*ngiri*' (warthog) is used by the speaker to profile the referent as an individual not fit for leadership because he is so forgetful and does not learn from past political events. The intention of the speaker is to portray the referent who is the leader of the AMANI Coalition as unreliable person and therefore worthless. Within this interpretation, the utterances constitute hate speech since they dehumanize the referent by

inferring that he is or similar to '*ngiri*' (warthog). The speaker's intention in using these utterances seems to have been achieved going by the audience response in utterances (E) below which were uttered by speaker 2 who took the podium after Speaker 1:

Utterances E

Speaker 2: *Nani alikuwa deputy wa Mheshimiwa SIMBA?* (Who was the deputy to Hon. SIMBA?)

Response: NDOVU.

Speaker 2: *Alikuwa nani?* (Who was he?)

Response: NDOVU (Emphatically)

Speaker 2: *SIMBA alifukuza yeye?* (Did SIMBA chase him away?)

Response: *Hapana.* (No)

Speaker 2: *Alimfukuza?* (Did he chase him away?)

Response: *Hapana* (No) (Emphatically)

Speaker 2: *Nani alidanganya yeye?* (Who misled him?)

Response: *Shetani.* (Devil) (A heavy chorus of sarcastic laughter)

The utterances above come after the implied referent (NDOVU) had tried to sign a political pact between his AMANI Coalition and JUBILEE Coalition. After the said agreement, the JUBILEE proponents denied the pact and this portrayed the referent as a person who is easily duped for political mileage. The attempt to sign the failed pact was claimed by JUBILEE supporters as having been antics by the devil (*shetani*) to derail the JUBILEE Coalition from its focus on capturing presidency during the March 2013 General Elections. Based on this background information, when speaker 2 asks the audience; '*nani alidanganya yeye?*' (who cheated him?), the audience gives a chorus response '*shetani*' (devil) which is based on the claim advanced by

JUBILEE supporters. The response from the audience emphasises the speaker's hate speech message to portray the implied referent (NDOVU) as a person who is easily duped and one without firm principles. The intention of speaker 2 in these utterances is to portray the referent in the negative sense as a person easily duped even by 'shetani' (the devil). In this respect therefore, these utterances would qualify as hate speech since they stir up hatred and discrimination against the referent on the basis of his perceived political actions and association.

It is important to note that political rallies in Kenya are largely attended by an audience that support the set of politicians who are expected to speak at a given rally. This seems to have encouraged hate speech utterances because politicians were aware that they are speaking to an audience that largely constitutes supporters of their political coalition. As such, the spread of hate speech utterances in the 2013 General Election campaign speeches cut across all the major political coalitions.

There seems to have been a trend of each coalition trying to hit back or respond to verbal attacks from a rival coalition. In response to the hate utterances (D) and (E), Speaker 3 rendered the utterances (F) below:

#### Utterances F

Speaker 3: *Ni juzi tu ndugu zetu walikuwa hapa. Walikuwa hawatunii lugha nzuri...*

*Wale wanaosema JUBILEE ni ukabila tunasema ni mashetani. Washindwe katika jina la Yesu Kristo.* (It is just the other day our brothers were here. They were not using good language... those who are saying JUBILEE is tribal; we are saying they are devils. They should be defeated in the name of Jesus Christ)



Response: (Cheers and blowing of vuvuzela in support)

Speaker 3: *Vijana wenzangu Kenya mzima wanakufa njaa. Ni nani waziri anahusika na mambo ya vijana?* (Fellow youth Kenyans are dying of hunger. Who is the Minister responsible for youth affairs?)

Response: (Cheers and blowing of vuvuzela)

Speaker 3: *Ni mrengo gani?* (Which wing of politics?)

Response: ODM (Orange Democratic Movement)

Speaker 3: *Vijana wamenyanyaswa; wametapeliwa shilingi mia tatu kwa vitambulisho. Ni nani anahusika na mambo ya vitambulisho?* (Youth have been oppressed; they have been conned of three hundred shillings to acquire national identity cards. Who is responsible for issues of national identity cards?)

Response: (Cheers and blowing of vuvuzela)

Speaker 3: *Hata hawana adabu...* (Even they are not ashamed)

From the first utterance in Utterances (F) above; '*Ni juzi tu ndugu zetu walikuwa hapa*' (It is just the other day our brothers were here), it is evident that speaker 3 is responding to earlier utterances (Utterances C and D) delivered at the same venue where Utterances (F) were being delivered. While Speaker 3 is accusing Speakers 1 and 2 of having used disparaging language by referring to a member of his political coalition as a thief ('*kuiba ndiyo unajua zaidi*' [stealing is what you know best]) and dehumanizing another as '*ngiri*' (warthog), speaker 3 equally uses the same disparaging language by referring to members of the rival coalition (CORD) as '*Mashetani*' (Devils). These utterances received wild support from the audience and this encouraged the speaker to go on and describe his opponents as oppressors of the youth who

exploit the youth by illegally receiving three hundred shillings from the youth in exchange for national identity card as shown in this utterance:

*Vijana wamenyanyaswa; wametapeliwa shilingi mia tatu kwa vitambulisho. Ni nani anahusika na mambo ya vitambulisho? (Youth have been oppressed; they have been conned of three hundred shillings for national identity cards. Who is responsible for issues of national identity cards?)*

Finally, Speaker 3 describes his rivals as people who are still shameless even in the face of all these. The intention of Speaker 3 is to cast aspersions on the members of the rival political coalition (CORD) and incite the hearer against the CORD leadership. Judging from the audience response, the intention of Speaker 3 seems to have succeeded. In this context, Utterances (F) can be interpreted to contain hate speech messages.

NCIC (2010) states that hate speech is designed to initiate violence or prejudicial action against a person or a group of people based on their social grouping. Some political utterances in the 2013 General Election campaign speeches tended to prepare hearers for violent reaction in an attempt to ensure that the voting process was fair and just. Utterances (G) below can illustrate this argument:

#### Utterances G

Speaker 4: *Tuwe macho siku ya Jumatatu. Tusikubali kura zetu ziibiwe; kura zetu zikarabatiwe; kura zetu zisipotee...* (Let us be vigilant on Monday. We should not allow our votes to be stolen; our votes to be manipulated; our votes should not get lost...)

Response: (cheers and whistling)

Speaker 4: *Kwa sababu kila kura inamaana katika kinyangayiro hiki.* (Because very vote in this contest is important)

In utterances (G) above, the speaker was asking the hearer to be vigilant to ensure votes cast on the Election Day are not stolen or manipulated. Noticeable in these utterances is that the person likely to steal the votes that will be cast is not identified but merely implied; the ‘who’ to steal the votes as indicated in parenthesis below is not stated:

*“Tusikubali kura zetu ziibiwe...”[na nani?]* (we should not allow our votes to be stolen...[by who?])

However, the reaction from the audience (cheers and whistling) presupposes a known possible thief or thieves of their votes. In this political contest between the political coalitions, it can only be concluded that the implied thief or thieves are the members of the rival political coalition, JUBILEE. Thus, in the event of a malpractice during the voting exercise, the speaker is simply asking the hearer to take unspecified action against the ‘thief’. This can be interpreted as incitement of the hearer into violence or prejudicial action against a member or members of the JUBILEE coalition who are the implied thieves in this context by virtue of their political association. As captured in the linguistic indicators of hate speech utterances (NCIC, 2010), hate speech utterances must encourage people into negative action. Therefore, utterances (G) can qualify as hate speech. This interpretation finds support in the utterances (H) below from the speaker who came next:

#### Utterances (H)

Speaker 5: *Mko tayari?* (Are you ready?)

Response: *Tuko tayari* (We are ready)

Speaker 5: *Waambiwe haiwezekani tena kikundi cha watu wachache mno wao ndio walala hai na sisi ni walala hoi. Wale wale ambao wako Kiboko Park waambiwe hakuna tena mwananchi wa Kenya atalala hoi.* (Let them be told that it is not possible again that a very small group of people are the rich yet we remain poor. The ones who are at Kiboko Park should be told that never again shall a Kenyan citizen be poor)

Response: (Cheers and blowing of vuvuzela in support)

Speaker 5: *Hakuna tena; haiwezekani...* (Never again; it cannot be possible...) on Monday, earliest time possible ... let there be queues of liberation; of Kenya saying 'Never again are we going to tolerate bad governance. Never again are we going to see them manipulate results of elections.

Response: (Extreme cheers and blowing of vuvuzela)

Speaker 5: *Mko tayari?* (Are you ready?)

Response: *Tuko tayari.* (We are ready)

Speaker 5: ... *mimi nasema tuwe vigilant. Tuwe vigilant kabisa kwa sababu hatutaki safari hii kura ziibiwe. Wangapi watakuwa vigilant?* (... I am saying let's be vigilant. We should be vigilant because we don't want votes to be stolen this time. How many will be vigilant?)

Response: (Affirmative response of wild cheers and blowing of vuvuzela)

The excerpt below from utterances (H) now assists us to identify the 'thief' of votes implied in utterances (G);

*Wale wale ambao wako Kiboko Park waambiwe hakuna tena mwananchi wa Kenya atalala hoi.* (The ones who are at Kiboko Park should be told never again shall a Kenyan citizen be poor)

The above excerpt is spreading a divisive message of US versus THEM ideology. The utterance implies members of the JUBILEE Coalition who were congregating at Kiboko Park at the time speaker 5 is making utterances (G) and (H) at a CORD political rally convened at the Kasarani Stadium. The intention of the speaker 5 in utterances (H) is clearly to portray members of the rival political coalition (JUBILEE) as opportunists of bad governance who get political power by manipulating election results as seen in the utterance. In this context therefore, it is clear that according to speaker 5, JUBILEE Coalition is linked to the outgoing government which is characterised with bad governance as implied in the excerpt below:

*“...Waambiwe haiwezekani tena kikundi cha watu wachache mno wao ndio walala hai na sisi ni walala hoi. Wale wale amboa wako Kiboko Park waambiwe hakuna tena mwananchi wa Kenya atalala hoi.* (They should be told it is not possible again that a very small group of people remain rich while we remain poor. The ones who are at Kiboko Park should be told that never again shall a Kenyan citizen be poor)... on Monday, earliest time possible ... let there be queues of liberation; of Kenya saying ‘Never again are we going to tolerate bad governance. Never again are we going to see them manipulate results of elections....’”

This further lends support to interpretation of utterances (A) and (B) that JUBILEE Coalition is for maintenance of status quo. It is within this understanding that speaker 5 is describing the queues during the voting exercise as ‘Queues of liberation’. The intention of Speaker 5 is to influence and manipulate the hearer into getting convinced that members of the rival political

coalition, JUBILEE, are responsible for his current state of poverty and this is the time for the hearer to rise up against this injustice by ‘watching’ over the votes. Speaker 5 finally uses a dialogue structure of question and answer by asking the audience how many will be vigilant to ensure election results are not manipulated. Again, reading into the intentions of speaker 5, then utterances (H) could be interpreted to contain hate speech propositions. This conclusion is further qualified by the propositions in utterances (I) below by speaker 5:

#### Utterances (I)

Speaker 5: The message we are sending out today is that it cannot be heard that only a small clique of Kenyans will want to sit forever on the destiny of the Kenyan nation; will always be the ones to dictate the terms when it comes to leadership. We must say a big No to this selfish agenda.

In the context of the Kenyan political leadership, the intention of speaker 5 is to cue the mind of the hearer to remember that the previous occupants of presidency in Kenya constitute ‘a small clique of Kenyans’, and to lead the hearer into realising that presidential candidates from JUBILEE Coalition are from the same two ethnic communities in Kenya that have produced holders of the office of the president since independence. To speaker 5, the two communities constitute just ‘a small clique of Kenyans’ compared to the remaining forty ethnic communities. Thus, according to speaker 5, JUBILEE Coalition, within this interpretation, then has a selfish agenda. By implication then, speaker 5 is setting the hearer against the rival political coalition purely on historical facts; that the two communities which have produced presidents in Kenya have been dictating on the destiny of Kenya and this time round they should be rejected. Within this interpretation, then utterances (I) constitute hate speech.

Another set of utterances that can be given a similar interpretation are utterances (J) below by speaker 6:

Utterances (J)

Speaker 6: This election can only be compared to the election of 1963 which brought independence to our country.

Response: *Ndio Baba* (Yes Father) (with cheers and blowing of vuvuzela)

Speaker 6: For fifty years, Kenyans have wandered in the wilderness.

Response: *Ndio Baba* (Yes Father)

Speaker 6: They now have an opportunity, through this election, to change the course of history. There are two forces in our country... the forces for the retention of status quo and the forces for change.

Response: *Ndio Baba* (Yes Father)

Speaker 6: This struggle has been long. It has been very consistent; sometimes it has been very violent. That is how we can explain the assassination of Pio Gama Pinto, the assassination of Thomas Joseph Mboya, the assassination of J. M. Kariuki, to mention but a few... These are the dark forces of our history... We, this generation can change all these by voting for right on Monday, by voting for change, voting for forces of progress against the forces of stagnation, the forces of retrogression...

Response: *Ndio Baba* (Yes Father)

Speaker 6: ... *tunataka kumaliza utawala wa kiimla, tunataka kumaliza ufigadi, tunataka kumaliza unyakuzi wa ardhi.* (...We want to end dictatorship, we want to end corruption, we want to end land grabbing)

Response: (Intense blowing of vuvuzela and cheering)

Speaker 6: *Nimehesabu wakenya ambao waliwawa kinyama. Mtoto wa nyoka ni nini?* (I have counted those who were brutally killed. The child of a snake is?)

Response: *Nyoka* (A snake) (blowing of vuvuzela, whistling)

In utterances (J), the response from the hearers '*Ndio baba*' (Yes father) reflect the level of fanatical loyalty that the hearers have towards speaker 6, SIMBA. It confirms the analysis provided in section 4.1 that political rallies in Kenya are attended largely by an audience that supports the leadership of the political party or coalition that is addressing the rally in question. In the case of utterances (J), the audience has a fanatical support for the speaker. The speaker intends to make his hearer understand that if his coalition (CORD) is not elected into power in the forthcoming general elections, then the hearer is likely to get into a dictatorial and inhuman regime under the rival JUBILEE Coalition. The speaker tests if his message is received as intended by posing a proverb as a question; '*Mtoto wa nyoka ni?* (The child of a snake is?). The response from the audience confirms to the speaker that his intended message is received by the hearer. According to the speaker, the regime that perpetuated the assassinations is similar to the one that JUBILEE Coalition will put in place if elected in the forthcoming election. This is explained by the question he asks whose answer is given by the audience as '*nyoka*' (snake). In the context, this is interpreted to refer to the JUBILEE Coalition presidential candidate whose father was president at the time the assassinations were carried out. By this interpretation, utterances (J) can then be understood as containing hate speech messages and this fits into the NCIC (2010) indicator of linguistic item on hate speech that such linguistic items include use of stories to profile people negatively.



Another set of political utterances that can be understood as hate speech are utterances (K) by speaker 7 below:

Utterances (K)

Speaker 7: *Juzi Ukambani tumefunguliwa Syokimau, eti station ya gari ya moshi. Eti sisi Wakamba tukitoka pande hiyo, tuache magari yetu Syokimau. Eti tuingie gari ya moshi, hiyo mtungi tushuke Nairobi. Na wao wakitoka Central wanapanda hiyo barabara iliyo juu ya ngazi wakuje wa park magari yao Nairobi.* (Recently in Ukambani, Syokimau, a train station was inaugurated for us. That we Kamba people from that part of the world, we should leave (park) our vehicles at Syokimau. Then get into the train, that container, to alight in Nairobi. While for them, when they leave Central, they drive on the Thika Super Highway to come and park their vehicles in Nairobi.)

Response: (Cheers of bitterness and blowing of vuvuzela for the speaker)

Speaker 7: *Hiyo ni ubaguzi wa maendeleo* (That is discrimination of/by development)

If understood in the context of Perlmutter (1999) and NCIC (2010) interpretation of hate speech, utterances (K) can then qualify as hate speech. Perlmutter (1999) and NCIC (2010) observe that hate speech includes verbal expressions which discriminate one on the basis of their membership in an ethnic group. Interpreting utterance (K) within this definition, speaker 7 is implying that members of the ethnic community from Central are favoured with prestigious infrastructure while members of his ethnic community (Wakamba) are treated with less prestigious

infrastructure. These utterances are exploiting extra-linguistic evidences to incite one community of Kenyans against another.

In essence, the intention of speaker 7 is to instil negative perceptions in the hearer towards people from Central. As captured in the indicators of linguistic items on hate speech NCIC (2010), utterances by speaker 7 qualify as hate speech since they are intended to stir up ethnic hatred. The applause the speaker receives from the audience encourages the speaker to conclude that *“hiyo ni ubaguzi wa maendeleo”* (That is discrimination of/by development). Once the hearer is made to feel discriminated against even at the level of government-sponsored development projects, he/she develops dislike for the target ethnic group from Central. Thus utterances (K) can also be interpreted as containing hate speech.

Therefore, from the data of selected political utterances presented above and the analysis given to the data, it is evident that political speeches in the 2013 General Election’s campaign contained hate speech utterances. Data analyses in the sections below now discuss pragmatic interpretations of the hate speech utterances as guided by Relevance Theory by Dan Sperber and Deirdre Wilson in the light of the study objectives.

#### **4.3 Speaker’s manipulation of context to conform to hearer’s expectation of relevance**

Data analysis in this section helped the study to respond to objective one of the study: to establish how political speakers manipulated context to conform to hearer’s expectation of relevance when encoding hate speech messages in political utterances.

The notion of context and the principle of relevance for communication are tenets upon which Relevance Theory operates. According to Relevance Theory (Sperber & Wilson, 1986;1995;2004), the search for relevance in an utterance by a hearer is a psychological process

guided by the mental context of the communicators. Utterances raise the expectation of relevance in a hearer. An utterance is relevant to a hearer when it connects with the background information the hearer has so as to yield conclusions that matter to the hearer. The background information the hearer has constitutes the hearer's linguistic context. The theory describes context as a psychological construct which is a subset of the hearer's assumptions about the world. Cruise (2000) interprets correct context of an utterance as the set of assumptions which yield adequate contextual effects compared with effort required when combined with new information contained in the utterance. Schroder (2008) looks at context of an utterance as referring to some kind of encyclopaedia about the world which contains the values and norms of a society, personal belief system and cultural norms. In other words, context constitutes all the knowledge that the communicators will have stored in their mind at the time they enter a conversation.

Relevance Theory distinguishes two kinds of contexts: linguistic and situational contexts. Blass (1990) describes a linguistic context as including linguistic information that precedes the speech event while situational context includes virtually everything non-linguistic in the environment of the speaker. For effective communication, the speaker has a prime responsibility of providing a proper context for the interpretation of the utterance to the hearer; if not provided, the hearer ends up deciding on the most possible context of the utterance. One possible strategy that a speaker can utilize in an effort to provide a proper context for the interpretation of intended speaker meaning in an utterance is manipulation of the context surrounding the utterance. This study has adopted the description of the notion of manipulation in utterance interpretation as proposed by Maillat & Oswald (2009); that manipulation is a communicative strategy which

constitutes a form of cognitive constraint on the selection of contextual assumptions relevant to an utterance.

Speakers of political utterances in campaign speeches for the 2013 General Elections in Kenya largely utilized manipulated context to communicate hate speech messages to the hearer. Past events in the history of Kenya formed an important context for hate speech messages. Consider the utterances below:

“...*Nyinyi mlipiga kura kwa fujo kwangu.* (You voted for me in large numbers.) (Cheers, ululations, vuvuzela and intense whistling from the crowd) *lakini kura ilipofika Nairobi, ikafanyiwa ukarabati mpaka mkasema; no SIMBA...* (But when the votes reached Nairobi, they were modified until you said: no SIMBA...)”

Response: No peace

“...*Jamaa wakatoa bunduki.* (Fellows produced guns) (A lot of laughter) *Wakaanza kupiga watu wetu; damu ilimwagika. Nilikuja hapa Kakamega, nikakuta watu wetu wamelazwa; risasi kwa matumbo; risasi nyingine kwa tumbo; nyingine hapa kwa paja; nyingine hapa kwa mguu. Si ni unyama huo?* (They started shooting our people; blood was shed. I came here in Kakamega, I found our people hospitalised; bullets in the stomach, bullets in the thigh, another here in the leg. Isn't that brutality?)”

Response: *ndio* (yes) (emphatically)

In these utterances, the speaker is using events of the 2007-2008 Post-Election Violence in Kenya as historical facts to create an extra-linguistic context within which to advance the hate message on the ideology of ‘Us against Them’. In the context of the utterance, ‘Us’ refers to supporters of CORD Coalition while ‘Them’ refers to supporters of JUBILEE Coalition. The

speaker then uses a dialogue structure in which he allows the hearer to complete utterances that the speaker was saying as a way of confirming if the hearer and the speaker were now sharing the context created for the hate message on ‘Us against Them’:

Speaker 1: *...si ni unyama huo?* (is that not brutality?)

Response: *ndio* (yes) (emphatically)

The affirmative response indicated to the speaker that what the speaker was saying was felicitous to the hearer and context, and therefore relevant to the hearer. Relevance of these utterances is anchored in the intention of the speaker (which motivates the speaker’s manipulation of the extra-linguistic context) to communicate the ideology of ‘Us against Them’. The utterances, having been rendered in a pre-election campaign speech for the 2013 General Elections in Kenya are intended by the speaker to depict CORD Coalition and those who support them as victims of political violence perpetuated by government-allied agencies, especially the police. The effectiveness of the manipulated context so created by the speaker in communicating the hate speech message that is relevant to the hearer was enhanced by the atmosphere (social context) for change already established by the speaker in the speaker’s introductory utterances to the political speech as captured below:

Speaker 1: *Tarehe nne mwezi wa Machi mwaka huu tutaona kivumbi. Kivumbi ya kuleta Kenya mpya ... Tumekuja manaake sisi kama Wakenya tunataka mabadiliko. Sio?* (On 4<sup>th</sup> March this year we shall see a cyclone. A cyclone to bring a new Kenya ... we have come because we Kenyans want change. Isn’t that so?)

Response: *Eeh.* (Yes)

In this excerpt, the speaker describes the forthcoming general election as a ‘...*kivumbi*; *Kivumbi ya kuleta Kenya mpya...*’ (...cyclone; A cyclone to bring a new Kenya...). The speaker’s political coalition (CORD) is being depicted as the agent of this cyclone for change while the rival political coalitions (JUBILEE and AMANI), by implication, are pro-status quo. The speaker is utilizing two shared contexts: a manipulated context created by the speaker in which people want change and the manipulated context of injustices against the people during the 2008 Post-Election Violence to advance hate messages. It is within the manipulated contexts that the speaker uses the term ‘*kivumbi*’ (cyclone). Thus, the interpretation of ‘*kivumbi*’ (cyclone) and the ideology of ‘Us against Them’ are constrained by the manipulated linguistic context created by the speaker. Notice that in both cases, the speaker is using a dialogue structure of question and answer to confirm if the message he intends to communicate is received and accepted by the audience. Affirmative response from the hearer is used to determine the acceptance of the propositions in the utterance by the hearer; an indication that the utterances are relevant to the hearer. We can therefore conclude that the speaker has used past political events known to the audience to create a manipulative context for the utterances and thereby make the utterances on hate speech relevant to the hearer.

Use of historical events to create a manipulated linguistic context and thereby make utterances relevant to the hearer is evident in some other sets of utterances. Speaker 6 in the utterances below creates relevance of his utterances by making reference to events which took place a few years after independence:

Speaker 6: This election can only be compared to the election of 1963...

Response: *Ndio Baba* (Yes Father)

Speaker 6: For fifty years, Kenyans have wandered in the wilderness... they now have an opportunity... to change the course of history... the struggle has been long... that is how we can explain the assassination of Pio Gama Pinto... Thomas Joseph Mboya... J. M. Karuiki, to mention but a few... *tunataka kumaliza utawala wa kiimla, tunataka kumaliza uifisadi, tunataka kumaliza unyakuzi wa ardhi... nimehesabu Wakenya ambao waliwawa kinyama. Mtoto wa nyoka ni nini?* (...we want to end dictatorship, we want to end corruption, we want to end land grabbing... I have counted Kenyans who were killed brutally. The child of a snake is?)

Response: *Nyoka* (Snake) (Intensive blowing of vuvuzela and cheering)

In these utterances, Speaker 6 uses past events of assassinations to create a manipulated linguistic context that makes his hate message relevant to the hearer. The interpretation of these utterances is constrained the manipulated linguistic text of historical events in Kenya which may not be true because the speaker does not provide evidence of who committed the assassinations. Once again, the speaker employs a dialogue structure by posing a metaphorical question to the hearers. The answer given by the hearer then confirms to the speaker that the intended hate message has been received. Thus, the utterances cited above are evidence of how politicians make use of events in history to manipulate context for the interpretation of utterances. The manipulated context makes the utterance felicitous and as such make the intended hate speech message conform to the hearer's expectation of relevance.

Another context-related strategy used by politicians to make the utterances conform to hearer's expectation of relevance is the use of personal pronouns. Leech & Svartvik (1986) describe pronouns as words which function as whole noun phrase; and that most pronouns act as

substitutes or replacements for noun phrases in the context in which they have been used. Of relevance to this study is the use of the personal pronouns ‘we’, ‘us’ and ‘they’ in the political utterances on hate speech. Hakansson (2012) observes that the pronoun ‘we’ when used in political speeches expresses ‘institutional identity’. It depicts the speaker as a representative of or speaking on behalf of an institution. A speaker uses ‘we’ to manipulate context and create a divisive impression of ‘us’ from ‘them’ and thereby easy to give a positive picture of the group he/she belongs to while the other group is depicted negatively. Consider the following utterances in which pronouns ‘we’, ‘us’ and ‘they’ have been used:

Speaker 5: *Waambiwe haiwezekani tena kikundi cha watu wachache mno ndio walala hai na sisi ni walala hoi... tuwe vigilant kabisa kwa sababu hatutaki safari hii kura zimeibwa... (They should be told that it is no longer possible for a very small group of people are rich and the rest of us are poor... lets be so vigilant because we don't want this time votes to be stolen...)*

The first person pronoun ‘sisi’ (us) and ‘tu’ (we) in ‘hatutaki’ (we don’t want) in the above excerpt are used by the speaker to create a social context in which both the speaker and the hearer belong to the same institution or social class. This is a case where language is used to manipulate reality and establish a manipulated social context for the interpretation of the utterance. This interpretation is acceptable within the manipulated context already created by the pronoun ‘they’. An impression of ‘them’ against ‘us’ is created by the speaker’s use of the pronoun ‘wa’ (they) in the verb phrase ‘waambiwe’ (they should be told) and it is enhanced by the speakers description of ‘they’ as just a small group of people who are economically able, exploitative and steal votes to acquire political power; while the speaker’s political coalition (CORD) constitutes people who are poor and exploited and now ‘championing for justice’ in



Kenya. Remember, the speaker is a member of the political elite class and therefore in actual fact, he is economically wealthy. Therefore, in order to fulfil the hearer's expectation of relevance in his utterances, he uses an all-inclusive first person plural pronoun to break the class barrier between him and the hearer. Thus, the use of 'sisi' (us) and 'tu' (we) creates a shared manipulated context (psychological) that subverts the social order and creates a false one in which the hearer and the speaker share a socio-economic class. Such a manipulated context makes the political utterance on hate speech felicitous to the hearer and thereby fulfils the hearer's expectation of relevance. The hate message in the above utterances by speaker 5 then connects with contextual assumptions of hunger and poverty assumed to be affecting the hearer as relevant background information in the mind of the hearer to yield relevant contextual implications of 'hate' towards the JUBILEE as the implied referent. Some other sets of political utterances on hate speech in which speakers have used personal pronouns to create a context that makes the hate message conform to the hearer's expectation of relevance include the following excerpts:

From Utterances A:

Speaker 1: *Jamaa wakatoa bunduki... wakaanza kupiga watu wetu...* (Fellows produced guns... they started shooting our people...)

From Utterances C:

Speaker 1: *Sisi tutatekeleza yale ambayo tunasema... sio kama wale wa kusema na kutenda... kuiba ndio unajua...* (We shall accomplish what we are saying... not like those ones of 'to say and to do'... stealing is what you know)

From Utterances F:

Speaker 3: ...*walikuwa hapa...walikuwa hawatunii lugha nzuri...wale wanaosema JUBILEE ni ukabila tunasema ni mashetani...* (...they were here...they were not using good language...those who are saying JUBILEE is tribal; we are saying they are devils...)

In all these excerpts, the use of personal pronouns 'wa' (they) and 'wale' (those), vis-à-vis 'sisi' (us) and 'tu' (we) helps to strengthen the preceding argument on how political speakers in Kenya use personal pronouns to create a manipulated context of 'Us against Them'. For instance, speaker 3 above says '*walikuwa hapa*' (**they** were here)... '*tunasema ni mashetani*' (**we** say they are devils). The pronouns 'wa' (they) and 'tu' (we) are used to achieve feelings of hate in the hearer influenced by the ideology of 'Us' (referring to JUBILEE) against 'Them' (referring to CORD) implied in the utterances. The message of hate in these utterances is achieved because the utterances are made felicitous to the audience and context by the speaker creating in the mind of the audience the feeling of 'Us' against 'Them'; thus fulfil the hearer's expectation of relevance upon which hate speech messages are delivered. As explained by van Dijk (1998), use of contrastive dimension of 'Us versus Them' helps articulate mental representations which yield into building of ideological frameworks of power relations with one group (Us) presenting itself in positive terms, and the other (Them) in negative terms. In this context, the politician has used the 'Us and Them' dimension to advance hate speech message within a context that fulfils expectation of relevance in the utterance to the hearer.

Another incident in which politicians used manipulated context to fulfil the hearer's expectation of relevance is in the presentation of the current socio-political events in the country in a manner to twist the hearer's emotions or feelings so as to influence the hearer's ideological perceptions.

This is achieved through recounting of current and past events as a manipulative discourse intended to make the hearer feel insecure, threatened or discriminated against by the victim implied or referred to in the hate speech utterance. The excerpt below demonstrates this argument:

Speaker 6: ...for fifty years, Kenyans have wandered in the wilderness...

Response: *Ndio Baba* (Yes Father)

Speaker 6: ...this struggle has been long. It has been very consistent; sometimes it has been very violent. That is how we can explain the assassination of Pio Gama Pinto, the assassination of Thomas Joseph Mboya, the assassination of J. M. Kariuki, to mention but a few... These are the dark forces of our history... We, this generation can change all these by voting for right on Monday, by voting for change, voting for forces of progress against the forces of stagnation, the forces of retrogression...*nimehesabu wakenya ambao waliwawa kinyama. Mtoto wa nyoka ni nini?* (I have counted those who were brutality killed. The child of a snake is?)

Response: *Nyoka* (A snake) (blowing of vuvuzela, whistling)

In this excerpt, the intention of the speaker is to manipulate context to influence the hearer's emotions. By recounting past events of politically instigated murders of J. M. Kariuki, Tom Mboya and Pio Gama Pinto, the hearer is made to sympathise and empathize with the victims of political atrocities. However, when the speaker finally involves the hearer by way of the metaphorically framed incomplete statement '*mtoto wa nyoka ni...?*' (the child of a snake is..?) requiring the hearer to fill in the missing element '*nyoka*' (snake), the hearer provides the missing element with a feeling of insecurity. The hearer's affirmative and emphatic response

confirms to the speaker on the effectiveness of the manipulated context created by the speaker to communicating the hate speech message in the utterance.

The discussion in this section establishes that political utterances on hate speech in the pre-election campaign speeches for the 2013 General Elections in Kenya heavily relied on manipulated context for the communication of hate messages. The speakers created a favourable manipulated context to make the utterances felicitous to both context and the hearer thereby fulfilling the hearer's expectation of relevance in the political utterances on hate speech.

#### **4.4 Linguistic strategies and obscurity of meaning in political utterances on hate speech**

This section responds to the second and third objectives of this study: to establish the linguistic strategies used by politicians when making political utterances containing hate speech messages; to describe how the linguistic strategies are used by politicians to obscure meaning in political utterances containing hate speech messages. The two objectives are jointly discussed in this section because they are related and this avoided unnecessary repetition of data.

According to Sperber & Wilson (1986), the principle of relevance is crucial in deciding the propositional form of an utterance. When the correct context of the utterance is identified, the propositional form of the utterance is arrived at through structural and pragmatic processes of implicatures and explicatures of the utterance. Implicatures are implicitly communicated. Sperber & Wilson (1986) say implicatures constitute contextual assumptions and contextual effects; they form part of the intended interpretation of an utterance and they are recovered through criterion of consistency with the principle of relevance. On the other hand, explicatures are explicitly communicated; they constitute what the speaker said but not implied (Blass, 1990).

Cruise (2000) adds that in Relevance Theory, the explicatures of an utterance consists of all the propositions that are explicitly communicated by the speaker through the utterance.

Relevance Theory provides an account for comprehension of utterances. The cognition and comprehension of utterances has practical implications for pragmatics. Verbal comprehension of an utterance starts with the recovery of a linguistically encoded sentence meaning, which then must be contextually enriched in a variety of ways to yield a full-fledged speaker's meaning. The process of contextual enrichment of an utterance so as to arrive at the speaker meaning may involve resolution of linguistic features such as ambiguities and referential ambivalences, interpretation of ellipses, and other under-determinacies of explicit content. There may be implicatures to identify, illocutionary indeterminacies to resolve, metaphors and ironies to interpret. Such linguistic features of constructing a linguistic expression like an utterance constitute linguistic strategies of encoding utterance meaning. All these require an appropriate set of contextual assumptions (that this study has discussed in section 4.4 for political utterances on hate speech), which the hearer must also supply to be understood by the hearer (Wilson & Sperber, 2004). In the light of this study, the investigations in this section have discussed how linguistic strategies contributed to obscurity of meaning in political utterances on hate speech. The obscurity of meaning in an utterance is due to the ability of an utterance to elicit different propositions requiring multiple pragmatic interpretations. Thus, it is in this sense that this section discusses linguistic strategies in the political utterances on hate speech and how the linguistic strategies yield multiple pragmatic interpretations that could lead to obscurity of meaning in an utterance.

The comprehension procedures leading the hearer to the intended speaker meaning must involve linguistic strategies for identification of explicatures and implicatures of the utterance. The

hearer's linguistic strategies for utterance comprehension need to reflect the speaker's linguistic strategies for encoding propositions in the utterance if the interlocutors must engage in effective communication. Going by this argument, then the analysis of data in this study should reveal speaker's linguistic strategies for encoding hate messages in the political utterances. Thus, the following linguistic strategies have been used by politicians in Kenya in encoding propositions in political utterances on hate speech:

- a) Ambiguity
- b) Ellipsis
- c) Minimal propositional content
- d) Semantic incompleteness
- e) Creative metaphors
- f) Interactive dialogue structure

The discussion on each linguistic strategy goes further to show how the strategies lead to obscurity of utterance meaning occasioned by multiple pragmatic interpretations of political utterances on hate speech. The multiple pragmatic interpretations of an utterance constitute the range of propositions that can be generated in an utterance as a result of the linguistic strategy used in encoding meaning in the utterance when interpreted within the manipulated context shown in section 4.4. In Relevance Theoretical terms, the multiple propositions conceivable from an utterance are described as the implicatures of the utterance. Implicatures are all the communicated assumptions that are not explicit and which cannot be established by the semantic interpretation (Logical Form) of the utterance alone (Sperber & Wilson, 1995). The logical form of the utterance provides the explicatures of the utterance (i.e. the semantic interpretation of the utterance). In this section, the study discusses the linguistic strategies used to encode hate speech

messages and show how the strategies led into building of implicatures as communicated premises.

#### 4.4.1 Ambiguity

Fromkin, *et. al* (2007) observe that when words, phrases and sentences have more than one meaning, then they are ambiguous. Piantadosi, Tilly & Gibson (2012) succinctly say that a linguistic form is ambiguous if it can map to more than one possible meaning. However, language has a mechanism of handling ambiguity by conveying bits of information about the speaker's intended meaning. Wilson & Sperber (2004) in Relevance Theory observe that the speaker's intended meaning of the utterance is arrived at through a process of disambiguating the ambiguous linguistic form.

In the data of political utterances on hate speech in Kenya collected in this study, there were several instances of speaker's using ambiguity to encode hate speech messages in their utterances. Consider the following utterances below:

Speaker 1: ...*manaake sisi tunasema na kutenda. Sio wale wa kusema na kutenda, kusema na kutenda* (with a sarcastic and derisive laughter) *kuiba ndiyo unajua zaidi halafu unasema kusema na kutenda.* (Because we talk and do. Not like those of 'talk and do', 'talk and do' (sarcastic and derisive laughter) stealing is what you know best and then you say 'talk and do'.)

The focus is on the pronoun 'u' (you) in the word 'unajua' (you know) within the sentence 'kuiba ndio unajua zaidi' (stealing is what you know best). The ambiguity created by the use of 'u' (you) in this utterance can only be understood if the utterance is given a context-based interpretation; without which the ambiguity may not be evident. The utterance in which 'u' (you)

is used is delivered in direct speech yet the subject that 'u' (you) refers to is not specified in this utterance. It is therefore ambiguous because it could refer to the person being spoken to (the hearer of the utterance) or the person being spoken about who is not the hearer. However, the manipulated context guides the hearer to disambiguate the utterance by assigning the appropriate referent (J2) to the pronoun. Within the political circles in Kenya, the slogan '*kusema na kutenda*' (to talk and to do) is associated with the JUBILEE presidential running-mate (J2) and this becomes shared background information between the speaker and hearer which assists the hearer to disambiguate the utterance as to who the referent is.

Another instance of ambiguity is in the personal pronoun '*sisi*' (we) in the excerpt above as seen in the utterance '*sisi tutatekeleza yale ambayo tunasema*' (we shall accomplish that which we are saying). Given pragmatic interpretation, the personal pronoun '*sisi*' (we) in this utterance does not have a specified referent. It is therefore ambiguous because the speaker could be using the pronoun '*sisi*' (we) to refer to that group of politicians in the political coalition to which he belongs or to refer to himself and his hearers (audience) at that moment as a group of people who support the political coalition to which the speaker belongs. However, the linguistic context already created by the speaker enables the hearer to disambiguate the ambiguity created by the personal pronoun '*sisi*' (we) and assign the correct referent to the personal pronoun; that '*sisi*' in the manipulated context of usage refers to the group of politicians in the CORD Coalition.

The above illustrations of ambiguity in political utterances on hate speech fit into the preceding argument if the utterances are given pragmatic interpretation. They display what Ibrahim (2005) describes as lexical ambiguity. The lexical ambiguity in such utterances could probably explain why politicians in Kenya find it easy to deny certain interpretations given to political utterances they make. This argument is supported by the inherent ability of ambiguity as a linguistic



strategy to create obscurity of utterance meaning by yielding multiple pragmatic interpretations in utterances as shown below:

Speaker 1: ...*kuiba ndio unajua zaidi*... (...stealing is what you know best...)

Interpreted within the manipulated context, this utterance contains the following pragmatic propositional information:

- i. The subject marker 'u' (You) could have been used by the speaker to refer to the hearer of the utterance given that the entire sentence is rendered in direct speech.
- ii. The subject marker 'u' (You) could as well have been used by the speaker to refer to someone else other than the hearer of the utterance given that the utterance is in a speech being delivered to supporters of the speaker's political coalition and therefore the political utterances on hate speech are intended to wound a member of the rival political coalition.

The ambiguity in the above utterance is what Ibrahim (2005) describes as pragmatic ambiguity and it results into multiple pragmatic interpretations of the utterance due to the use of a personal pronoun 'u' (you) referring to an inexplicit referent. Notice that the ambiguity in the utterance is enhanced by the speaker using the pronoun 'u' (You) which lacks both anaphoric and cataphoric referent in this context. Thus, the pronoun 'u' (you) is indeterminate. A similar interpretation is applicable to other utterances like the one below by speaker (1) in which ambiguity has been created in the use of the personal pronoun 'sisi' (we):

Speaker 1: ...*sisi tutatekeleza yale ambayo tunasema*... (...we shall accomplish what we are saying)

On its own, the utterance above does not contain hate speech message. The pronoun *'sisi'* (us) has been used by the speaker within the manipulative linguistic context of other surrounding utterances to achieve an ideological framework of 'Us against Them' upon which the main hate speech utterance *'...kuiba ndiyo unajua zaidi halafu unasema kusema na kutenda...'* (...stealing is what you know best then you say talk and do...) is based. Therefore *'sisi'* (us) within the manipulated context can yield the following pragmatic interpretations:

- i. *'sisi'* (us) referring to the speaker, his fellow politicians and the hearer.
- ii. *'sisi'* (us) referring to the speaker and his fellow politicians alone because it is them who are in real competition for political power.

Thus, ambiguity as a linguistic strategy used by politicians to encode hate speech messages in political utterances resulted into obscurity of utterance meaning characterised by multiple pragmatic interpretations of the utterance.

#### **4.4.2 Ellipsis**

Johnson (2013) describes ellipsis as instances of anaphora in which a missing element is able to find an antecedent in the surrounding discourse as in the example below:

Holly Golightly won't eat rutabagas; I don't think Fred will either.

In the example above, the dependent clause has the VP element 'will eat rutabagas' left out. Filling in of the ellipted VP will have the clause read as below:

'I don't think Fred will eat rutabagas either'.

Such is a case of VP ellipsis. Ellipsis of such elements in a sentence occurs for other syntactic groups such as NP in the subject position of a sentence.

In earlier publications, Biber *et. al* (1999) observe that subject ellipsis is not a rarity, especially in conversation. Sentences lacking overt subjects are often easily interpretable and do not appear to be errors on the part of speakers. For example, “don’t know” is an understandable reply when responding to a question one does not know the answer to, even though the subject “I” is omitted. Haegeman and Ihsane (1999) argue that because English speakers cannot use verbal agreement to identify ellipsed subjects, they must look to antecedents in the broader context of the text. Hendriks (2004) expounds on this by observing that if lexical material is left unpronounced in oral texts, a hearer must rely on other parts of the sentence, on contextual information and on intonation to recover the unpronounced material.

Wilson & Sperber (2004) in Relevance Theory identify recovery of ellipsed elements as one of the pragmatic processes of establishing implicatures of an utterance. Recovery of ellipsed elements occurs in an utterance which exhibits ellipsis of a syntactic element. In this study, political utterances on hate speech in Kenya exhibited instances of ellipsis. Consider the utterances below:

Speaker 1: ...*wakaanza kupiga watu wetu; damu ilimwagika*... (...they started beating  
(shooting) our people; blood was shed)

In the above utterance, the subject is omitted. Though the Kiswahili language used by the speaker has a subject marker ‘*wa*’ (they) on the verb phrase (VP) ‘*wakaanza*’ (they started), the structure of Kiswahili language, just like other Bantu languages, requires that the utterance has an overt noun phrase (NP) in the subject position as the antecedent to the subject marker embedded on the VP as in the illustration below:

‘*Askari wakaanza kupiga watu wetu*’ (Police started beating our people)

In the above example, 'Askari' (Police) is the NP in the subject position of the utterance with its subject marker 'wa' (they) embedded on the VP 'wakaanza' (they started). From this illustration therefore, it is clear that the speaker of the utterance above ellipted the subject of the utterance. This is a case of subject ellipsis in which the speaker assumes that the hearer will recover the omitted information from the shared context of the 2007-2008 Post-Election Violence in Kenya already created by the speaker. Within this set of utterances, by anaphoric reference to the preceding utterance, the ellipted subject is identified as 'Jamaa' (Fellows) in the utterance 'Jamaa wakatoa bunduki' (Fellows removed guns). Even with anaphoric reference to recover the ellipted subject, the lexical item 'Jamaa' (Fellows) does not reveal the exact subject referred to by the speaker. However, the hearer is able to understand who 'Jamaa' (Fellows) are within the manipulated context and by lexical broadening establish that 'Jamaa' (Fellows) refers to 'armed police officers' who represent government agencies. Thus, the ellipsis used in this instance requires multiple levels of interpretation involving contextual inferences to arrive at the ellipted referent. Given that the utterances in which ellipsis appears can be interpreted to contain hate speech messages, it then can be speculated that ellipsis of the NP element in this utterance, and use of anaphoric antecedent element involving lexical replacement, was a strategy by the speaker to avoid liability for mentioning the ellipted referent in negative sense. As hate speech, therefore, the speaker leaves for the audience to fill up the implied referent.

Another case of ellipsis can be seen in the utterances below:

Speaker 1: ...*sio wale wa kusema na kutenda, kusema na kutenda* (with a sarcastic and derisive laughter); *kuiba ndiyo unajua zaidi halafu unasema kusema na kutenda*. (Not like those of 'talk and do', 'talk and do (with a sarcastic and

derisive laughter); stealing is what you know best and you say ‘we say and do’)

In the excerpt above, the embedded clause ‘*Kuiba ndio unajua zaidi...*’ (stealing is what you know best’) lacks an explicit subject. Reference to the co-text of the embedded clause in the utterances still does not establish the antecedent subject implied by the subject marker ‘*u*’ (You) on the VP ‘*unajua zaidi*’ (you know best). However, from the response the speaker receives from the hearer in form of widespread laughter and blowing of vuvuzela, it is clear that both the speaker and the hearer know the implied subject is the JUBILEE presidential running-mate. The recovery of the ellipsed subject NP is based on the shared contextual assumptions that are easily generated from a constrained context that is influenced by the utterance ‘*kusema na kutenda*’ (talk and do) in Kenyan politics. This is a case of subject ellipsis in political utterances on hate speech whose NP is recovered from a shared context. The utterance below helps to illustrate this argument further:

Speaker 5: ...*waambiwe haiwezekani tena kikundi cha watu wachache mno wao ndio walala hai na sisi walala hoi...* (...they should be told that it is no longer possible for a very small group of people are rich and the rest of us are poor...)

Similarly, speaker 5 in the above utterances fails to provide the NP in the subject position by merely starting the utterance with a VP on which the subject marker ‘*wa*’ (they) is used to refer to the implied NP recoverable from the shared context. The pre-election campaign mood in which these utterances are rendered makes it clear that the utterances are implying the politicians in the JUBILEE Coalition.

It is noticeable that instances of ellipsis in political utterances on hate speech involve the omission of subject NP or subject ellipsis. One possible reason for this is that the utterance contains hate messages and therefore the omission of the subject NP is deliberate to avoid possible accusation from the implied referent. Given that the speaker provides enough background information for the utterance, the speaker finds it safe not to mention the implied referent since the hearer can retrieve the implied referent from the context.

The omission of subject NP in political utterances on hate speech creates a possibility of different implied referents and this leads to obscurity of utterance meaning since the utterance contains multiple pragmatic interpretations. Consider the utterance below in which the subject has been ellipted:

Speaker 1: ...*wakaanza kupiga watu wetu...* (...they started beating our people...)

The utterance above lacks an explicit subject leading to the question '*Nani alianza kuwapiga watu wetu?*' (Who started beating our people?). The mental search for the possible answers to this question leads to the multiple pragmatic interpretations. Depending on the background information the hearer has, the possible answers are:

- i. *Askari* (Police)
- ii. *Wafuasi wa serikali* (Supporters of the government)
- iii. *Wafuasi wa chama pinzani* (Supporters of the rival political party)

These possible answers will consequently result into multiple pragmatic interpretations of possible propositions in the utterance such as:

- i. *Askari wakaanza kupiga watu wetu.* (Police started beating our people)

- ii. *Wafuasi wa serikali wakaanza kupiga watu wetu.* (Supporters of the Government started beating our people)
- iii. *Wafuasi wa chama pinzani wakaanza kupiga watu wetu.* (Supporters of the rival political party started beating our people)

Thus in political utterances like the one being discussed here, political speakers use ellipsis of the subject NP in their political utterances so as to leave such utterances with multiple pragmatic interpretations. Though the speakers provide enough evidence to lead the hearer towards the speaker meaning, the ability of the utterance to generate multiple interpretations leaves the hearer with the prerogative to decide on the information to fill up the ellipsis. Similar argument applies to the political utterance on hate speech from utterances (8):

Speaker 5: *...waambiwe haiwezekani tena kikundi cha watu wachache mno wao ndio walala hai na sisi walala hoi...* (...they should be told it is no longer possible for a very small group of people are rich and the rest of us poor...)

In this utterance the speaker does not provide the NP in the subject position and still the subject marker 'wa' (they) on the VP 'waambiwe' (they should be told) does not have an antecedent in the surrounding utterances. The ellipsis of the NP in this utterance creates obscurity of utterance meaning by making the utterance have multiple pragmatic interpretations.

#### **4.4.3 Use of minimal propositional content**

Bach (2001) observes that the semantic content of a sentence can be too skimpy, relative to a speaker's likely communicative purposes in uttering the sentence. One way of making the semantic content of a sentence skimpy is by making the proposition it expresses to lack elements that are part of what the speaker means. Such sentences are described as expressing minimal

propositional content. When a speaker utters a sentence with minimal propositional content, what the speaker means is arrived at through expansion of the utterance. In the understanding of Relevance Theory, the process of expansion to recover the missing information in an utterance requires context dependent procedures to identify the missing information. Bach (2001) provides the following example to illustrate minimal propositional content in an utterance:

- i. Everyone went to the wedding.

This utterance contains an implicit quantifier restriction and the speaker's meaning is arrived at through an expansion of the utterance within its context by the listener, perhaps using the expanded version in the italics below:

- ii. Everyone *[in the family]* went to the wedding.

Minimal propositional content can also be achieved through implicit qualification as shown in example (iii) and (iv) below:

- iii. I will be there *[at the agreed time]*.
- iv. I haven't had a coffee break *[this morning]*. (Bach, 2001)

An important feature of minimal propositional content is that expressions which display this linguistic strategy appear structurally complete. In syntactic terms, such expressions fulfill the basics of a proper syntactic structure only that in terms of the propositional content, the expression is deficient. This study has established instances of minimal propositional content in political utterances on hate speech as a linguistic strategy used by politicians in Kenya. Consider the utterances below:

Speaker 1: *Tarehe nne mwezi wa Machi mwaka huu tutaona kivumbi. Kivumbi ya kuleta Kenya mpya...* (On the 4th of March this year we shall see a cyclone. A cyclone to bring a new Kenya...)



Analyzing the first sentence in the excerpt above, the sentence lacks complete propositional content to read like the sentence below:

*'Tarehe nne mwezi wa Machi mwaka huu tutaona kivumbi [cha kupiga kura]'* (On the 4<sup>th</sup> of March this year we shall see a cyclone of vote casting)

The missing qualifier *'cha kupiga kura'* (of vote casting) is recoverable from the extra-linguistic context of the utterance. The speaker possibly avoids providing complete propositional content because of the interpretation the word *'kivumbi'* (cyclone) can receive in the environment of fierce political contest between CORD and JUBILEE. This argument is further justified by the fact that the previous speaker at the same CORD rally had just been calling upon the hearer *'...musikubali kura ziibiwe...'* (...do not allow votes to be stolen...). Thus *'kivumbi'* can be interpreted as an alluded reference to the reaction from the hearer in case votes are stolen. The above utterance therefore contains implicit qualification which the hearer recovers through expansion of the utterance within the already constrained context of the political environment. As much as the speaker expands on the implicit qualification in the next utterance by saying *'kivumbi cha kuleta Kenya mpya'* (A cyclone to bring new Kenya), it cannot be assumed that *'cha kuleta Kenya mpya'* (to bring new Kenya) is the missing qualifier of the *'kivumbi'* (cyclone) as used in the first utterance. In fact, the speaker merely complicates the propositional content by making the utterance *'kivumbi cha kuleta Kenya mpya'* (cyclone to bring a new Kenya) that also displays minimal propositional content. The phrase *'Kenya mpya'* (a new Kenya) is as well not qualified because critical analysis will demand elaboration on 'what new Kenya is or entails'

A similar case of implicit qualification in an utterance that displays minimal propositional content is also evident in utterance below:

Speaker 1: ...*kuiba ndio unajua zaidi*... (...stealing is what you know best...)

The expanded version of this utterance would read like the one below:

'...*kuiba [mali ya umma] ndio unajua zaidi*... (...stealing [public property] is what you know best...)

Or

'...*kuiba [kura] ndio unajua zaidi*... (...stealing [votes] is what you know best) – to mean manipulation of election results.

The expansions of the propositional content in the above utterance by speaker 1 are the most likely ones within the political context of the utterance. This is because, as already noted in section 4.1, in the Kenyan political landscape, political coalitions focus on depicting each other in the negative sense. This explains why Speaker 1's utterances are cheered with a lot of laughter and blowing of vuvuzela from the hearers. Another case of minimal propositional content is evident in the utterance below whose propositional expansion is provided:

Speaker 1: ...*sisi tumasema na kutenda* (...we talk and do)

A likely expanded form of the utterance is '*...sisi tumasema [mambo] na kutenda [yale tunayoyasema]*' (...we talk about issues and do what we talk about)

Use of minimal propositional content as a linguistic strategy can result into obscurity of utterance meaning in the sense that an expression with minimal propositional content results into multiple pragmatic interpretations. Take a case of the utterances below:

Speaker 1: *Tarehe nne mwezi wa Machi mwaka huu tutaona kivumbi. Kivumbi ya kuleta Kenya mpya...* (On the 4<sup>th</sup> of March this year we shall see a cyclone. A cyclone to bring a new Kenya...)

The propositional content in the first sentence prompts the question: *kivumbi cha aina gani?* (A cyclone of what kind?). To complete the propositional content of the entire utterance, the following would be possible propositions acceptable in the constrained context of the utterance:

- i. *Mapinduzi ya serikali* (Overthrow of government)
- ii. *Kupiga kura kwa wingi* (Voting in large numbers)
- iii. *Mabadiliko ya msukosuko* (Violent change)
- iv. *Maandamano* (Demonstration)

All these propositions due to the lexical item '*kivumbi*' (a cyclone) are acceptable if interpreted within the linguistic context of the surrounding utterances by the speaker. Each of these propositions entails what the speaker says in the utterance that follows '*Kivumbi ya kuleta Kenya mpya*' (A cyclone to bring a new Kenya). Therefore use of minimal propositional content in political utterances on hate speech in Kenya was a linguistic strategy that resulted into multiple pragmatic interpretations of an utterance. The minimal propositional content of an utterance was achieved through the speaker using lexical items that make the sentence appear semantically complete but propositionally incomplete in pragmatic sense; by the lexical item lacking implicit quantifier and thus the utterance being minimal in implicit propositional information. As explained in Relevance Theory (Sperber & Wilson, 1995), the semantic completeness of an utterance represents the logical form of the utterance. The logical form of an utterance requires to be taken through some transformation for the hearer to arrive at the propositional form. This process of transforming the logical form into propositional form of an utterance is referred to as the development of a logical form (Sperber & Wilson, 1995) and the development is carried out through processes such as filling up of minimal propositional content and others like disambiguation and recovery of ellipted information.

Further illustrations of political utterances on hate speech that display use of minimal propositional content due to implicit qualification of a lexical item to derive multiple pragmatic interpretations can be seen in the following utterances:

Speaker 1: ...*kuiba ndio unajua zaidi*... (...stealing is what you know best...)

The implied propositions in this utterance due to the lexical item '*kuiba*' (stealing) are:

- i. *Kuiba mali ya uma* (stealing public property)
- ii. *Kuiba kura* (Manipulation of election results)

Speaker 1: ...*sisi tunasema na kutenda*... (...we talk and do...)

The implied propositions in this utterance due to the unqualified lexical items '*kusema*' (to talk) and '*kutenda*' (to do) include:

- i. Talking about one thing and doing the same.
- ii. Talking about one thing and doing a different thing.

These are just a few of the pragmatic interpretations that can be deduced from these political utterances due to lexical items without implicit quantifiers. Utterances like the ones above result into multiple pragmatic interpretations. Utterances with minimum propositional content in the pre-election campaigns for the 2013 General Elections in Kenya may have been intended by the speaker to obscure the hate messages in the utterances. Such utterances required some effort from the hearer during mind search to establish the intended speaker meaning on hate speech in the utterance. Due to the multiple pragmatic interpretations such utterances can elicit, it can also be interpreted that politicians uttered such utterances to find a way of circumventing the law when accused of peddling hate speech.

#### 4.4.4 Semantic incompleteness of vague expressions

Bach (2001) explains that another way of making the sentence of an utterance to appear skimpy is to have it fall short of expressing a complete proposition even relative to a context. When a speaker utters a semantically incomplete sentence what he means is arrived at through a completion of its incomplete explicit propositional form. The following are examples of semantically incomplete sentences:

- i. Danielle just FINISHED a novel. (doing what: reading, writing, editing, typing, eating?)
- ii. Gentlemen PREFER blondes. (to what: brunettes, sheep?)
- iii. Brad is TOO old/not young ENOUGH. (for what?) (Bach, 2001)

In the above examples, the semantic content of the utterance would have been completed if the speaker had provided information which answers the question in parenthesis. From the options provided as possible answers to the question in parenthesis, it is evident that semantically incomplete utterances include vague expressions. He Ziran (2000) considers vagueness as the language property of indeterminacy. He thinks that the study of vagueness in language is significant only when vagueness is analyzed from the perspectives of language use and comprehension. He Ziran (2000) explains that the meaning of a single word which is indeterminate can be determined only in the field of pragmatics, that is to say, when that word is placed in a specific context. Carter & McCarthy (2006) define vague language as words or phrases which deliberately refer to people and things in a non-specific, imprecise way. Vague expressions are therefore indeterminate structures in language; they are semantically incomplete. A key feature of semantically incomplete expressions is that such expressions are grammatically proper structures but semantically incomplete at the explicit level of language analysis.

Instances of vague expressions that reflect semantic incompleteness are evident in political utterances in Kenya. Consider the utterances below:

Speaker 5: *Muko tayari?* (Are you ready?)

Response: *Tuko tayari* (We are ready)

Speaker 5: *Waambiwe haiwezekani tena kikundi chs watu wachache mno ndio walala hai na sisi walala hoi.* (They should be told that it is not possible again that a very small group of people are rich and the rest of us poor.)

In these utterances, the question asked by the speaker, '*Muko tayari?* (Are you ready?), is not specific; it prompts the question: '*Tayari kufanya nini?*' (Ready for what?). As much as the hearer answers affirmatively '*Tuko tayari*' (we are ready), it is not certain that the hearer and the speaker are sharing the implied meaning in the speaker's utterance. This is therefore a case of semantically incomplete expression which is vague and would require pragmatic interpretation to arrive at the intended speaker meaning. The subsequent utterance by the speaker, '*Waambiwe haiwezekani tena...*' (They should be told that it is not possible again...), is equally vague in the sense that the utterance has an inexplicit referent which leaves the question '*Nani aambiwe?*' (Who should be told?) unanswered by the utterance. The inexplicitness of the NP in this utterance is clearer in language in which the utterance was uttered; that is Kiswahili language. Kiswahili language is a pro-drop Bantu language in which the NP can be left out in the subject position of the utterance but have an NP marker (as a pronoun) embedded on the VP. Therefore in Kiswahili language, the utterance is structurally complete at the logical form but semantically incomplete resulting into a semantically incomplete expression that is vague.

When semantically vague expressions are given pragmatic interpretation, they generate multiple propositions which lead to obscurity of utterance meaning. The multiple propositions in such utterances are as a result of the speaker using unqualified lexical items as in the illustrations below:

Speaker 5: *Muko tayari?* (Are you ready?)

Response: *Tuko tayari* (We are ready)

In the context of the utterances, the interrogative utterance can receive different pragmatic interpretations such as:

- i. *Muko tayari kuanza vita?* (Are you ready to start fighting?)
- ii. *Muko tayari kupiga kura?* (Are you ready to vote?)
- iii. *Muko tayari kupigania haki zetu?* (Are you ready to fight for your rights?)
- iv. *Muko tayari kupindua serikali?* (Are you ready to overthrow the government?)

All the above are possible propositions in the inexplicit interrogative '*Muko tayari?*' (Are you ready?). The use of semantic incomplete expressions that are vague in political utterances on hate speech may have been deliberate by politicians. The fact that such expressions result into obscurity of utterance meaning by making the utterance to elicit multiple pragmatic interpretations makes it easy for the politician to deny certain interpretations if accused of hate speech.

#### **4.4.5 Creative metaphors**

Lakoff & Johnson (1980) in the theory of conceptual metaphor see metaphors as a means of understanding something in terms of something else by “mapping” one conceptual domain onto another. Muller (2004) explains that creative metaphors characteristically display a deviation

from what might be expected in a given situation such as the delivery of a political speech. Creativity in metaphors involves, not only deviating or rule-breaking, but also awareness of when and where creativity is appropriate and useful. Muller (2004) concludes that creative metaphors challenge discursive or linguistic norms in a way which is acceptable by a relevant audience. In fact, creative metaphors require a creative co-production by the audience and this also requires readiness to accept the metaphor. If a metaphor is not accepted by an audience and is not explored by being interpreted and discussed, then the creative metaphor fails in its political-communicative purpose. Sperber & Wilson (2012) observes that, from a Relevance Theory perspective, metaphorical interpretations are arrived at in exactly the same way as other aspects of language use involving literal, loose and hyperbolic interpretations. There is no mechanism specific to metaphors, no interesting generalization that applies only to them. In political speeches, creative metaphors are a stylistic feature which display some form of creativity within political discourse.

The data in this study has instances of creative metaphors used by politicians in Kenya in making political utterances on hate speech. Consider the utterance below:

Speaker 1: *Tarehe nne mwezi wa Machi mwaka huu tutaona kivumbi. Kivumbi ya kuleta Kenya mpya...* (On the 4th of March this year we shall see a cyclone. A cyclone to bring a new Kenya...)

In the utterances above, the speaker refers to the events expected to take place on the 4th of March as '*kivumbi*' (a cyclone). The hearer knows that what is expected to take place on the 4<sup>th</sup> of March is voting exercise for the general elections in Kenya. In natural life, a cyclone is a phenomenon that disturbs the order of the existing state of affairs. Ideally, a cyclone is a



turbulent disturbance of existing state of affairs in a given place or region that leaves a clean-up effect. So the speaker is metaphorically using the image of a cyclone to describe the change expected by the election exercise on the 4<sup>th</sup> of March. To the speaker, after the election which he expects to have a cyclone-effect on Kenya, Kenya will be a new country with a different person (in this case the speaker himself) occupying the presidency and a different political order. This is a case of creative metaphor involving use of a lexical item as an imagery which the hearer subjects to lexical broadening process to arrive at the pragmatic interpretation of the metaphor as implicatures. In order to assess the effectiveness of this metaphorical utterance in communicating the intended political message, the speaker engages the hearer in an interactive dialogue by posing a question to solicit concurrence from the hearer:

Speaker 1: *Sio?* (Isn't that so?)

Response: *Eeh!* (Yes)

Similar interpretation to the one above can be advanced to explain the metaphor involving the lexical imagery in the utterance below:

Speaker 3: '*...wale wanaosema JUBILEE ni ukabila tunasema ni mashetani.*' ('...those who are saying JUBILEE are tribalistic, we are saying they are devils')

The speaker refers to the implied referents in the utterance as '*mashetani*' (devils). This lexical imagery can be understood if subjected to lexical broadening and pragmatic interpretation to arrive at implied meaning of 'evil' (as the implicature derived from the metaphor '*mashetani*').

Apart from lexical imagery, aspects of metaphorical anecdotes are also evident in the political utterances on hate speech in Kenya. Consider the utterances below:

Speaker 1: *Unajua ngiri? Anafanana na nguruwe; anasahau mingi sana. Akitoka hapa anafika pale amesahau. Sio?* (Do you know warthog? It resembles a pig; it is so forgetful; if he leaves here reaches there has forgotten. Is it not so?)

Response: Eeh (affirmative) (Yes)

In the above utterances, the speaker tells a short descriptive story about ‘*ngiri*’ (warthog). A quality about ‘*ngiri*’ (warthog) that the speaker identifies is ‘*sahau mingi*’ (highly forgetful) and this becomes the quality of comparison between ‘*ngiri*’ (warthog) and the implied referent. To be sure that the message has not lost relevance to the hearer and that communication is still successful, the speaker uses a question and answer structure to confirm if the hearer is in concurrence with him. The affirmative response from the hearer confirms to the speaker that communication is successful. The anecdote is being used by the speaker to provide a manipulated (or constrained) context for a shared background. This can be seen in the next utterance in which the speaker now employs lexical metaphor ‘*ngiri*’ (warthog) to precisely refer to the implied referent:

Speaker 1: *nimeona juzi ngiri anafanya mambo mazuri na mwenzake...* (The other day warthog did good things with his colleague...)

In the utterance above, the speaker refers to the referent as ‘*ngiri*’ (warthog) whose character has already been provided in the anecdote in the utterances that precede the utterance. To identify the contextual implicature, that the implied referent is unreliable and never learns from past experiences, the hearer needs to search for appropriate contextual assumptions from the extra-linguistic context surrounding the implied referent.

Interpretation that is similar to the one above about ‘*ngiri*’ (warthog) can also be advanced for the proverbial metaphor below which is rendered after a narration of historical events in Kenya:

Speaker 6: *Nimehesabu wakenya ambao waliwawa kinyama. Mtoto wa nyoka ni?* (I have counted Kenyans who were killed brutally. The child of a snake is?)

Response: *Nyoka* (Snake)

The proverbial metaphor ‘*Mtoto wa nyoka ni [nyoka]*’ is used to draw comparison between the regime that was there at the time of the historical events (assassinations) and the regime that will be in place if the rival political coalition wins the elections anticipated on the 4<sup>th</sup> of March. The similarities drawn by the speaker between the two regimes reflect the implicatures that the hearer is expected to make out of the metaphorical proverb. In this case the implied meaning (implicature) in the metaphorical proverb is leadership characterized with assassinations and similar atrocities.

Given the existence of literal meaning and implied meaning in creative metaphors, political utterances on hate speech that utilize creative metaphors yield multiple pragmatic interpretations. Further, the inherent nature of creative metaphors that lies in their ability to be mapped onto different conceptual domains enables them to generate multiple pragmatic interpretations in a given context. Consider use of lexical imagery in the excerpt below from utterances (2):

Speaker 1: *Tarehe nne mwezi wa Machi mwaka huu tutaona kivumbi. Kivumbi cha kuleta kenya mpya...* (On the 4<sup>th</sup> of March this year we shall see a cyclone. A cyclone to bring a new Kenya)

The logical form of lexical imagery ‘*kivumbi*’ (cyclone) carries its literal meaning of a cyclone as a form of movement of wind. However, this is not the intended speaker meaning based on the

constrained context in which the speaker used the lexical term as imagery. The concept of '*kivumbi*' (a cyclone) in this context can be mapped onto different conceptual domains as implicatures of the lexical imagery:

- i. A coup or political revolution
- ii. Turn out in large numbers to vote
- iii. A violent demonstration

The propositions above are all acceptable and are further qualified by the proposition in the utterance that follows '*Kivumbi cha kuleta Kenya mpya*' (A cyclone to bring a new Kenya). The usage of this lexical imagery is an example of a hate speech utterance that is completely unqualified; not even by the surrounding utterances. The speaker meaning in this lexical imagery is open-ended. The speaker leaves the utterance meaning to be derived by the hearer and this could be a strategy by the speaker to avoid being accused for having uttered a hate speech utterance with a specific message.

Another case of creative metaphor evident in political utterances in Kenya is the use of metaphorical anecdotes in which a story is advanced on a specific quality of human life. In such anecdotes, it is the identified quality of human life that is used metaphorically to map the image in the story onto the individual in real life in politics as illustrated below:

Speaker 1: *Unajua ngiri? Anafanana na nguruwe; anasahau mingi sana. Akitoka hapa anafika pale amesahau. Sio?* (Do you know warthog? It resembles a pig; it is so forgetful; if he leaves here reaches there has forgotten. Is it not so?)

Response: Eeh (affirmative) (Yes)

In the above metaphorical anecdote, the story is about '*ngiri*' (warthog) as the image upon which the literal aspect of the story is on. The quality about '*ngiri*' (warthog) that the speaker highlights is '*ku-sahau*' (to-forget). In this story, the speaker intends to use the quality of 'forgetfulness' in '*ngiri*' (warthog) to establish comparison between '*ngiri*' (warthog) and an individual in real life. The utterance below by the speaker now helps to contextualize the hidden or literary meaning in the metaphorical anecdote:

Speaker 1: *Nimeona juzi ngiri anafanya mambo mazuri na mwenzake...* (The other day warthog did good things with his colleague...)

In the context created by the above utterance, the referent of the metaphorical anecdote is not identified but understood within the external context of political environment in Kenya. The speaker assumes that the hearer already shares with him this external constrained context from which the meaning of the utterances can be drawn. However, the failure by the speaker to identify the person whom the anecdote refers to is for strategic reasons; to avoid accusation of hate speech against a specified person and this is what results into multiple pragmatic interpretations on the utterance. The hate speech utterance could refer to different referents depending on the assumptions in the hearer's mind. The assumptions in the hearer's mind determines the relevance of the utterance to the hearer so as to yield implicated premises which lead the hearer to implicated conclusions as argued by Wilson & Sperber (2004).

Use of creative metaphors in encoding hate speech messages in political utterances collected in this study yields multiple pragmatic interpretations in the utterance and this may have been the intention of the speaker in making utterances which exploit creative metaphors. Within the

multiple utterance meanings elicited by such utterances, the speaker would drive his intended message but still deny certain interpretations if accused of hate speech.

#### **4.4.6 Interactive dialogue**

Zollo (1999) describes dialogue as a collaborative endeavor. Zollo explains that a dialogue cannot be said to have occurred unless the participants collaborate at least to the point where one participant addresses a message to the other, and the other receives, decodes, and acknowledges the message. Dialogue involves taking turns to introduce propositions, provide indications of whether the propositions are understood and agreed to, monitor the conversation for potential misunderstandings, and repair misunderstandings when they occur. As a dialogue progresses, participants regularly provide feedback to indicate whether they have heard and understood what the other participant has said, a process referred to as grounding. Speakers often make an extra effort to correct themselves if they detect a potential source of misunderstanding in their original utterance and will correct their conversational partner if the feedback provided by the partner indicates a misunderstanding. The general goal of dialogue is to affect the beliefs and actions of the dialogue participants.

Zollo (1999) identifies Cooperative dialogue in which participants engage in a highly coordinated process that systematically builds up a set of beliefs held mutually by the participants. Stent (2001) adds that a dialogue is a conversational interaction involving two participants, each of whom contributes by listening to the other and responding appropriately.

Povolna (2005) says that when people communicate with others they do it not only to convey some new information but above all to exchange ideas, attitudes and opinions. As such, social interaction involves cooperation between two or more partners in a communicative situation.

Participants take their turns, that is, at any particular moment one of them is the current speaker and the others are the current hearers. Interactive items in a dialogue help the smooth flow of the dialogue as a social communicative activity.

To this study, interactive dialogue as a linguistic strategy in encoding hate speech messages in political utterances involves dialogue that solicits response from the audience. The purpose of interactive dialogue, apart from the speaker soliciting concurrence from the hearer, is to build up a set of beliefs held mutually by the participants and in the case of this study, build up an ideological framework for the hate speech. In this study, some political speakers involved the hearer in the course of their speech presentation by engaging them in an interactive dialogue involving question and answer. Interactive dialogue was used by politicians who made utterances on hate speech for several reasons. Firstly, this linguistic strategy was used by political speakers to solicit concurrence from the hearer over the message being communicated as in the excerpts below:

Speaker 1: ...*si ni unyama huo?* (...is that not brutality?)

Response: *Ndio* (Yes)

Speaker 1: ...*wakenya tunataka mabadiliko, sio?* (Kenyans we want change, isn't it?)

Response: *Eeh* (affirmative)

Secondly, interactive dialogue has also been used by political speakers making utterances on hate speech to manipulate context and create an impression that the speaker is merely echoing what is in the hearer's mind as common knowledge. In such a case, context was being manipulated and enhanced by interactive dialogue to create a set of beliefs that would appear mutually held by the interlocutors so as to achieve a common ideological framework. The political speakers used this

strategy in this sense to create a shared manipulated context with the hearer and consequently release the hate speech utterance to achieve the speaker's intention. This is evident in the following utterances:

Speaker 3: *Vijana wenzangu Kenya mzima wanakufa njaa. Ni nani waziri anahusika na mambo ya vijana?* (My fellow youth, Kenyans are dying of hunger. Who is the Minister responsible for youth affairs?)

Response: (Cheers and blowing of vuvuzela)

Speaker 3: *Ni mrengo gani?* (Which wing of politics?)

Response: ODM (Orange Democratic Movement)

Speaker 3: *Vijana wamenyanyaswa; wametapeliwa shilingi mia tatu kwa vitambulisho. Ni nani anahusika na mambo ya vitambulisho?* (The youth have been oppressed; they have been conned of three hundred shillings for national identity cards. Who is responsible for issues of national identity card?)

Response: (Cheers and blowing of vuvuzela)

Speaker 3: *Hata hawana adabu...* (Shame on them)

The response in form of uproar and intense cheering that the speaker receives to his first question in the above utterances was an indication that the hearer was in agreement with the speaker. It was a response to say 'the answer was obvious and what the speaker was saying was common knowledge.' The response gives the impression that the speaker was merely echoing what the speaker was thinking. This was a strategy by the speaker to manipulate linguistic context to hate speech on the ideology of 'Us' (JUBILEE) against 'Them' (CORD). Further, the strategy would enable the speaker avoid being held responsible for hate speech as it created the impression that the ideas expressed in the speaker's utterances were already in the hearer's mind.



As discussed in this sub-section, it is therefore evident that politicians in Kenya made use of certain linguistic strategies to encode hate speech messages in political utterances. The politicians made use of ambiguity, ellipsis, minimal propositional content, creative metaphors and interactive dialogue as linguistic strategies to encode hate speech messages in political utterances. The linguistic strategies used made the political utterances on hate speech to yield multiple pragmatic interpretations which led to obscurity of intended utterance meaning. In the next section, the study discusses how ostensive stimuli were used to redirect the hearer towards the possible intended speaker meaning on hate speech.

#### **4.5 Ostensive stimuli in political utterances on hate speech**

Relevance Theory attempts to account for inferential communication. Sperber & Wilson (2012) state that in Relevance Theoretical terms, all human intentional communication involves the communicator producing a piece of evidence for the meaning in an utterance and the addressee infers the meaning from the piece of evidence and the context. The piece of evidence provided by the speaker to suggest the speaker meaning is the ostensive stimulus of the utterance. Linguistic utterances are in themselves just one type of ostensive stimulus.

Sperber & Wilson (2012) elaborate further that ostensive stimuli include actions (such as gestures or speech) or traces of actions (such as writings) that are manifestly intended to attract an addressee's attention and convey some content. By using ostensive stimuli, humans are capable of communicating without language, and indeed without any other code. Communicating without encoding involves providing evidence that the communicator intends to convey some meaning, for instance, suppose Mary is angry with Peter and doesn't want to talk to him. When Peter tries to engage her in a conversation, Mary might do the following:

- i. Stare pointedly at the ceiling

- ii. Open a newspaper and start reading it.

These actions do not draw on any established code. Still, what staring at the ceiling or opening a paper suggests to Peter is that Mary would rather do these things than talk to him at that time. Given that these actions are ostensive stimuli (that is, they are performed in order to attract his attention and convey some content to Peter), Peter understands Mary to mean that she doesn't want to talk to him. He interprets her in this way not because of some underlying code. A stimulus can convey a meaning it does not encode by providing evidence that the communicator intends to convey this meaning. Here, the meaning is recovered not by decoding but by inference.

Similarly, verbal communication is always context-sensitive and inferential. Therefore, ostensive-inferential communication involves the use of an ostensive stimulus that is designed to attract an audience's attention and focus it on the communicator's meaning. By producing an ostensive stimulus, the communicator encourages the audience to presume that what is being said by the communicator is relevant enough to be worth mental processing. The communicator has a duty to make the ostensive stimulus as easy as possible for the audience to understand, and to provide evidence not just for the cognitive effects the speaker aims to achieve in the audience but also for further cognitive effects which, by holding his attention, will help the communicator achieve his/her goal (Sperber & Wilson, 2012).

In this study, political utterances on hate speech have already been established to have multiple pragmatic interpretations resulting into obscurity of utterance meaning. For the hearer to resolve the obscurity in the utterance meaning and pick out the intended speaker meaning or merely arrive at one meaning as the possible speaker meaning, ostensive stimuli played a key role.

Speaker meaning in political utterances on hate speech has been guided by manipulated context as an ostensive stimulus as in the utterances below:

Speaker 1: ...*sio wale wa kusema na kutenda...kuiba ndiyo unajua zaidi halafu unasema kusema na kutenda* (...not like those of ‘talk and do’...stealing is what you know best and then you say ‘talk and do’).

The referent/person against whom the hate message in the above utterance is set is not identified in the utterance. A search for the referent within the co-text of the utterance (as intra-textual analysis) neither establishes the referent of the hate speech by anaphoric nor cataphoric reference. However, an extra-textual analysis of the utterance establishes a non-linguistic context surrounding the utterance. The non-linguistic textual analysis is necessary as supported by Sperber & Wilson (1986) in Relevance Theory that an utterance needs to be interpreted within both the linguistic and non-linguistic context in which it exists. Where a speaker has not provided sufficient evidence in form of ostensive stimuli within the utterance, the cognitive principle of relevance holds it that the hearer’s mind will search for relevant contextual assumptions around the utterance and this process may include searching into the non-linguistic text of the utterance (Wilson & Sperber, 2004). Thus, in the above utterance, the hearer is compelled to get into inter-textual analysis of previous events to retrieve both linguistic and non-linguistic contexts relevant to the political phrase ‘*kusema na kutenda*’ (talk and do). The phrase ‘*kusema na kutenda*’ (talk and do [talk and execute what you talk about by actions]) is a political slogan for URP political party in Kenya and it is associated with the URP Party leader J2 who coined the slogan. Whenever the phrase is used in political circles, more often, it is used to make reference to the URP Party leader. Therefore, as used by the speaker in the utterance above, the

implied referent is the URP Party leader. In the utterance, the speaker deliberately fails to mention the referent NP is in the subject position:

*'...[missing NP] kuiba ndio unajua zaidi alafu unasema kusema na kutenda'* (...[missing NP] stealing is what you know best and then you say 'to talk and to do')

However, the hearer is able to recover the missing NP from previous linguistic and the non-linguistic contexts using the assumptions generated by the slogan *'kusema na kutenda'* (to talk and to do). The past linguistic and non-linguistic contexts of the utterance in this case act as the ostensive stimulus which guides the hearer to the speaker meaning.

Utterances such as the one being discussed here are not rendered with a precisely stated ostensive stimulus to help the hearer identify the intended speaker meaning. The hearer arrives at the possible speaker meaning because of the shared background information upon which the speaker anchors the utterance. There are other similar political utterances with hate speech messages in which the possible speaker meaning is retrieved from the linguistic and non-linguistic context external to the utterance like the one below:

Speaker 5: *Waambiwe haiwezekani tena kikundi cha watu wachache mno ndio walala hai na sisi walala hoi...* (They should be told that it is no longer possible for a very small group of people to be rich and the rest of us are poor...)

In the above utterances, the speaker does not mention the referent of the hate message in the NP subject position of the utterance;

*'...[missing NP] waambiwe haiwezekani tena...'* (...[missing NP] they should be told that it is no longer possible again...)

The missing NP elements, as already discussed in section 4.5, results into multiple pragmatic interpretations of the utterance leading to obscurity of utterance meaning. However, the hearer is able to retrieve the implied speaker meaning using the context external to the utterance. The hearer establishes that the utterances are rendered within a pre-election campaign in which the greatest competitor to the speaker's political coalition (CORD) is JUBILEE. Given that in Kenyan politics each political party focuses on depicting the rival party in the negative, the hearer of the utterance above concludes that the implied referent in the missing NP are members of the JUBILEE Coalition. Therefore such background information guides the hearer in identifying leaders of the JUBILEE Coalition as the implied referent and therefore as the possible speaker meaning out of all the possible referents as implicatures.

In some other political utterances on hate speech, especially utterances whose propositional content lacked elements of common knowledge to both the speaker and the hearer, political speakers provided some background information upon which the hate speech message was anchored. Such background information can be interpreted as ostensive stimulus because it guides the hearer to the kind of interpretation the speaker intended in the hate speech utterance.

Consider the utterances below:

Speaker 6: This election can only be compared to the election of 1963 which brought independence to our country.

Response: *Ndio Baba* (Yes Father) (with cheers and blowing of vuvuzela)

Speaker 6: For fifty years, Kenyans have wandered in the wilderness.

Response: *Ndio Baba* (Yes Father)

Speaker 6: They now have an opportunity, through this election, to change the course of history. There are two forces in our country... the forces for the retention of status quo and the forces for change.

Response: *Ndio Baba* (Yes Father)

Speaker 6: This struggle has been long. It has been very consistent; sometimes it has been very violent. That is how we can explain the assassination of Pio Gama Pinto, the assassination of Thomas Joseph Mboya, the assassination of J. M. Kariuki, to mention but a few... These are the dark forces of our history... We, this generation can change all these by voting for right on Monday, by voting for change, voting for forces of progress against the forces of stagnation, the forces of retrogression...

Response: *Ndio Baba* (Yes Father)

Speaker 6: ... *tunataka kumaliza utawala wa kiimla, tunataka kumaliza ufigadi, tunataka kumaliza unyakuzi wa ardhi.* (...We want to end dictatorship, we want to end corruption, we want to end land grabbing)

Response: (Intense blowing of vuvuzela and cheering)

Speaker 6: *Nimehesabu wakenya ambao waliuawa kinyama. Mtoto wa nyoka ni nini?* (I have counted those Kenyans who were brutally killed. The child of a snake is?)

Response: *Nyoka* (A snake) (blowing of vuvuzela, whistling)

In the utterances above, the speaker's intention is not clear before the question he poses to the hearer '*Mtoto wa nyoka ni nini?* (The child of a snake is what?). Initially, the recount on events since 1963 appeared a mere attempt by the speaker to inform the hearer of past events in Kenya.

However, at the point of this question the speaker's intention is now revealed; to caution the hearer that the presidential candidate in the JUBILEE coalition is a son to the country's president at the time of the assassinations and therefore electing him as president in the forthcoming elections would mean a continuation of assassinations and other atrocities. Thus, the intention the speaker has in narrating the historical events to the hearer is to guide the hearer on the intended speaker meaning in the metaphorical proverb. In this context therefore the narration of the past events to the hearer serves as an ostensive stimulus for the hate speech utterance '*mtoto wa nyoka ni nyoka*' (the child of a snake is also a snake). A similar strategy in which a speaker builds up a narration of events to the hearer as ostensive stimulus leading to the main hate speech utterance is also seen in the utterances below:

Speaker 7: *Juzi Ukambani tumefunguliwa Syokimau, eti station ya gari ya moshi. Eti sisi Wakamba tukitoka pande hiyo, tuache magari yetu Syokimau. Eti tuingie gari ya moshi, hiyo mtungi tushuke Nairobi. Na wao wakitoka Central wanapanda hiyo barabara iliyo juu ya ngazi wakuje wa park magari yao Nairobi.* (Recently in Ukambani, at Syokimau, a train station was opened for us. That we, Kamba people, who come from that part of the country should park our vehicles at Syokimau [when coming to Nairobi]. Then board a train, that container, to alight in Nairobi. While for them when [they coming to Nairobi] from Central, they drive on Thika Super Highway to park their vehicles in Nairobi.)

Response: (Cheers of bitterness and blowing of vuvuzela for the speaker)

Speaker 7: *Hiyo ni ubaguzi wa maendeleo* (That is discrimination of/by development)

In the utterances above narration of past events by the speaker serves as ostensive stimuli used to guide the hearer on the intended meaning out of the multiple pragmatic interpretations that the

utterance on hate speech is able to generate. The hate speech utterance is '*hiyo ni ubaguzi wa maendeleo*' (that is discrimination of development). This utterance on its own would not portray the intended speaker meaning. The narration about the Thika Super Highway and the Railway station at Syokimau by the speaker is an ostensive stimulus to guide the hearer on the speaker message contained in the speaker's hate speech utterance.

The discussion above enables the study to establish how political speakers manipulate context, both linguistic and non-linguistic to guide the hearer of political utterances on the speaker meaning. The hearer's mind searches for relevance of the political utterance using both inter-textual and intra-textual context generated evidences to arrive at the speaker meaning. It is therefore prudent enough to conclude that political speakers use ostensive stimuli in political utterances on hate speech so as to resolve the obscurity of utterance meaning created by linguistic strategies used in encoding propositions in political utterances on hate speech. The ostensive stimuli resolve obscurity in utterance meaning by guiding the hearer to the possible intended speaker meaning in the utterance especially when the political utterance generates multiple pragmatic interpretations.



## CHAPTER 5

### SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

#### 5.1 Introduction

This study analysed political utterances on hate speech in Kenya. The analysis of data was guided by the principles advanced in Relevant Theory by Dan Sperber and Deidre Wilson. In this chapter, the study presents the summary, conclusion and recommendations of the study in relation to the objectives outlined in Chapter 1.

#### 5.2 Summary of findings

The first objective of the study which was not stated but implied in the set of objectives stated was to establish if actually the political utterances rendered in the 2013 pre-election campaign speeches in Kenya had hate speech messages. This study has established that political utterances rendered during the pre-election campaign period for the March, 2013 General Elections in Kenya contained hate speech messages. In this summary, this study will use the terms ‘direct’ and ‘indirect’ to classify the hate speech political utterances. The hate messages in the political utterances analysed in this study were either direct or indirect.

Direct hate speech political utterances identified the target of the hate speech attack. Such political utterances did not demand for a detailed pragmatic interpretation to arrive at the implied referent since the logical form of the utterance explicitly identified the victim of the hate speech as an NP in the subject position. In political utterances with direct hate speech, the explicit identification of the hate speech target makes the logical form of the utterance to directly reflect the propositional form of the utterance.

Indirect hate speech political utterances are covert in their reference to the victim of the hate speech. Such utterances did not explicitly identify the NP in the subject position as the target of the hate speech. The individuals or group of individuals under attack by the hate speech utterance were understood in a context that both the speaker and hearer shared. In indirect hate speech political utterances, relevance driven procedures are necessary to pragmatically identify implicated premises and implicated conclusions as the propositional form of the utterance.

### **5.2.1 Manipulation of context**

The study sought to establish how political speakers manipulate context to conform to hearer's expectation of relevance when encoding hate speech messages in political utterances. This study has found out that politicians in Kenya during the pre-election campaign period for the 2013 General Elections in Kenya made use of the socio-political events in the country to create and manipulate contexts for their political utterances on hate speech. The manipulated contexts by the politician were aimed at constraining the range of contextual assumptions retrievable on the utterance so as to suggest speaker intention and achieve relevance of the utterance to the hearer. Some of the manipulated contexts were aimed at manipulating the hearer's emotions and perceptions so as to advance an ideology for hate speech that was relevant to the hearer. The contexts created to advance hate speech can be divided into linguistic and non-linguistic contexts.

Politicians in Kenya used non-linguistic contexts to make utterances on hate speech conform to the hearer's expectation of relevance. Past events in the history of Kenya were used as a non-linguistic context for the advancement of hate speech messages. One such non-linguistic context is that on the events after Kenya's independence in 1963 which involved political assassinations of prominent politicians like J. M. Kariuki and J.T Mboya. Another historical event as a non-

linguistic context utilised to advance hate speech messages is the 2007-2008 Post-Election Violence in Kenya. Such non-linguistic past events were rendered within a manipulated linguistic context that would twist the emotions of the hearer and thereby advance a hate speech messages.

Politicians in Kenya also used linguistic contexts to advance hate speech messages in political utterances. Linguistic contexts were presented as a manipulative discourse for political utterances on hate speech. Manipulated linguistic contexts were created by the speaker's use of the person pronouns especially '*sisi*' (us) and '*wao*' (them). Use of these pronouns assisted the speaker to manipulate context to create an ideological of "Us versus Them" upon which hate speech messages were advanced. These pronouns created a context in which the speaker and the hearer belonged to the same social group. As such, the speaker was understood as speaking for the hearer since, at a pragmatic level, language had been used to create a context in which reality in life was manipulated to create a pseudo-world where the hearer and the speaker belong to the same social group. In this case therefore, it is a metalinguistic use by the politician to create a context to make political utterances on hate speech relevant to the hearer.

### **5.2.2 Linguistic strategies in political utterances on hate speech**

The study also sought to establish linguistic strategies used by politicians to encode hate speech messages in political utterances. Linguistic strategies used by a speaker to encode propositions in an utterance enable the processing of implicatures and explicatures of an utterance. This study has found out that politicians used a number of linguistic strategies to encode hate speech messages in political utterances during the pre-election campaigns for the 2013 General Elections in Kenya. The linguistic strategies used by politicians were: ambiguity, ellipsis,

minimal propositional content, semantic incompleteness of vague expressions, creative metaphors and interactive dialogue structure.

Ambiguity in political utterances with hate speech messages was achieved through the use of personal pronouns without antecedents. The personal pronouns used in the political utterances did not as well have a cataphoric referent within the neighbouring utterances. Pronouns such as 'u' (you) in Kiswahili language were attached on the VP as subject marker in utterances without an explicit referent resulting into utterances with indirect hate speech messages. The absence of the implied NP in the utterances itself and in the neighbouring utterances resulted into structural ambiguity of the utterance making utterance meaning obscure. The obscurity of utterance meaning was manifested in the multiple pragmatic interpretations that the utterance generated. Ambiguous utterances required the hearer to process their disambiguation within the context of socio-political events in Kenya so as to arrive at the implied NP.

This study also found out that political utterances containing hate speech messages displayed aspects of ellipsis. Politicians in Kenya made political utterances in which an NP in the subject position was elided. Political utterances on hate speech without an explicit NP were based on shared background assumptions (context) between the speaker and the hearer. The missing NP in political utterances on hate speech resulted into multiple pragmatic interpretations making utterance meaning obscure. The ellipsis of the subject NP therefore required the hearer to process the recovery of the implied NP guided by contextual evidences generated by the shared assumptions surrounding the utterance.

Minimal propositional content is another linguistic strategy evident in political utterances on hate speech in Kenya. Utterances with minimal propositional content were skimpy since such

utterances lacked elements that are part of what the speaker implied. Such utterances required expansion of the propositional content to arrive at the information implied by the speaker through pragmatic processes influenced by context of the utterance. The process of expanding the proposition results into multiple pragmatic interpretations which obscure utterance meaning.

This study also found out that politicians employed use of semantic incompleteness to create vague expressions in their political utterances on hate speech. Utterances that are semantically incomplete required a hearer to arrive at the speaker meaning through completion of the incomplete explicit propositional form. The logical form of such an expression appears complete yet the expression contains indeterminate words which create multiple pragmatic interpretations that obscure utterance meaning.

This study has also established the use of creative metaphors as a linguistic strategy used by politicians in making political utterances on hate speech. Creative metaphors involved figurative use of language. In instances of creative metaphor, the hearer arrives at the speaker meaning by exploiting the context of the utterance to map the conceptual domain of the metaphor onto the explicit domain. Creative metaphors were in the form of lexical imagery requiring lexical broadening and use of context to establish the speaker meaning. Another type of creative metaphors seen in the political utterances on hate speech is metaphorical anecdotes. Metaphorical anecdotes involved use of a specified quality of human life to map one conceptual framework onto another so as to create a context for speaker meaning. Another aspect of creative metaphor that the study has established is use of proverbial metaphor. Proverbial metaphors in political utterances on hate speech were often used to communicate terse messages of hate following a narration of events. Generally, use of creative metaphors resulted into multiple

pragmatic interpretations of the utterance making the utterance display obscurity of utterance meaning.

Finally, the study has also established use of interactive dialogue as a linguistic strategy in political utterances on hate speech in Kenya. Politicians made use of interactive dialogue structure as a strategic stylistic feature involving question and answer. Interactive dialogue was used by the speaker to assess if the hearer was in concurrence with the speaker on the message in the utterances. In some other instances, politicians used interactive dialogue structure to make the hearer complete the speaker's utterance. In such utterances, the filling-in by the hearer created the impression that the speaker was merely echoing what the hearer had in mind. This was for strategic reasons to create a false impression that the hate speech message the speaker was sharing with the hearer was already common to the hearer and therefore not an incitement against anyone.

In a word, the findings in this section highlight the kinds of linguistic strategies used by politicians in Kenya when encoding hate messages in political utterances. In the next section, the study presents findings on how these strategies yield multiple pragmatic interpretations to display obscurity in utterance meaning.

### **5.2.3 Obscurity of utterance meaning in political utterances on hate speech**

This study has established that the linguistic strategies discussed in section 5.2.2 above made political utterances display obscurity of utterance meaning. The obscurity of utterance meaning was reflected in the ability of the utterances to contain multiple pragmatic interpretations due to the following factors:

a) An utterance lacking an element of its linguistic structure

Utterances that were structurally incomplete either semantically, pragmatically or both and did not convey full meaning. Such utterances exhibited use of ambiguity, ellipsis, minimal propositional content and semantic incompleteness of vague expressions as linguistic strategies used by the speaker to encode hate speech messages. Use of these linguistic strategies in utterances resulted into multiple pragmatic interpretations of an utterance since the missing element was left to the hearer to fill-in so as to establish the speaker meaning. The pragmatic process of developing the propositional form of an utterance from its logical form resulted into multiple interpretations since the filling-in or retrieval of the missing element depended on several factors that were context-driven. Some of the utterances had a syntactic structure that appeared explicitly complete yet implicitly incomplete and the proposition of the utterance needed expansion to pragmatically fill in the implicit qualifier to make the proposition that reflects the speaker meaning complete.

b) Structurally complete utterances with linguistic units that could be mapped onto several conceptual frameworks.

Political utterances in this category exhibited use of creative metaphor as a linguistic strategy used to encode hate speech messages. The multiple pragmatic interpretations in such utterances were due to the inherent ability of creative metaphors eliciting several conceptual frameworks to be mapped onto different domains.

Thus, the study has found out that politicians in Kenya made political utterances with hate speech messages during the pre-election campaign speeches for the 2013 General Elections in

Kenya. The political utterances were presented within a manipulated discourse while exhibiting linguistic strategies such as ambiguity and ellipsis to encode hate messages in utterances that elicit multiple pragmatic interpretations. The multiple pragmatic interpretations in the political utterances on hate speech created obscurity of utterance meaning. However, the obscurity of meaning due to multiple pragmatic interpretations is easily resolved due to the manipulated context which limits the range of contextual assumptions for easy identification of the possible intended speaker meaning.

#### **5.2.4 Ostensive stimuli used in political utterances on hate speech**

This section responds to the last objective of the study: to determine the kind of ostensive stimuli that politicians use to focus the hearer on the possible intended speaker meaning in political utterances on hate speech.

The study found out that politicians in Kenya used ostensive stimuli to capture the attention of the hearer and focus the hearer on the possible speaker meaning. Ostensive stimuli were enhanced by manipulated context to provide crucial links in the utterances to guide the hearer towards speaker meaning especially when the utterance generated multiple pragmatic interpretations. Politicians in Kenya made use of either linguistic or non-linguistic context-driven ostensive stimuli to guide the hearer towards speaker meaning. In some utterances, the ostensive stimulus used was a combination of both linguistic and non-linguistic aspects.

Linguistic ostensive stimuli included the utterances themselves as evidence of relevance in the utterance. This confirms the claim in Relevance Theory that utterances, in their own right as linguistic units, are an expression of the speaker's intention to communicate something and therefore utterance is an ostensive stimulus. In this study, linguistic context was used as



ostensive stimuli in cases where the hate speech utterance targeted an individual who is associated with a given aspect of language use such as a slogan for a political party. Such linguistic evidence in the political utterance served as ostensive stimuli to guide the hearer towards the implied referent as the target of the hate speech.

The study also found out that some other linguistic context that served as ostensive stimuli for hate speech political utterances was presented in the form of anecdotes; that is, a brief narration of background historical or current events. Politicians used metaphorically the events in stories while presenting them as manipulated discourse to focus the hearer on the intended meaning in the hate speech utterance. Where metaphorical aspect of the narration created multiple pragmatic interpretations in the utterance, the speaker highlighted an aspect of human life in the story upon which the intended utterance meaning was centred. The identification of the relevant aspect or quality of human in the metaphorical anecdote assisted to focus the hearer on one propositional form of the metaphor to enhance communication of the intended speaker meaning.

### **5.3 Conclusion**

This study sought to account for the variance between speaker's and hearer's interpretation of meaning in political utterances on hate speech in Kenya. This study concludes that the variance over the interpretation of political utterances on hate speech between the speaker and hearer can be settled by a pragmatic analysis of the utterances.

As stated in the Relevance Theory, notion of context is a key factor in the comprehension of utterances. This study concludes that political speakers exploit a manipulated context to construct utterances that fulfill the hearer's expectation of relevance in the utterance. Manipulation of context is set as a cognitive construct that twists the hearer's perception for the

hearer to interpret the utterance as intended by the speaker. Such contexts create a linguistic world around the utterance that constrains the range of contextual effects that the utterance can yield in the mind of the hearer.

The study further concludes that the effect achieved by manipulated context is enhanced by the utterance exhibiting some structural linguistic strategies such as ellipsis, ambiguity, minimal propositional content, semantic incompleteness of vague expressions and creative metaphors. These linguistic strategies yield multiple pragmatic interpretations which create some obscurity of meaning in the utterance. Therefore, the hearer needs to process the utterance for meaning by engaging in a pragmatic cognitive process involving processes such as recovery of ellipted element, disambiguation, expansion of implicit propositional content, completion of incomplete explicit propositional form and mapping the conceptual domain of the metaphor onto the explicit domain.

Ultimately, the study concludes that the speaker-hearer variance on the interpretation of political on hate speech is due to the obscurity of meaning in the utterances. Political utterances on hate speech are rendered within a manipulated context and meaning in them is encoded using strategies which elicit multiple pragmatic interpretations thereby creating obscurity of meaning. As such, politicians in Kenya capitalize on this obscurity of meaning to deny certain interpretations of meaning by hearers of their political utterances on hate speech. However, the intended speaker meaning of the utterance is arrived through clearly established ostensive stimuli. The ostensive stimuli set by the speaker provide hints on the intended speaker meaning within the already constrained context of the utterance created by the speaker.

With the above stated conclusions which respond to the objectives of the study, the study finally concludes that the data used in the analysis of political utterances on hate speech was sufficient and effective. Similarly, Relevance Theory by Sperber and Wilson provided workable guidelines for pragmatic interpretation of utterances that enabled this study effectively respond to the study objectives.

#### **5.4 Suggestion for further research**

This study has carried out a pragmatic interpretation of selected political utterances on hate speech in Kenya. The study focused on utterances as linguistic forms already rendered by the speaker and therefore existing within a linguistic context. This study suggests that a similar study should be carried out on such utterances collected within their actual physical environment. Such a study will help establish extra-linguistic properties that affect utterance meaning when interpreted within the physical context; thereby compliment the findings of this study.

The study has also established that manipulative context is highly utilized in the construction of hate speech messages in political utterances. This study therefore suggests that more studies need to be carried out on the use of manipulation in other genres of political discourses that contain hate speech messages. In such studies, the scope needs to capture linguistic strategies within such genres because linguistic strategies generate meaning that is already constrained by a manipulated discourse.

Finally, the analysis of data in this study was guided by Relevance Theory. This study suggests that a similar study needs to be carried out applying a different pragmatic theory. The finding of such a study will help verify the findings in this study as a contribution of knowledge and/or advance a different dimension within the academic discipline of this study.

## REFERENCES

- Adam, K. (2013). *Saturation in qualitative research*. Retrieved from [http://www.rcn.org.uk/data/assets/pdf\\_file/0003/.../Research2013Th39.pdf](http://www.rcn.org.uk/data/assets/pdf_file/0003/.../Research2013Th39.pdf). Retrieved July 12th, 2013.
- Babbie, E. (2004). *The Practice of social research*. (10th ed.). Belmont: Thomson Wodsworth.
- Bach, K. (2001). *Regressions in pragmatics*. Downloaded from [userwww.sfsu.edu/.../Bach.Regressions.pdf](http://userwww.sfsu.edu/.../Bach.Regressions.pdf). Retrieved on 27<sup>th</sup> April, 2015
- Bakhtin, M. M. (1986a). *Speech genres and other late essays*. Trans. by Vern, W. McGee. Austin, Texas: University of Texas Press.
- Bakhtin, M. M. (1986b) 'Understanding utterances'. Retrieved from [http://pubpages.Unpubpages.unh.edu/~jds/Bakhtin utterance.htm](http://pubpages.Unpubpages.unh.edu/~jds/Bakhtin%20utterance.htm). Downloaded on 12th July, 2013.
- Bayram, F. (2010). 'Ideology and political discourse'. Retrieved from [research.ncl.ac.uk/ARECLS/volume7/bayram-vol7.pdf](http://research.ncl.ac.uk/ARECLS/volume7/bayram-vol7.pdf). Downloaded on 20th August, 2013.
- Biber, D., Johansson, S., Leech, G., Conrad, S. and Finegan, E. (1999). *Longman grammar of spoken and written English*. Essex: Pearson Education Limited.
- Blass, R. (1990). *Relevance relations in discourse*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Blommaert, J. (1990). 'Modern african political style: strategies and genre in swahili political discourse'. *Discourse and Society*, Vol. 7 pp. 115–131.
- Brown, G. & Yule, G. (1983). *Discourse analysis*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Bublitz, W. & Norrick, N. R. (2011). 'Introduction: The burgeoning field of pragmatics.' In Bublitz, W., Jucker, A. H. & Schneider, K. P. (Eds.). (2011). *Foundations of pragmatics*. Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton. (p. 1-20).
- Calitz, M. G. (2009). *Pilot study*. Retrieved from [uir.unisa.ac.za/bitstream/handle/10500/1648/06chapters.pdf](http://uir.unisa.ac.za/bitstream/handle/10500/1648/06chapters.pdf). Downloaded on 23<sup>rd</sup> June, 2015.
- Carston, R. (2002). *Thoughts and utterances*. Oxford: Blackwell.

- Carter & McCarthy (2006). *A Pragmatic study on the functions of vague language*. Retrieved from [www.ccsenet.org/journal/index.php/elt/article/viewFiles/27266/16559](http://www.ccsenet.org/journal/index.php/elt/article/viewFiles/27266/16559). Downloaded on 21th May, 2015.
- Constitution of Kenya*. (Revised Edition, 2010). Published by The National Council for Law. Retrieved from <http://www.kenyaembassy.com/pdfs/The%20Constitution%20of%20kenya...> Downloaded on 30th Oct. 2014.
- Council of Europe. Committee of Ministers. Recommendation 97(20) on “hate speech”. 30<sup>th</sup> Oct. 1997
- Cruise, A. D. (2000). *Meaning in language: An introduction to semantics and pragmatics*. Manchester: Oxford University Press.
- CSU Writing Guide. (2004). An introduction to content analysis. Retrieved from [www.umsl.edu/.../mrpc-web-resourses/content-analysis.pdf](http://www.umsl.edu/.../mrpc-web-resourses/content-analysis.pdf) Downloaded on 4th Oct. 2017
- Dandi Li, L. (2008). ‘The pragmatic construction of word meaning in utterances.’ *Journal of Chinese Language and Computing* 18 (3):121-137.
- Dhillon, A. (2003). ‘Political parties and coalition formation’. Retrieved from [www2.warwick.ac.uk/fac/soc/economics/staff/.../bookchapter/.pdf](http://www2.warwick.ac.uk/fac/soc/economics/staff/.../bookchapter/.pdf). Downloaded on 1<sup>st</sup> Feb. 2015
- Eagleton, T. (2000). ‘Ideology’ in Wodak, R. (Ed). (2007). *Language and ideology*. Amsterdam; John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Eugene, E. O. (2004). ‘What is an utterance?’ Retrieved from [www.Sil.Org/Linguistics/Glossary](http://www.Sil.Org/Linguistics/Glossary) of Linguistic terms/WhatIsAnUtterance.htm. Downloaded on 8th Sept. 2013.
- Facebook Help Centre: What does Facebook consider to be hate speech? Available at: <http://www.facebook.com/help/135402139904490/>. Downloaded on 1<sup>st</sup> Oct. 2017
- Fromkin, V., Rodman, R. and Hyams, N. (2007). *An introduction to language* (8th ed) Amsterdam: Thomson Wadsworth.
- Google user content and conduct policy. Available at: <http://www.google.com/intl/enUS/+/policy/content.html>. Download on 1<sup>st</sup> Oct. 2017.

- Grice, P. (1975). 'Logic and conversation'. In Cole, P. & Morgan, L. J. (eds.) (1975). *Syntax and semantics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Grice, H. P. (1989). *Studies in the way of words*. Harvard: Harvard University Press.
- Gregersen, E. A. (1977). *Language in Africa: An introductory survey*. London: Gordon and Breach.
- Habwe, J. H. (1999). *Discourse analysis of Swahili political speeches*. University of Nairobi: Unpublished PhD thesis.
- Habwe, J. H. (2010). 'Dialogue drama in Kenyan political speeches and its pragmatic implications'. *Nordic Journal of African Studies* 19(3): 165–180.
- Haegeman, L. & Ihsane, T. (1999). 'Subject ellipsis in embedded clauses in English language and linguistics'. Retrieved from [infolingu.univ.mlv.fr/colloquies/Bonifacio/proceedings/teddiman.pdf](http://infolingu.univ.mlv.fr/colloquies/Bonifacio/proceedings/teddiman.pdf). Downloaded on 27<sup>th</sup> April, 2015.
- Hakansson, J. (2012). 'The use of personal pronouns in political speeches' Retrieved from [www.diva-portal.org/smash/get/diva2:531167/fulltext01.pdf](http://www.diva-portal.org/smash/get/diva2:531167/fulltext01.pdf). Downloaded on 26<sup>th</sup> March, 2015.
- Haugerud, L. & Njogu, S. K. (1991). *State voices in the country side: Politics and the Kenyan baraza*. Boston University: African Study Centre.
- Hendriks, P. (2004). *Coherence relations, ellipsis and contrastive topics*. Retrieved from [los.oxfordjournals.org/content/21/2/132.short](http://los.oxfordjournals.org/content/21/2/132.short). Downloaded on 4<sup>th</sup> July, 2015.
- He Ziran, R. (2000). *A Pragmatic study on the functions of vague language*. Retrieved from [www.ccsenet.org/journal/index.php/elt/article/viewFiles/27266/16559](http://www.ccsenet.org/journal/index.php/elt/article/viewFiles/27266/16559). Downloaded on 21<sup>th</sup> May, 2015.
- Hudson, R. A. (1996). *Sociolinguistics* (2nd ed). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hurford, J. R. & Heasley, B. (1983) *Semantics: A Coursebook*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Ibrahim, W. J. (2005). *Types of ambiguity*. Retrieved from [basiceducation.uomosul.edu.iq/files/files/files\\_4745295.pdf](http://basiceducation.uomosul.edu.iq/files/files/files_4745295.pdf). Downloaded on 20<sup>th</sup> July, 2015.
- Indede, F.N (2003). 'The Pragmatics of political language' in C.Etzold & S.K Mutuku (eds) (2003). *Institutionalizing democracy in Kenya: Prospects and challenges*. Workshop Proceedings. P. 191
- Itebete, P. A. N. (1974). 'Language standardization in Western Kenya: The luhya experiment.' In Whiteley, W. A. (1974). *Language in Kenya*. (p 87-114). Nairobi: Cambridge University Press.
- Johnson, K. (2013). *What VP ellipsis can do*. Retrieved from [people.umass.edu/kbj/homepage/content/what\\_vpe\\_can\\_do.pdf](http://people.umass.edu/kbj/homepage/content/what_vpe_can_do.pdf). Downloaded on 4<sup>th</sup> July, 2015.
- Jaszczolt, K. M. (2002). *Semantics and pragmatics: Meaning in language and discourse*. London: Longman.
- Kihara, P. C. & Schroder, H. (2012). "A Relevance-Theoretical Analysis of aspects of mchongoano". *The University of Nairobi Journal of Language and Linguistics*. Vol. 2 (2012). p63-78.
- Lakoff, G. & Johnson, M. (1980). *Creative metaphors in political discourse*. Downloaded from [www.metaphorik.de/09/Muller.pdf](http://www.metaphorik.de/09/Muller.pdf). Retrieved on 27<sup>th</sup> April, 2015.
- Leech, G. (1983). *Principles of pragmatics*. London: Longman Group UK Limited.
- Leech, G. & Svartvik, J. (1986). *A Communicative grammar of English*. London: Longman.
- Levinson, S. (1983). *Pragmatics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Longman Dictionary of Contemporary English. (4th ed). (2008). Edinburgh Gate: Pearson Longman.
- Lwaitama, A. F. (1995). *A critical language study of Tanzanian Kiswahili presidential oratory*. Birmingham: Aston University Unpublished PhD thesis.
- Makila, F. E. (1978). *An outline history of the bukusu*. Nairobi: Kenya Literature Bureau.

- Maillat, D. & Oswald, S. (2009). *Defining manipulative discourse: The pragmatics of cognitive illusions*. Retrieved from <http://www.unine.ch/webdav/site/grsp/shared/documents/Oswald/MaillatRp2009.pdf>.  
Downloaded on 20<sup>th</sup> July, 2016.
- Manley, M. (2008). *The politics of change*. Washington, D. C.: Howard University Press.
- Mugenda, O. M. & Mugenda, A. G. (1999). *Research methods: Quantitative and qualitative approaches*. Nairobi: ACTS Press.
- Muller, R. (2004). 'Creative metaphors in political discourse'. Downloaded from [www.metaphorik.de/09/Muller.pdf](http://www.metaphorik.de/09/Muller.pdf). Retrieved on 27<sup>th</sup> April, 2015.
- National Cohesion and Integration Commission (August, 2010). '*Guidelines for monitoring hate speech in the electronic media in Kenya*'. Retrieved from [www.cohesion.or.ke/~cohesion/images/downloads/guidelines%2520monitoring%2520](http://www.cohesion.or.ke/~cohesion/images/downloads/guidelines%2520monitoring%2520).  
Downloaded 22nd Oct. 2014
- Newmark, P. (1988). *A textbook of translation*. Prentice: New York
- Odongo, M. (2010). *Unpacking hate speech*. Retrieved from [www.cohesion.or.ke/.../144-unpacking-hate-speech-by-commissioner-milly...](http://www.cohesion.or.ke/.../144-unpacking-hate-speech-by-commissioner-milly...) Downloaded on 20th Feb. 2014.
- Oginde, D. (2017, Sept. 17). Hate speech are futile if we don't address real issues. The Standard Digital. Retrieved from <https://www.standardmedia.co.ke> Downloaded on 1<sup>st</sup> Oct. 2017
- Pearson, J., Nelson, P., Titsworth, S. and Harter, L. (2003). *Human communication*. (2<sup>nd</sup> ed).  
New York: Mc Graw-Hill.
- Perlmutter, P. (1999). *Legacy of hate*. Retrieved from <http://books.google.co.ke/books>.  
Downloaded on 30th Oct. 2014.
- Piantadosi, S. T., Tilly, H. & Gibson, E. (2012). *The communicative function of ambiguity*. Retrieved from [tedlab.mit.edu/tedlab\\_website/.../piantadosi\\_et\\_al\\_2012\\_cogn.pdf](http://tedlab.mit.edu/tedlab_website/.../piantadosi_et_al_2012_cogn.pdf).  
Downloaded on 19<sup>th</sup> April, 2015.



- Potts, C. (2005). *Introduction to pragmatics*. Retrieved from [www.Staford.edu/class/linguist130a-handout-01-17-sentproputt.pdf](http://www.Staford.edu/class/linguist130a-handout-01-17-sentproputt.pdf). Downloaded on 26<sup>th</sup> Feb. 2016
- Povolna, R. (2005). *Some notes on interactive discourse items in spoken English*. Retrieved from [http://www.phil.munic.cz/plonedata/wkaa/BSE\\_2005-31\\_offprints/BSE%202005-31%20\(049-061\)%...](http://www.phil.munic.cz/plonedata/wkaa/BSE_2005-31_offprints/BSE%202005-31%20(049-061)%...) Downloaded on 25<sup>th</sup> July. 2016.
- Ramney, A. (1996). *Governing: An introduction to political science*. (7th ed.). New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.
- Rigotti, E. (2005). 'Towards a typology of manipulative processes'. In L. de Saussure & P. Schulz (eds.). (2005). *Manipulation and ideologies in the twentieth century: discourse, language, mind*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. (page: 61 – 83).
- Roberts, C. (2006). 'Context in dynamic interpretation.' In Horn, L. R. & Ward, G. (Eds.). (2006). *The Handbook of pragmatics*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing. (pages 197-220).
- Roskin, M., Cord, R. L., Medeiros, J. A. & Jones, W. S. (1997). *Political science: An Introduction*. (6th ed). New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.
- Schroder, H. (2012). "A relevance-theoretical analysis of intercultural misunderstanding in global communication. *The University of Nairobi Journal of Language and Linguistics*. Vol 2 (2012). p42-61.
- Shen, L. (2012). *Context and text*. Retrieved from [www.academypublication.com/issues/past/tpls/vol02/12/28.pdf](http://www.academypublication.com/issues/past/tpls/vol02/12/28.pdf). Downloaded on 26<sup>th</sup> Feb. 2016.
- Spark, K. (2004). *Persuasion and manipulation: Relevance across multiple audiences*. Retrieved from [https://arts-sciences.und.edu/summer-institute-of-linguistics/thesis\\_files/doc/2012-sparks-kevin.pdf](https://arts-sciences.und.edu/summer-institute-of-linguistics/thesis_files/doc/2012-sparks-kevin.pdf). Downloaded on 20<sup>th</sup> July, 2016.

- Sperber, D. & Wilson, D. (2004). *Relevance Theory*. Retrieved from <http://www.Phon.ucl.ac.uk/home/PUB/WPL/02papers/wilson-sperber.pdf>. Downloaded on 12th July, 2013.
- Sperber, D. & Wilson, D. (1986). *Relevance: Communication and cognition*. Oxford: Basill Blackwall.
- Sperber, D. & Wilson, D. (1995). *Postface to the second edition of relevance: Communication and cognition*. Blackwell: Oxford.
- Sperber, D. & Wilson, D. (2012). *A deflationary account of metaphors*. Retrieved from [philosophy.as.nyu.edu/~SperberWilsonAdeflationaryaccountofmetaphors...](http://philosophy.as.nyu.edu/~SperberWilsonAdeflationaryaccountofmetaphors...) Downloaded on 7<sup>th</sup> July, 2015.
- Stacks, D. W. & Hocking, J. E. (1999). *Communication research*. (2nd ed). New York: Longman.
- Stent, A. (2001). *Dialogue systems as conversational partners*. Retrieved from <http://www.amandastent.com/papers/stentunpublished2001.pdf>. Downloaded on 25<sup>th</sup> July, 2016.
- United States General Accounting Office. (March, 1089). Content analysis: A methodology for structuring and analyzing written material. Retrieved from [www.archive.gao.gov/d48t13/138426.pdf](http://www.archive.gao.gov/d48t13/138426.pdf) Downloaded on 4<sup>th</sup> Oct. 2017.
- van Dijk, T. (1997). What is political discourse analysis?. *Belgian Journal of Linguistics*. Vol. 11, p11-52.
- van Dijk, T. (2000). Opinion and Ideologies in the Press. In Bell, A. and Peter, G. (Ed) *Approaches to media discourse*. (P. 21-63). Oxford; Blackwell.
- Van Dijk, T. (2006) . Discourse and manipulation . *Discourse & Society* 17: 359 - 383.
- Walker, S. (1994). *Hate speech: The history of an American controversy*. The University of Nebraska Press; London.
- Were, G. S. (1969). 'Tribes of Western Kenya' in Ogot, B. A. (1974). *A survey of East African History*. (p 177-197). Nairobi: Longman.
- West, R. & Turner, L. H. (2010). *Introducing communication theory: Analysis and application* (4th ed). New York: Mc Graw Hill.

- Wilson, J. (2008). 'Political discourse' in Schffrin, D., Tannen, D. & Hamilton, H. E. (2008). *The handbook of political discourse*. P. 398-415. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing House.
- Wodak, R. (2007). "Language and ideology". Retrieved from [www.lang.lancs.ac.uk/staff/wodak/papers/ideology\\_jlp.pdf](http://www.lang.lancs.ac.uk/staff/wodak/papers/ideology_jlp.pdf). Downloaded on 20th Sept. 2013
- Xu, Z. (2013). *Relevance Theory and its applications to advertising posters*. Retrieved from [www.academypublication.com/iissues/past/tpls/vol03/03/13.pdf](http://www.academypublication.com/iissues/past/tpls/vol03/03/13.pdf). Downloaded on 15<sup>th</sup> April, 2016.
- Youtube Community Guidelines. Available at: [http://www.youtube.com/t/community\\_guidelines](http://www.youtube.com/t/community_guidelines). Downloaded on 1<sup>st</sup> Oct. 2017
- Yule, G. (1996). *The study of language* (2nd ed). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Yus, F. (2010). 'Relevance Theory.' In Heine, B. & Narrog, H. (eds). (2010). *The oxford handbook of linguistic analysis*. P. 679-701. Oxford; Oxford University Press.
- Zollo, T. (1999). *A study of human dialogue strategies in the presence of speech recognition errors*. Retrieved from <https://www.aaii.org/papers.symposia/fall/1999/FS-99-03/FS99-03-019.pdf>. Downloaded on 25<sup>th</sup> July, 2016.

## **APPENDIX: SELECTED RAW DATA OF POLITICAL UTTERANCES**

### **Introduction**

This section presents selected utterances as raw data from which the utterances on hate speech discussed in this study were extracted. The utterances presented here are parts of the speeches that were rendered at pre-election campaign rallies for the 2013 general elections in Kenya. The speeches from which these utterances were extracted were those delivered at CORD, JUBILEE and AMANI rallies attended by the presidential candidates for the 2013 general elections in Kenya.

The raw data presented here is meant to closely reflect what the speaker said. Therefore some of the sentence-like structures presented here flout the rules of language use such as those on sentence construction and diction in an effort to present what the speaker actually said as recorded at the archives of the media houses.

Speakers of the raw speeches have been identified by their actual names. However, a few speakers have been identified as speaker 1 and 2. These are speakers who were not identified by name in the recorded texts at the archives of the media houses.

### **Key to the text**

**Resp** – Response from the crowd

*The data below constitutes selected utterances from speeches collected at a CORD campaign rally.*

*(A Song in Luluhya to Psyche the crowd)*

**Wetangula:** Wananchi wa Mulembe; Mulembe swa...

**Resp:** Swaaa

**Wetangula:** Mulembe peee

**Resp:** Peee

**Wetangula:** Mulembe ngaa

**Resp:** Ngaa

**Wetangula:** Tumekuja hapa kumuelezea tukiwa pamoja; nothing can go wrong. Tukiwa pamoja, we are going. Tukiwa pamoja, we cannot fail to achieve; tukiwa pamoja, we are going to restore

our country to where it rightfully belongs. Tukiwa pamoja, tutashinda wale wenye pesa kwa sababu sisi ni wenye watu (*cheers and applause with vuvuzela playing from the audience*)

Sisi katika muungano wa CORD tunasimamia umoja wa wananchi wa Kenya. Hatutakaa kwa boardroom kuanza kupiga siasa kikabila eti wamejiandikisha wengi, hawa wachache, eti watashinda sisi tunajua kila mkenya roho yake iko CORD. Na nyinyi vijana mambo yenu ya kesho yataangaliwa, na kuangaziwa na kutimizwa na CORD kwa sababu mkiangalia hawa viongozi, mheshimiwa Simba amepitia kila aina ya jaribio; Mheshimiwa CHUI amekuwa usukani kwa zaidi ya miaka ishirini na tano; Mimi wenu nimekuwa wakili wa nchini kwa zaidi ya miaka thelathini. Kweli kweli ukichukua Vice President na Prime Minister wanaweza shindwa na hawa vijana?

**Resp:** Hapana

**Wetangula:** Wanaweza?

**Resp:** (emphatically) Hapana

**Wetangula:** Lakini kushinda kwetu kutategemea kura zenu. Ukitoka hapa ujue Simba hatapita bila kura yako. Kila Mmoja wetu ajue, kura yako ndio silaha yetu. Nataka kuwaambia siri siku ya leo, siri ni hii.

**Resp:** Toboa...

**Wetangula:** CORD itashinda kura hii round one

**Resp:** (*Intense celebration, ululations, Vuvuzela, whistling*)

**Wetangula:** Yule anayejidanganya ataunda mseto baada ya round one anaota mchana

**Resp:** Waambie

**Wetangula:** Ajue atapata mwana si wake, atapata kama kila kitu kimekwisha

**Resp:** (Cheers vuvuzela)

**Wetangula:** Na tunataka watu wa Mulembe mjue; watu wa Mulembe tujue: sisi ni jamii ya Kenya; musiyumbishwe kuambiwa ati angalia hapa kwetu. Mimi nilitaka kuwa Rais wa Kenya; nilizunguka Kenya mzima nikaamua kuwa any one time, Kenya will only have one president, any one time, Kenya will only have one Deputy President. And any one time, that President will come because we are united that is why we stand here today to tell the whole country that the resolve of this team is to give the country a new beginning.

**Resp:** (*Cheers, vuvuzela*)

**Wetangula:** I know our captain is going to unveil our manifesto lakini wakenya wajue kitu kimoja tutaweka kipaumbele ni mtoto wa kenya kutoka nasari hadi University atalipiwa fees na serikali

**Resp:** *(Cheers/Vuvuzela)*

**Wetangula:** Inawezekana inafanywa kwa nchi zingine kama Cuba ambazo hazina rasilimali kama Kenya, na sisi tumeangalia tumeona. Nataka kutoa heshima yangu kwa ndugu Jirongo.

**Resp:** *(Cheers /Vuvuzela/ shouts/Whistling)*

**Wetangula:** Ndugu yangu Jirongo tulijaribu kuleta na yeye watu wa Mulembe pamoja lakini kila mtu alikuwa anasema maneno yake. Nikamwendea nikamwambia “hii ndoa ya siasa umefunga, inaonekana haitadumu; kuja kwenye watu” (A direct speech.) Na sasa umekuja, tumeshirikiana na tunataka kuwaambia wakenya jamii ya Mulembe haitabahatisha kura yake; Jamii ya mulembe iko katika CORD; na jamii ya Mulembe itapiga kura Mundu khumundu.

**Resp:** *(Wild Cheers/ululations/Vuvuzela).*

**Wetangula:** Mundu...

**Resp:** Khumundu

**Wetangula:** Kwa CORD. Kwa hayo machache kwa sababu kuna wengi wanataka kuongea ninataka kuwaambia ndugu zangu kutoka Western, it is not over until it is over. Tukimaliza hii rally kubwa, tubaki mkoani humu tukitafuta kura nyumba kwa nyumba ili kuhakikisha ya kwamba tarehe tano wapende wasipende tangazo litakuwa ni moja tu Rais Mpya, Rais wa nne ni Simba...

**Resp:-** *(Wild screams) Simba! (Vuvuzeka/Cheers/Whistles in support)*

Let me now take this opportunity to invite my brother Stephen CHUI ambaye kama mimi alijinyima nafasi ya Rais wa Kenya kwa sababu Kenya ni kubwa kuliko sisi wote, aje pia aombe kura ya CORD.

*(Song: lero lero ni lero, abolanga mukamba ni mubei)*

**CHUI:** Nipeni Wiper

**Resp:** Wiper (amidst cheers, vuvuzela)

**CHUI:** ODM

**Resp:** CORD.

**CHUI:** Wiper

**Resp:** CORD

**CHUI:**FORD KENYA

**Resp:** CORD

**CHUI:** Liberal (party of Kenya)

**Resp:** CORD

**CHUI:** Nataka kuwasalamia watu wa Mulembe; Mulembe khandi;

**Resp:** Mulembe.

**CHUI:** Mulembe muno

**Resp:** Mulembe.

**CHUI:** Mulembe bosi

**Resp:** Mulembe

**CHUI:** Basi leo nimekuja kwa furaha tele. Ninaomba niwashukuru sana wakaaji wa Kakamega kwa kujitolea na kuja kwa wingi sana. Kabla ya kufika hapa mimi nilipita upande wa Khwisero; nashukuru sana watu wa Khwisero wametupokea kwa sababu ya heshima ya Mzee Masinde Muliro aliyekuwa champion wa demokrasia Kenya hii. Tayari serikali ya CORD imeweka shamba ekari mia moja ambalo tutakuja kuweka monument ya Masinde Muliro...

**Resp:** *(Wild Cheers/Vuvuzela/shouts/ululation).*

**CHUI:** Ambaye bila shaka angekuwa hapa angefurahi sana. Vita ambavyo tunapigana navyo ni vita dhidi ya umasikini, ufukara; Atakayechaguliwa Gavana wa Kakamega County atakuwa na timu yake ya Ministers kama kumi hivi. Hizi barabara ambazo zinaelekea kila sehemu ya Kakamega County ziko hali mbovu.

**Resp:** Ndio *(affirmative)*

**CHUI:** Na lazima zote ziwekwe lami sawa kwa sababu mgao wa fedha/pesa zitatoka consolidated funds; Zitatoka directly kwa Kakamega County kama vile zitaenda other counties. Kwa hivyo hali ya ugatuzi wa serikali ni jambo la maana sana chini ya katiba ambayo mnajua nyinyi wenyewe mliidhinisha.

**Resp:** *(Cheers, vuvuzela)*

**CHUI:** Mwananchi wa kawaida, sasa chukua kura yako ukijua sasa uko huru chini ya katiba mpya. Lakini itakuwa ni jambo lisilofaa kama tunaweza kukabidhi utekelezaji wa katiba hii kwa watu ambao pengine hawajasoma vizuri sheria kama Moses na Mimi na Prime Minister.

Unajua zote tulianza kukataa ile katiba mbaya 2005. Rafiki yangu mheshimiwa Attorney General Amos Wako nakuomba Msamaha leo.

**Resp:** (Cheers, vuvuzela)

**CHUI:** Sasa mambo ya chungwa tumerudisha tena. Na ni lazima tulete ukombozi wa mwisho na wa kweli katika Kenya hii. Yale ambayo tulikadiria kufanya wakati ndio huu; nawasihi ndugu wapenzi wa mkoa wa magharibi ambao uko na kaunti za maana: Kakamega County, Vihiga County, Busia County Bungoma county na hata Transzoia County, muwe mstari wa mbele kuleta ukombozi wa kweli chini ya katiba mpya. Msikubali kuonekana kama kawia kuweni kama Wiper.

**Resp:** (Cheers, vuvuzela)

**CHUI:** Si ni kweli?

**Resp:** (Emphatically) Eeh!

**CHUI:** Mimi vile ambavyo mnanijua, si ninaweza kuwa Rais?

**Resp:** (Emphatically affirmative) Eeh! (laughter, cheers, vuvuzela)

**CHUI:** Na kwa nini mimi nikasema SIMBA Tosha? Ni kwa sababu nimeweka Kenya mbele na mimi nyuma.

**Resp:** Eeh (Cheers, cheers, vuvuzela)

**CHUI:** Tusiwe na tabia ya kuitumia Kenya kwa masilahi yetu wenyewe; bali tuwe na tabia ya kutumikia Kenya. Kwa hivyo ukiona mtu ambaye anataka kutumia Kenya, huyo kataa hata (to use) kabla ya kuja Muliro Garden. Na ni wazi ambao wanataka kuitumia Kenya badala ya kutumikia Kenya. Basi Vijana (Direct address) sio sawa kwamba ni lazima mtu akipata degree yake kutoka Masinde Muliro University of Science and Technology na kwingineko zile kazi mnapata ni ya boda boda. Anachukua boda boda, na ako na degree yake, na hili ni swala lina kera wananchi (implies jobless) wote.

**Resp:** (Cheers) (affirmatively)

**CHUI:** Kwa hivyo ni lazima serikali inayokuja atakae iongoza mheshimiwa waziri mkuu tukiwa pamoja naye. Na hii serikali mnavyoiona hapa hakuna mkubwa, ni sisi team ya CORD. Sote vile tutasema ni lazima waekezaji walete mali yao Kenya kwa sababu tutakuwa na hali ya utulivu baada ya kutekeleza Katiba mpya. Halafu tuwe na viwanda mashinani.

**Resp:** (Cheers, vuvuzela)



**CHUI:** Hivi viwanda mashinani kila mahali ndivyo ambavyo vinasaidia vijana wetu kupata kazi. Unemployment in this country is not ever qualifiable .Whereas in the world we have succeeded in the area of Education, conducive environment must be so enabling that everybody must feel their full potential is being realized in order to create necessary jobs.

Kwa hivyo kazi kwa vijana; kazi kwa vijana, na sio kazi kwa wazee. sasa hivi nataka nikamilishe kwa kumwalika Waziri Mkuu.

**Resp:** *(Cheers/ Whistling)*

**CHUI:** Wacha niseme hivi: yale ambayo yanafanyika Tana River, hayawezi yakakubalika kamwe katika nchi ambayo inajitawala kwa hivyo.SIMBA

*(Song: Niwina walonga shialo (Song/dance/cheers)*

**SIMBA:** Haya! Haya! *(intense cheers, vuvuzela, screams)* Bandu baingo mulembe.

**Resp:** Mulembe

**SIMBA:** Mulembe khandi.

**Resp:** Mulembe

**SIMBA:** Mulembe tee

**Resp:** tee

**SIMBA:** Mulembe swa

**Resp:** swa

**SIMBA:** Mulembe Mia

**Resp:** Mia

**SIMBA:** Muli mwoyo

**Resp:** Eeh! *(affirmative)*

**SIMBA:** Asanteni sana. Tumerudi ingo tena

**Resp:** Eeh.

**SIMBA:** Na leo tumerudi kwa sababu moja pekee yake.

**Resp:** Eeh

**SIMBA:** Leo ni tarehe kumi na moja ya mwaka mpya.

**Resp:** Ee.

**SIMBA:** Na tunasema “Happy new Year”

**Resp:** Happy new year.

**SIMBA:** Tangazo ni moja pekee yake:Kumepambazuka.

**Resp:** (More Cheers/laughter)

**SIMBA:** Amukeni twende tufanye kazi; jogoo imewika mara tatu.(symbolic)

**Resp:** (*Laughter/more excitement, intense vuvuzela*).

**SIMBA:** Tarehe nne mwezi wa Machi Mwaka huu tutaona kivumbi;

**Resp:** (*Wild cheers*)

**SIMBA:** Kivumbi ya kuleta Kenya Mpya.

**Resp:** (*Cheers, vuvuzela*)

**SIMBA:** Hiyo ndio sababu tumekuja kutangaza eti wakati ni sasa. Sisi tumeungana pamoja; mmemuona CHUI, mmemuona Wetangula, mmemuona Jirongo, mmemuona Oparanya, mmemuona Gumo, mmemuona Otuoma na kadhalika.

**Resp:** Eeh!

**SIMBA:** Hii ni timu ya kwanza; yani first 11 ya CORD. Sawa sawa?

**Resp:** Eeh!

**SIMBA:** Tumekuja manaake tunajua sisi kama wakenya tunataka mabadiliko sio?

**Resp:** Eeh!

**SIMBA:** Tumekaa sana miaka mitano katika serikali ya Mseto. Nyinyi mlipiga kura kwa fujo kwangu.

**Resp:** (*Cheers/ululations/vuvuzela/Whistling*)

**SIMBA:** Lakini kura ilipofika Nairobi ikafanyiwa ukarabati si mnajua?

**Resp:** (*A lot of excitement/ vuvuzela/ Cheers*) Eeh

**SIMBA:** Mpaka vijana wakalalamika mpaka wakasema: No SIMBA...

**Resp:** No peace

**SIMBA:** No SIMBA...

**Resp:** No peace.

**SIMBA:** No SIMBA...

**Resp:** No peace

**SIMBA:** Jamaa wakatoa bunduki (*a lot of laughter*) wakaanza kupiga watu wetu damu ilimwagika. Nilikuja hapa Kakamega nikaenda kwa hospitali hapa Kakamega; nikakuta watu wetu wamelazwa huko; Risasi kwa matumbo, risasi nyingine kwa shingo, nyingine hapa kwa paja, nyingine hapa kwa mguu... si ni unyama huo?.

**Resp:** (*fiercely*) ndio

**SIMBA:** Tukasema dunia hii ni daima, lakini binadamu haishi milele, hata kesho ni siku nyingine sivyo.

**Resp:** ndio

**SIMBA:** Tukasema lazima tuketi chini tuzungumuze. Tukazungumza na tukasema hii nyama ilikuwa yetu lakini nilitangulia kuchinja tukasema wachukue nusu; tuchukue nusu. Hiyo ndio nusu mkate lakini haikuwa nusu. Walikuwa wametangulia kuchinja; wamechukua manovu manovu ikabaki mifupa peke yake. *(Cheers/excitement/ululation more charged crowd)*.

Lakini tukasema haidhuru; hata mkia ni nyama. *(More laughter /excitement/vuvuzela)*  
Nikachukuwa mkia nikatengeneza supu: Nikalisha watu wetu kwa supu: Tukivumilia. Manaake wahenga walisema; Mvumilivu...

**Resp:** Hula mbivu.

**SIMBA:** Ile mbivu tumekula ndani ya hiyo miaka mitano ni katiba mpya.

**Resp:** Eeh!/ndio baba.

**SIMBA:** Katiba mpya ndio mbivu tumekula.

**Resp:** Ndio baba.

**SIMBA:** Hii katiba mpya imewezesha sisi kuleta mabadiliko

**Resp:** Ndio baba.

**SIMBA:** Ndio sababu mnaona tunasema Coalition for Reforms and Democracy (CORD)

**Resp:** Ndio Baba

**SIMBA:** Tumetumia katiba mpya kubadilisha Kenya.

**Resp:** Ndio baba.

**SIMBA:** Katiba mpya imewezesha sisi kutengeneza ndoto ya waanzilishi wa taifa la Kenya

**Resp:** Ndio baba

**SIMBA:** Ambao walitangaza vita dhidi ya maadui wa Kenya: ugonjwa, ujinga, umaskini na utawala mbaya, dhuluma za kimabavu

**Resp:** Ndio baba

**SIMBA:** Sasa yale ambayo tutafanya; tutaangalia hii katiba mpya; tufungue funguo ya nne; chapter 4 Human Rights chapter, tukitekeleza hiyo tutabadilisha maisha Kenya.

**Resp:** Ndio baba.

**SIMBA:** Nitaanza kwa kusema there is a Right to life. Every Kenyan has a right to life. Haki ya kuishi; mkenya asiwe mkenya mwingine na hii ni jukumu ya serikali; kama kule Tana River isifanyike, kama kule Suguta Marmar isifanyike.

**Resp:** Ndio baba.

**SIMBA:** Kila Mkenya ana haki ya kuishi sio?

**Resp:** Ndio baba.

**SIMBA:** Ya pili; Right to food: Kila mkenya anahaki ya kupata chakula. Mkenya asilale njaa sawa sawa?

**Resp:** Eeh!/Ndio baba

**SIMBA:** Tatu; Right to Education: Kila mtoto ambaye amezaliwa Kenya hii, wazazi wake wana pesa, hawana pesa, apewe nafasi sawa, apewe fursa sawa ya kupata elimu kuanzia nasari mpaka chuo kikuu.

**Resp:** (Cheers/acclamations/vuvuzela)

**SIMBA:** Nne; Right to medicare: Hali ya kupata matibabu; Kila mkenya, akiwa mgonjwa, anapesa hana pesa, apate matibabu ya kutosha.

**Resp:** (Cheers/Whistling/Vuvuzela)

**SIMBA:** Sawa?

**Resp:** Sawa

**SIMBA:** Sita; Right to work: Haki ya kupata ajira;

Kila mkenya ambaye amehitimu umri wa miaka kumi na minane, apewe nafasi ya kupata kazi pale ambapo atapata riziki yake.

Kama watu wanafanya kazi, Vijana, mama wanafanya kazi wametengeneza mali na hapo ndipo taifa inajengeka. Vijana hawana kazi ndio kwa sababu wanakunywa pombe. Na pande hii umeweka polisi wanasukuma sukuma eti hii, na kazi hakuna. Tunataka polisi wafanye kazi ya muhimu waachane na hii mambo ya kusumbua watu ambao wamekunywa changaa.

**Resp:** (Applause/Cheers).

**SIMBA:** Sisi tuna mbinu ya kuona ya kwamba uchumi inapanuka na kazi inafanyika; upande wa ubinafusi tuone ya kwamba viwanda vinajengwa hapa na pale. Old people security settlement programme; Sasa kuanzia June mwaka huu, kila mzee ambaye amehitimu miaka Sitini na tano na zaidi, atapata hiyo marupurupu ya kila mwezi. Hiyo ni mipango ya CORD; sio watu wale wengine. Sisi tutatekeleza yale ambayo tunasema; manaake sisi tunasema na kutenda.

**Resp:** (*Laughter/Excitement/Vuvuzela*)

**SIMBA:** Kenya hii kuna unafiki mwingi zaidi unaita mtu namna hii kama unaita kuku unataka kuchinja. Asema eti ‘kutkutkutkut’

**Resp:** (*Alot of laughter/Chanting/ Excitement/Vuvuzela*)

**SIMBA:** Anarushiwa mahindi; anafikiria jama ni mkarimu zaidi, akifika karibu ananaswa.

**Resp:** (*Wild screams, laughter, vuvuzela*)

**SIMBA:** Kwekwekwekwe; maji imechemka, sio?

**Resp:** Eeh!

**SIMBA:** Halafu baadaye anasema... (*suspense*) Kitenda wili?

**Resp:** (*Widely*) Tega

**SIMBA:** Kitenda wili?

**Resp:** (*More widely*) Tega.

**SIMBA:** Unajua tamaa ilimua nani?

**Resp:** fisi (*cheers, vuvuzela*)

**SIMBA:** Naye kusahau ilimfanya nani apigwe teke?

**Resp:** ----- (*No answer*).

**SIMBA:** Unajua ngiri anafanana na nguruwe. Anasahau mingi zaidi: akitoka hapa anafika pale amesahau; sio?

**Resp:** (*Cheers, laughter*)

**SIMBA:** Sio?

**Resp:** Eeh! (*affirmatively*)

**SIMBA:** Anapigwa teke. Nimeona juzi ngiri anafanya mambo mazuri na mwenzake mpaka wanaandikana; baadaye ngiri anasema eti shetani ndiye alimpeleka huko (*derisive laughter*).

**Resp:** (*A lot of laughter/cheers/chants/vuvuzela/whistling*).

**SIMBA:** Sisi hatuna kitu kama hiyo. Sisi tunasema na kutenda. Sisi tuliketi chini tukaongea kama watu wazima. Na tunakuja mbele yenu na CHUI ndiye aliyeongea; hakusema ati nilikuwa nimesau. (*laughter*).

(*A song to introduce the next speaker, Fred Gumo*)

(*Song: Mubiri kuno, kulikona emakombe, sangasya ombiri*).

**Gumo:** ODM

**Resp:** CORD

**Gumo:** WIPER

**Resp:** CORD

**Gumo:** FORD KENYA

**Resp:** CORD

**Gumo:** Yangu yatakuwa machache sana. Nataka kuwaambia kitu kimoja Omuluhya wewe, si wewe ni mluhya?

**Resp:** Eeh! (*affirmatively*)

**Gumo:** Sasa (*silence*) sisi tukiwa katika ODM, sisi tukiwa katika ODM, ODM is a national party; Haina ukabila wowote. Na sisi tumesema ya kwamba ni lazima tuunganishe Kenya yote pamoja.

**Resp:** (*Cheers, vuvuzela*)

**Gumo:** Na nyinyi mkiwa watu wa Western, nani alikuwa Deputy wa Mheshimiwa Simba?

**Resp:** Musalia/ NDOVU (*Mixed responses*)

**Gumo:** Alikuwa nani?

**Resp:** Musalia/NDOVU (*Mixed responses*)

**Gumo:** SIMBA alifukuza yeye?

**Resp:** Hapana

**Gumo:** Alimufukuza?

**Resp:** Hapana

**Gumo:** Nani alidanganya yeye?

**Resp:** Shetani (*jeering and sarcastic*)

**Gumo:** Haya! Unajuwa huyo ni rafiki yangu na mimi nilimwambia, na wengi wenu mulinisikia. Nilimwambia ndugu yangu mahali unapelekwa sisi tumekuwa huko na tunajua chenye kiko kwa hiyo barabara.

**Resp:** (*vuvuzela, laughter*)

**Gumo:** Rudi nyumbani; kama unataka tufanye nomination katika chama chetu wacha tufanyie hapa ndani; ama namna gani?

**Resp:** Ndio!

**Gumo:** Walikuwa wanataka atoke tu katika ODM; akatoka kwa ODM. Baadaye wakamwambia kuja tukupatie kiti. Mimi nikamuuliza, aah?

**Resp:** (*Cheers, vuvuzela, shouting*)

**Gumo:** Mnajua glutton?

**Resp:** Eeh! (*vuvuzela, jeering*)

**Gumo:** Lingu (glutton) akiwa na nyama yake atakuita ati kuja tukule nyama?

**Resp:** Hapana.

**Gumo:** Fisi akiwa na nyama yake pale, eti mbwa anajaribu kufika pale akule, atampa mbwa kweli?

**Resp:** Hapana

**Gumo:** Si atakula hata mbwa mwenyewe?

**Resp:** Eeh! (*cheering, vuvuzela*)

**Gumo:** Nikamwaambia hapo unaenda ndugu yangu utapitia kwa moto.

**Resp:** (*vuvuzela*)

**Gumo:** Wakaenda kwa nyumba yake wakamwambia kuja tukupatie kiti.

Akaweka saini, akaenda kwa ile nyumba ingine tena akaweka saini, eti watampatia kiti. Baadaye wakasema eti shetani ndiye alikuwa anasain hizi vitu.

**Resp:** (*vuvuzela, cheering, jeering*)

**Gumo:** Unajua haja yao yote ni kugawa Western Province. Haja yao yote ni kugawa kura ya waluhya; mimi namwambia ndugu yangu arudi tufanye kazi pamoja.

*(Song to introduce Cyrus Jirongo)*

**Jirongo:** Mulembe bos!

**Resp:** Mulembe

**Jirongo:** Mulembe Khandi

**Resp:** Mulembe

**Jirongo:** Kwanza, sisi kama jamii ya mkoa wa Western Province, sisi kama watu wanaoelewa tunatoka wapi na tunaenda wapi.

Sisi ambao tulimzaa Masinde Muliro, sisi ambao tulimzaa Musa Amalemba, sisi ambao tumekuwa na wanaume ambao wanaona mbali lazima turejeshe heshima ya taifa letu.

**Resp:** (*Vuvuzela*)

**Jirongo:** Mimi nilikuwa hapa na rafiki yangu, tukaamua tena kuunga mkono PAMBAZUKA. Tulitoka hapa tukarundi Nairobi. Kuamka asubuhi nikaambiwa ameenda hivyo; halafu siku iliyofuata nikaambiwa ameenda AMANI. Halafu mimi nikaketi nikasema yale mambo

tulizungumzia bado yanaendelea. Nikaangalia mbali na nikaona hapa mwenzangu alitumwa kunifunga tu; ili ahakikishe kunifunga miguu ili kura ipigwe upande huu kivingine tu ili watu wengine wapite katikati.

**Resp:** (*vuvuzela*)

**Jirongo:** Mimi na Wetangula tukae pamoja katika serikali ya SIMBA AmoIo Simba; tumwambie apatie nyinyi maendeleo.

**Resp:** (*Cheering, vuvuzela*)

**Jirongo:** Na yeye amesema atafuata katiba .Yeye amesema kura si sababu wakenya walipigana. Anasema wakenya walipigana kwa sababu ya ugawaji mbaya. Watu wengine wanavuta zaidi kupeleka kwao na kuwaacha wakenya wengine wakilala njaa.

Hiyo ndio sababu ilifanya wakenya wakafuruga Kenya hii.

**Resp:** (*cheers, vuvzela*)

**Jirongo:** Yeye anasema atapigania devolution.

*The data below consists of utterances selected from speeches at a JUBILEE campaign rally*

*(Speaker not identified)*

**Speaker 1:** Leo ni leo, msemae kesho ni?

**Resp:** Mwongo

**Speaker 1:** Tumekuja hapa manake ni wakati wa wakenya kuamua. Ziko timu mbili;

**Resp:** (*vuvuzela*)

**Speaker 1:** Timu ya kwanza ni timu ya wazee ambao wanaenda kustaafu

**Resp:** (*Vuvuzela*)

**Speaker 1:** Timu iliyokutana hapa leo ni timu ya vijana chipukizi; akiwa mbele yao yuko Mheshimiwa KIBOKO, Mheshimiwa J2 na Mama Mwenyewe, Charity Kaluki Ngilu.

**Resp:** (*Whistling Cheers/Vuvuzela*)

**Speaker 1:** Vile vile tuko na mheshimiwa Balala mwenyewe hapa.

Sisi kutoka Lower Eastern, watu wa Lower Eastern, wakamba wako hapa. Msiambiwe wakamba hawako hapa.

**Resp:** (*cheers*)

**Speaker 1:** We have decided as a community. We shall not allow ourselves to be in opposition; we want to be in the next government. And the next government is being formed here today.



**Resp:** *(Celebration, vuvuzela)*

**Speaker 1:** If you are not here today you will be left out of the vision in the next Government.

**Resp:** *(cheers, whistling, vuvuzela)*

**Speaker 1:** Today the competition which we are pretty before the Kenyans is the competition of between those who stand for the future of this Nation; transformative leadership and those who stand for yesterday who are going for retirement.

**Resp:** *(cheers)*

**Speaker 1:** Mimi ninataka kuwauliza, yule mtu ambaye anatuletea vitendawili kweli ataweza kutatua shida za wakenya?

**Resp:** Hapana.

**Speaker 1:** Shida za wakenya zitasuluhishwa na hawa viongozi. Mungu awabariki, JUBILEE Hoyee!

**Resp:** Hoyee *(vuvuzela/Cheers)*.

**Sonko Mbuvi:** Vijana Aaa

**Resp:** Aaa!

**Sonko:** Warembo Eeh!

**Resp:** Eeh!

**Sonko:** Wamama Eeh!

**Resp:** Eeh!

**Sonko:** Mimi ndio Sonko wa masonko; kwanza mimi nikishirikiana na mheshimiwa Kiboko na Mheshimiwa Sungura, sisi ndio hasla wa mahasla (Hustler wa ma-hustler)

**Resp:** *(Cheers/ Vuvuzela)*

**Sonko:** Sisi bado ndio watetezi wa wanyonge; watetezi wa maskini watetezi wa matajiri na watetezi wa wanainchi wa katikati.

**Resp:** *(cheers)*

**Sonko:** Ahsante sana; lakini ujumbe ambao ninao kwa wakenya wenzangu; akina mama, vijana na wakenya kwa jumla. Ni juzi tu ndugu zetu walikuwa hapa. Walikuwa hawatumi lugha nzuri. Sisi kama wakenya tunawashawishi wakenya wenzangu mahali walipo wananiangalia leo. Ni haki ya kikatiba, ni haki ya kidemokrasia, ni haki ya uhaki wa wakenya kwa mheshimiwa Kiboko kusimama kama Raisi wa Jamhuri ya Kenya

**Resp:** *(Cheers and Support).*

**Sonko:** JUBILEE Coalition si chama; ni mrenge wa wakenya wote. Mheshimiwa Kiboko ni mkenya. Mheshimiwa Sungura ni mkenya Mheshimiwa Balala ni mkenya. Mheshimiwa Ngilu ni mkenya. Wale wanaosema JUBILEE ni ukabila tunasema ni mashetani; washindwe katika jina la Yesu Kristo.

**Resp:** *(Cheers/vuvuzela/acclamation)*

**Sonko:** Wakenya wenzangu kama mna macho nataka mjionee; kama mna masikio, nataka msikie, kuna kiongozi fulani alisimama hapa akaongea mambo ya barabara, mimi ningependa kuuliza wakenya: Ni nani waziri wa barabara?

**Resp:** *(Cheers to imply it is common knowledge)*

**Sonko:** Ni mrenge gani?

**Resp:** *(More intense cheers implying it is obvious)*

**Sonko:** Ni chama gani? Pesa za vijana zililiwa? Vijana wenzangu Kenya nzima wanakufa kwa njaa, ni nani waziri anahusika na mambo ya vijana? Ni mrenge gani?

**Resp:** ODM

**Sonko:** Vijana wamenyanyaswa: wametapeliwa shilingi mia tatu kwa vitambulisho; ni nani waziri anahusika na mambo ya vitambulisho?

**Resp.:** *(Vuvuzela/ cheers)*

**Sonko:** Hata hawana adabu! Walisimama hapa wakaongea mambo ya mashamba; ni nani waziri wa mashamba Kenya?

**Resp:** *(Cheers/vuvuzela)*

**Sonko:** Wa chama gani?

**Resp:** ODM

**Sonko:** Tafadhalini wakenya msikubali kudanganywa tena: Msikubali kutapeliwa tena

**Rachel Shebesh:** Today, am very happy woman; a happy Nairobi woman politician.

Today I am a very optimistic mother and a very optimistic wife. But most importantly, I am a very optimistic Kenyan.

**Resp:** *(Cheers)*

**Shebesh:** I am tired as a woman for fighting for myself. I want a government that recognizes the stake for women leadership. I thank God because of the JUBILEE Coalition we know that Charity Ngilu will ensure our stake as women.

**Resp:** *(Cheers)*

**Shebesh:** I am also tired of living in a country in which I am divided between my religion and my ethnicity. I am tired of people talking that as a Christian I must not get married to a Muslim; I thank God that in JUBILEE Coalition, Mheshimiwa Najib Balala will deliver us from that kind of discrimination.

**Resp:** *(Cheers)*

**Cecily Mbarire:** Asante sana. Ni furaha yangu kuwa hapa siku ya leo. And what I would like to say is ninataka mnisikilize kimakini as today we are bound to make history in our country. And the way we are making history in this country is that we are handing over political leadership from the older generation to the younger generation. That is what has brought us here today.

**Resp:** *(Cheers/Whistling)*

**Mbarire:** And if you look at the history across the world, political generation handling over of leadership has never been easy. We saw yesterday at Kiboko Park that the leadership is not willing to pave way. And so it is for us, sisi wenyewe tuwajibike na kura zetu.

**Resp:** *(Cheers/vuvuzela)*

**Mbarire:** Na mimi ningetaka kusema hivi, 2002 wakati Mheshimiwa KIBOKO alisimama, akipatiwa support na Mheshimiwa J2, waliambiwa ni vijana sana! Waende wakunywe maziwa wapate miaka mingi ndio warudi kuitisha kura, si ndivyo waliambiwa?

**Resp:** Eeh!

**Mbarire:** Si waliambiwa waende wakunywe maziwa?

**Resp:** Eeh! *(Emphatically)*

**Mbarire:** 2007 Mheshimiwa J2 put his weight behind Hon Simba. Mheshimiwa KIBOKO put his weight behind Kibaki. They both supported old leaders for the sake of stability. Now is the time; today is the day for them to take over leadership. Mnakubali?

**Resp:** *(Thunderous applause)* Yes

**Mbarire:** I want to tell Mheshimiwa Sungura and Mheshimiwa Kiboko. I want to tell them this: Mtatusiwa, mtaitwa husband; mtaitwa mambo mingi; But do note that our goal is to make sure we send Simba home to Bondo.

**Resp:** *(Cheers/vuvuzela)*

**Mbarire:** And I want to tell this to Mheshimiwa Simba, the writing is on the wall; time is up. Mimi ninauliza hivi, Mheshimiwa Kiboko anaweza ama hawezi?

**Resp:** *(Affirmatively)* Anaweza

**Mbarire:** Mheshimiwa Sungura anaweza ama hawezi?

**Resp:** *(Affirmatively)* Anaweza

**Mbarire:** Mheshimiwa Sungura anaweza ama hawezi?

**Resp:** *(with screams, vuvuzela)* Anaweza.

**Mbarire:** JUBILEE inaweza ama haiwezi?

**Resp:** Inaweza

**Mbarire:** Sisi wenyewe tunaweza, time is up Simba.

Asante.

**Charity Ngilu:** Asante sana. Thank you. Viongozi wa JUBILEE, Delegates wa JUBILEE, TNA,URP, NARC na wale wengine wamekuja hapa, NARC?

**Resp:** Rainbow

**Ngilu:** NARC

**Resp:** Rainbow

**Ngilu:** Tarehe tano mwezi wa kumi nilikuwa nikisherekea Graduation yangu. That afternoon, one young man walked into my Graduation ceremony anaitwa Kiboko na nikashangaa sana.

Nikamuuliza: what brings you here?

Akasema: “I am coming to ask you to support me to become the President of Kenya”. I said to him, I am afraid I don’t think I can do so. Ok, I have my five very important issues that I would like somebody to deal with if I am going to support somebody else other than myself.

And he asked can I go through these issues with you; and I was surprised how patient he was. Nobody had asked me about these issues.

Nikamuambia ya kwamba we must set a clear agenda for this country. We cannot forever continue to celebrate poverty; to celebrate suffering of our people and yet we have been in leadership for so long. I said to him that 50 years ago your father identified three issues:

Na akasema ya kwamba yeye atatupatia matibabu ya bure katika nchi yetu ya Kenya; Huyu ni babake alisema hivyo. Alisema ata attempt issues of poverty: atamaliza umaskini. Na akasema atatupatia elimu ya bure. Nikamuuliza, those three are still with us in Kenya today. We in NARC have taken these issues on board.

Nikamuambia the issues we have come up with is food and water; chakula na maji. Nikamuambia Milioni mbili na nusu ya wakenya wanalala bila chakula kila siku. Wakienda kulala hawana chakula.

Four Million Kenyans hawana maji safi. Ukienda Health sector, tunatumia Billion 27 ku-treat watu ambao wanazaa. Na nikamuuliza mambo ya akina mama wafanye biashara; utaweza na uwasaidia akina mama na wakenya wafanye biashara na wapate pesa kama wengine? Akasema hiyo nitaweza.

**Resp:** *(Cheersa, vuvuzela)*

**Ngilu:** Nikamuuliza na hii yote hatuwezi tukawa na mali yetu kwa sababu hatuwezi tukafanya biashara; mali yetu yote tunafanya biashara na China na hakuna kitu sisi tunafanya hapa; akasema hiyo tutawezesha ili tujitengenezee mali hapa.

Nikamuuliza, na mambo ya mahindi kutoka Rift valley, ili watu wakipanda huko Rift valley, mahindi hawawezi wakauza mali yao vizuri, akasema hiyo tutaweza.

Pia nikamuuliza umewahi kutembea kutoka Uthiru, Kibira, Kawangware uone vile kila asubuhi wanainchi wa kawaida wanatembea kwa miguu, unaweza kuweka light rail ndio hawa wananchi waweze kuchukua light rail wakienda kazini? Akasema hiyo nitafanya; sasa ninasema ataweza na atafanya.

**Resp:** *(Cheers/vuvuzela)*

**Ngilu:** Nikiangalia upande mwingine sisikii mtu akisema mambo juu ya wananchi; nikajiuliza nisaidie huyu kijana ataangalia mambo ya akina mama, watoto na kila mtu pamoja na wengine. Nikasema lazima utaweka kile kidole chake, unajua yeye anaweka sahihi na kidole ya kushoto. Nikamuambia lazima uweke hicho kidole cha kushoto kwa haya mambo ya NARC matano. Na nikasema ni haki tano miaka mitano. Akasema ni hivyo; ahadi tano miaka mitano. Semeni hivyo: Ahadi tano miaka Mitano

**Resp:** *(Cheers, vuvuzela)* Ahadi tano miaka mitano

**Ngilu:** Nikamuuliza Sungura; na wewe Sungura utaweza kufanya hivyo?

Asante sana

**J2:** Basi ndugu zetu wanaJUBILEE hamjambo.

**Resp:** Hatujambo

**Sungura:** Asalaam aleikum

**Resp:** Alikumsalam

**Sungura:** Bwana yesu asifiwe

**Resp:** Asifiwe

**Sungura:** Nataka nichukuwe nafasi hii, nafasi ya kipekee kukubali kuteuliwa kama mtu ambaye atawania kiti cha deputy President kupitia kwa mrengo huu wa JUBILEE Coalition

**Resp:** *(Cheers/ Vuvuzela/whistling)*

**Sungura:** Nataka niwashukuru wanachama wote. My friends and Presidential candidate KIBOKO have spoken. I would want to limit my speech to very few things I want to say. First and foremost, this contest has now been properly framed and clearly defined. It is now absolutely clear what the contest is all about. Are we together?

**Resp:** *(Vuvuzela/cheers/whistling)*

**Sungura:** This contest, ladies and gentlemen, is going to be a contest between the gentlemen on the other side, who have a hangover of the past, yesterday and the day before, and these young men who have the hope for the future and the days to come. This contest that I say is between the analogue generation on the other side and the digital generation on this other side.

**Resp:** *(Cheers/vuvuzela)*

**Sungura:** It is the contest of men and women on the other side who focus on the problems and the men and women on this side who focus on the solution

**Resp:** *(Vuvuzela/Cheers).*

**Sungura:** It is a contest between two generations: the JUBILEE generation and the generation that is assembling their wares to go into retirement.

**Resp:** *(Vuvuzela)*

**Sungura:** Ladies and gentlemen it is a contest between men and women who believe in rhetoric and those on this side who believe in result, in performance and in delivery. And that

contest is as clear as day is from night. And it's for the people of Kenya on the 4<sup>th</sup> of March next year to choose between the past and the future.

**Resp:** (*cheers/vuvuzela*)

**Sungura:** Ladies and gentlemen, I want to tell you why I will support the honorable KIBOKO, Ladies and Gentleme, the candidate that we select, I want to tell our competitors that if they think that selection is going to be defined by ethnicity, they are damn wrong; this contest is going to be defined by the issues which affect the 40 Million Kenyans and the solution we offer for sorting out those challenges.

*The data that follows consists of selected utterances collected from speeches at a CORD campaign rally*

**Kalembe Ndile:** TIP TIP

**Resp:** Amani Kenya

**Ndile:** Asante sana. Yangu ni kuchukua hii nafasi niseme pongezi kwa Prime Minister Simba na CHUI kwa kukubaliana. Pongezi kwao na niwaambie kitu tunaongelea ni wakenya. Kumbuka tuko na makabila mawili: tajiri na maskini. Tuangalie mambo ya maskini ili wasonge juu hakuna tena Kenya hii, mtoto wa Kenya atasimama tena na kuitwa mtoto wa squatter.

Hapa Kenya mnajua mimi nilikuwa ninasimamia wanyama wa porini na mnajua fisi na ndovu wanafanya kazi sana.

**Ababu Namwamba:** Thank you very much. Nikiwaona, naona muko tayari; muko tayari kukaa na wapinzani wetu mundu-khu-mundu?

**Resp:** Eeh! (*cheers/vuvuzela*)

**Namwamba:** Ebu semeni: Mundu-khu-mundu

**Resp:** Mundu-Khu-Mundu

**Namwamba:** Muko tayari kukaa na wapinzani bumper to bumper

**Resp:** Eeh! (*Vuvuzela*)

**Namwamba:** Sisi leo tunashuhudia kupambazuka kwa enzi mpya. Tunashuhudia mwanzo mpya kwa taifa letu. Leo tunashuhudia mwanzo mpya wa taifa la Kenya. Vijana nawaambia kolabo (collaboration) ya man Stevo, na Rao na Weta ni Kolabo ya nguvu.

**Resp:** (*Cheers/vuvuzela*)

**Namwamba:** Ni Kolabo ya power; when others see the devil; we see God. When others express pride, we show humility. When others show hubris, we demonstrate servant leadership; when we see our rivals we remember the words of the great great philosopher Euripedes who said, and I quote him: Those that the Gods intend to destroy first make them loose their senses” so as we see senselessness spreading over our rival, we say bring it off! Semeni, bring it off: semeni:

**Resp:** Bring it off.

**Namwamba:** Na sasa ndugu yangu Musalia NDOVU mimi ninamuambia hivi; wahenga walisema mwenda tesi na omo marejeo ni ngamani.

**Resp:** (*Vuvuzela/cheers*)

**Namwamba:** Wahenga waliongezea, wakanena tena ya kwamba ngombe akiumia malishoni, hurejea zizini. Tunamuambia ndugu yetu Musalia, karibu nyumbani. Mlango uko wazi. Nairobi Mnamkaribisha arudi nyumbani?

**Resp:** (*vuvuzela/cheers/Whistlers*)

(*Christian Song*)

**Milly Odhiambo:** Wazee aa!

**Resp:** Aah!

**Milly:** Vijana aa!

**Resp:** Aah!

**Milly:** Asanteni; mimi ninataka kusema neno moja, hatutaki kwenda kwa mashetani. We want leaders who believe in God and who respect God. Let God bring us together in the CORD that cannot be broken. Mubarikiwe.

**Speaker 2:** Sisi wakaaji wa Nyanza, tumeamua tunataka tukae mahali ambapo wakenya, all Kenyans of good-will wameamua kukaa.

Namba mbili: Sisi hatutaki viongozi ambao wanatukazia uongozi wa kikabila. Sisi tumeamua kuunga chama/Muungano wa vyama ambavyo vitaunda serikali; sisi watu wa Nyanza tunataka tukae ndani ya hiyo serikali na muungano huo ni muungano wa CORD.

(*Kamba music*)

**CHUI:** Ahsanteni, Wiper



**Resp:** CORD

**CHUI:** ODM

**Resp:** CORD

**CHUI:** Ford Kenya.

**Resp:** CORD

**CHUI:** Basi wakenya wenzangu nawauliza kwa heshima tunyamaze kidogo. Kwanza nitawaulizeni hivi; tunaposungumza, wenzetu katika Tana Delta jana asubuhi, mnajua kwamba tulikuwa na uvamizi mbaya sana. Na wananchi zaidi ya karibu thelathini wakafa. Mmoja wao alikua mgombea wa kiti cha County Assembly na alikuwa analeta makaratasi yake kwa Wiper House akawawa pamoja na baba yake.

**Resp:** (Expression of sorrow)

**CHUI:** Tunawapa watu wa Tana River pole zetu na huku tukihimiza, na kwa sababu tunajua uchungu ulioko katika nchi nzima kutokana na tukio hilo; nikama tukio ambalo linaendelea kwa mvululizo. Leo ni leo, anaesema kesho?

**Resp:** Ni mwongo

**CHUI:** Kutoka leo Kenya ya badilika.Sema Kenya badilika...

**Resp:** Kenya badilika.

*The data that follows below consists of selected utterances collected from speeches at a JUBILEE campaign rally*

**Speaker 3:** Ukitaka kujua kama mtu ni mzuri unauliza marafiki zake.Unauliza wale amefanya kazi nao.Unauliza wale amejiri. Sasa Miguna amekaa na mtu huyo; wale wa Pentagon wamemkana. Na pia wale alikuwa anaongoza kama wabunge wamemkana. Huyo mtu anaweza kuongoza Kenya?

**Resp:** Hawezi. (*cheers/ vuvuzela*)

**Speaker 3:** Anaweza?

**Resp:** Hawezi (*Emphatically*)

**Speaker 3:** Ahsanteni Sana.

**Balala:** Safari hii tuko ngangari; wakati huu ni vijana. Huu ni wakati wa digital. The TV ya box tunazima.Tunataka flat screen sio?

**Resp:** Ndio

**Balala:** Basi, nikisema Kiboko mnasema ndani; nikisema wazee mnasema Nyumbani .

Tumeelewana?

**Resp:** Ndio

**Balala:** Kiboko...

**Resp:** Ndani

**Balala:** Wazee...

**Resp:** Nyumbani

**Balala:** Vitenda wili

**Resp:** Nyumbani

**Balala:** Basi...Tunasema Wazee wanaenda nyumbani Sio?

**Resp:** Ndio

**Balala:** Ni wakati wa vijana chipukizi. Leo nimekumbuka wakati wa historia tuliofanya kwenye uwanja huu wa Kiboko park. Na rais wetu atakuwa ni?

**Resp :** Kiboko

**Balala:** Kwa hivyo tunasema; wakati huu hakuna tena kwenda kwa barabara. Ikiwa wewe umeshindwa, kubali; uende kotini ama ukarudi mashambani ukalime.

**Resp:** *(cheers/vuvuzela/whistling).*

**Balala:** Vitenda wili vimeleta vurugu sasa tunataka amani na Kiboko State House. Hii team haitaki vichekesho tena; hii team inataka kubadilisha Kenya. Team hii inataka kusaidia nchi yetu kama zile nchi zenye zimesonga mbele.Vijana hatutaki tena wawe ni pressure group. Tunataka vijana wajitegemee wenyewe kwa kuwapa ahadi ambayo wataweza kupata mikopo bila riba na kuweza kujitegemea wenyewe.

**Resp:** *(Cheers)*

**Balala:** Wakati huu ni akina mama ikiwa katiba imesema akina mama watatambulika basi ninataka akina mama watambulike Kenya nzima.

**Charity Ngilu:** Thank you; Wana JUBILEE hamjambo

**Resp:** Hatujambo

**Ngilu:** Leo tunaona pale serikali itakuwa. Tunajua tarehe tano, Mheshimiwa KIBOKO ndio atakuwa Rais wa Kenya

**Resp:** *(Cheers)*

**Ngilu:** Na tunaamini ya kwamba, na tumesoma magazeti; na wametuletea news mbaya, eti kusema JUBILEE ikishinda watatupeleka kortini na hawatakubali. We want to remind them; tunataka kuwakumbusha, this is not 2007

**Resp:** *(Cheers/vuvuzela).*

**Ngilu:** This is 2013, tunawakumbusha pia, wale wote walikuwa na huyu Simba sasa wako na KIBOKO.

**Resp:** *(cheers).*

**Ngilu:** Ikiwa amewachwa na kila mtu, amebaki na nani? Amebaki na nani?

**Resp:** *(Cheers).*

**Ngilu:** Nasema hapa, amebaki na yule wa kupita katikati.

**Resp:** *(Cheers/Vuvuzela)*

**Ngilu:** Na sasa ningependa kusema kwa Simba; hakuna njia ya katikati.Sasa njia ile tuko nayo ni ya kwenda direct to State House.

**Resp:** *(cheers/Vuvuzela).*

**Ngilu:** Jumatatu, we are now talking about ours;

***The data below consists of utterances selected from speeches at a CORD campaign rally***

**Wetangula:** We come here at the threshold of rewriting our history.

**Resp:** *(cheers/vuvuzela)*

**Wetangula:** We come here in total humility, resolve and trust that the people of Kenya will stand with the CORD Alliance. I come here to urge you and inform you that we have travelled every part of this country.We have impressed every Kenyan.We have sold out our policies: and we have told Kenyans that we are the better option.

**Resp:** *(Intense cheers)*

**Wetangula:** We come here today on the last day of our campaigns to tell Kenyans, our brothers and sisters that in the CORD Alliance, with our presidential candidate Simba and the running mate Stephen CHUI, Kenya cannot have it any better.

**Resp:** *Cheers/vuvuzela)*

**Wetangula:** We shall ensure our total commitment to the implementation of the constitution. We shall be on the side of Kenyans all the times ensuring Kenyans are proud to be citizens of this country. Tusikubali kura zetu ziibiwe, kura zetu zikarabatiwe, kura zetu zisipotee.

**Resp:** *(cheers/chants)*

**Wetangula:** Kwa sababu kila kura inamaana katika kinyanganyiro hiki. Tunawaomba na tunawasihi ndugu zetu police kwamba ni jukumu lao kisheria na kikatiba kulinda amani ya kila mpiga kura. Na sisi kama serikali ya CORD, tunawahakikishia ndugu zetu police kwamba tutaendelea tukiunda serikali.

**CHUI:** Tulipoanza safari hii ya muungano CORD Coalition. Niliahidi kutafutia ndugu yangu Simba kura kwa nguvu zote, kwa akili yangu yote.

**Resp:** *(Cheers)*

**CHUI:** Mabadiliko ni sasa, na kama anavyosema SIMBA, huwezi kuanza kuzuia mto unaoelekea bahari ya Mediterranean.

**Resp:** *(Cheers)* Huwezi

**CHUI:** Muko tayari

**Resp:** Tuko tayari

**CHUI:** Waambiwe haiwezekani tena kikundi cha watu wachache wao wawe ndio walala hai na sisi ni walala hoi.

**Resp:** *(Cheers)*

**CHUI:** Wale wale ambao wako Kiboko Park waambiwe hakuna tena mwananchi wa kenya atalala hoi

**Resp:** *(Vuvuzela/cheers)*

**CHUI:** Hakuna tena

**Resp:** *(Cheers of strong approval)*

**CHUI:** Haiwezekani tena wakenya waendeleo kuwa masafara nao wanakuwa ni walala hai. Kwa hivyo masafara wote tumeamka na kusema wakati wa mabadiliko ni sasa.

**Resp:** *(Cheers/Vuvuzela)*

**CHUI:** Kwa hivyo ndugu wapenzi, we still have work to do. And it is precise, on Monday, earliest time possible, by the time they open those polling station, let there be queues across this

nation; queues of liberation; of Kenyans saying never again are we going to tolerate bad governance. Never again are we going to see them manipulate results of elections.

**Resp:** (*Vuvuzela/cheers/whistling*)

**CHUI:** Muko tayari?

**Resp:** Tuko tayari

**CHUI:** Basi hawa, eti wanasema wanatawanya makaratasi katika mitaa ya Nairobi hii wakidhani wanaweza kushtuwa CHUI, wanatawanya wanasema muungano wetu sisi; wa ndugu SIMBA na Moses Wetangula eti ni Muungano wa unafiki; wao ndio wanafiki.

**Resp:** (*Cheers/vuvuzela*)

**CHUI:** Wao ndio wanafiki

**Resp:** (*Cheers/vuvuzela*)

**CHUI:** Na hii ni dalili ya kushindwa. Ni wafidhuli hao; ambao hawajui ya kwamba huwezi yale ambayo yamefanyika, Muungano wetu ni wa powerful ideas; a serious union between committed Nationalists as opposed to those who want to misuse the word digital; if you go to the so called digital leaders, there is nothing so serious than reversal of the strides we have made through new constitution. Tuko tayari?

**Resp:** Eeh! (*Excitement/cheers*)

**CHUI:** Ahsante; nawatoleeni kofia tena

**Resp:** (*More wild cheers*)

**CHUI:** Kutoka sasa tusilale. Amesema hapa ndugu yetu mmoja eti tupige kura twende tukangojee matokeo. Mimi nasema tuwe vigilant. Tuwe vigilant kabisa. Kwa sababu hatutaki safari hii kura zimeibiwa.

**Resp:** (*Cheers/Vuvuzela*)

**CHUI:** Wangapi watakuwa vigilant?

**Resp:** (*Cheers/ Vuvuzela*)

**CHUI:** We cannot, haiwezekani tena dunia nzima inangojea. Haiwezekani tena watu wa dunia wasikie kura imeibiwa Kenya tena. Kwa hivyo tuwe waangalifu. Na mimi ninawahakikishia ukisikia SIMBA ameshinda mjue dunia nzima ita-celebrate.

**Resp:** (*Vuvuzela/ Cheers/Wild*)

**CHUI:** Nimesoma leo magazetini eti mkuu wa utumishi wa umma yeye amechukuwa jukumu la kukaribisha viongozi kutoka duniani kuja kwa kuapishwa pengine ndoto zake zinaelekea upande mbovu. Nataka niwaambie SIMBA mwenyewe ndiye atawaalika kusema kujeni; kujeni.....

**Resp:** *(Cheers/Vuvuzela)*

**CHUI:** They want me to speak in English so that international friends can begin to follow what we are saying; I am basically saying that the whole world is waiting patiently and eagerly to see the rebuild of the Kenyan nation and I know that the whole world will celebrate with the Kenyan people on hearing a solid, first round win for CORD coalition; Coalition for Reforms and Democracy.

**Resp:** *(Wild cheers)*

**CHUI:** So fellow Kenyans, What Mwalimu Julius Nyerere said of Mahatma Gandhi that to get leadership of the quality and of the type/kind of Mahatma Gandhi, that humility will need a million years; and I want to suggest to you fellow Kenyans to get the kind of leadership that is committed; with such emotion and dedication that we see in our brother Simba it will take us a very long, long time.

**Resp:** *(Wild cheers/Vuvuzela)*

**CHUI:** In effect kama mnataka kujua yale alikuwa anaweza angalau kufanya comparison kidogo ni CHUI; na mimi niliweza kusalimu amri nikasema safari hii niko tayari kungojea

**Resp:** *(cheers)*

**CHUI:** Nikasema Kenya is more important than Stephen CHUI so that we can give justice a chance. Fellow Kenyans, this country; and I mean every corner of this country is important and therefore it can never be hard. And this is my serious submission to the Kenya people; if we want to do a death blow to negative ethnicity, and tribalism, the time to be able to do that is now by electing Simba...

**Resp:** *(Wild cheers/Vuvuzela)*

**CHUI:** We have suffered enough. From now mkisikia ya kwamba tumeshinda uchaguzi huu, basi mjue tutakua na wakati hata Mturkana, Elmolo. Mugiriana; tuko pamoja?

**Resp:** Eeh!

**CHUI:** Msomali, anybody born within the border of this country will have a hope that one day you can become the President of Kenya.

**Resp:** *(Cheers/vuvuzela)*

**CHUI:** The message we are sending out today is that it cannot be heard that only a small clique of Kenyans will want to sit forever on the destiny of the Kenyan nation; will always be the one to dictate the terms when it comes to leadership. We must say a big No to this selfish agenda. Kwa hivyo mimi nikaamua tuungane, tushikane tukomboa Kenya na kutetea katiba hii ambayo watu wa Kenya wamemwaga damu, watu wa Kenya wamemwaga damu. Watu wa Kenya, mimi na SIMBA wakati mmoja tulifutwa kazi si ni hivyo?

**Resp:** Eeh!

**CHUI:** Halafu sisi tukasema hatuwezi kurudi nyuma kwa hivyo nikisema teteatetea sema katiba. Teteatetea...

**Resp:** Katiba

**CHUI:** Inawezekanaje waliokuja na red card wakasema hii katiba ni mbaya; Inawezekanaje tuwakabidhi uongozi wa Kenya hii. Inawezekanaje?

**Resp:** Haiwezekani (*Vuvuzela/Cheers/Whistling*)

**CHUI:** We must be serious. This is the way to reform this generation, Kizazi hiki. We have a serious date with destiny; we either have the destiny of our nation in our hands or allow the country hijacked by a group of self seekers. Hatuwezi kufanya hivyo. Therefore I am asking all of you on Monday tarehe 4 March, 2013 tuamke mapema zaidi tupigie Simba

**Resp:** (*Cheers/vuvuzela*)

**CHUI:** Basi yeye ako tayari, nyinyi muko tayari

**Resp:** Ndio

*(Song/Ameamua SIMBA)*

**SIMBA:** Haya!

**Resp:** Haya

**SIMBA:** Vijana hoye X 3

**Resp:** Hoye

**SIMBA:** Wamama Hai

**Resp:** Hai

**SIMBA:** Leo ni leo

**SIMBA:** Fellow Kenyans; Today is a very historic day for Kenyans. Kenyans stand on the threshold of history; rarely does a generation have the opportunity to change the course of history.

This generation has the responsibility to change the course of our country. In a matter of hours Kenyans are going to participate in a very historic election

**Resp:** Ndio baba

**SIMBA:** This election can only be compared to the election of 1963 which brought independence to our country.

**Resp:** Ndio baba

**SIMBA:** For fifty years, Kenyans have wondered in the wilderness; they now have an opportunity, through this election, to change the course of history.

**Resp:** Ndio baba

**SIMBA:** There have been two forces in our country pulling in two opposite direction: The forces for the retention of status another for change. This struggle has been long. It has been very consistent; some times it has even been violent. That is how we can explain the assassination of Pio Gama Pinto, the assassination of Thomas Mboya, the assassination of JM Kariuki, to mention but a few. I could add Ronald Ngala. These are the dark forces of our history today is the 38<sup>th</sup> Anniversary of the Assassination of JM Kariuki: We remember JM Kariuki and I want to call to the stage here Rosemary Kariuki to come here.

**Resp:** *(Cheers/Vuvuzela/Whistling)*

**SIMBA:** This is Rosemary Kariuki, the daughter of a great Kenyan Hero Josiah Mwangi Kariuki; who was abducted from the Hilton Hotel, transported to Ngong area, tortured and assassinated and the body dumped for hyenas to eat on Ngong hills. As we remember JM, I urge you to observe a minute of silence in honour of JM Kariuki... *(silence)* Thank you.

**Resp:** *(Vuvuzela/whistling/cheers)*

**SIMBA:** We, this generation can change all these by voting for right on Monday. By voting for change: voting for forces of progress against the forces of stagnation, The forces of retrogression

**Resp:** Ndio Baba

**SIMBA:** Wananchi wa Kenya

**Resp:** Ndio Baba



**SIMBA:** Waswahili wanasema, eti siku njema huonekana?

**Resp:** Asubuhi

**SIMBA:** Kwa hivyo Jumatatu asubuhi tutakuwa tumeshinda. Tunataka kumaliza utawala wa kiimla, tunataka kumaliza ufisadi, tunataka kumaliza wizi wa ardhi.

**Resp:** (*Vuvuzela/Cheers*)

**SIMBA:** Tunataka watoto wetu wote wasome sawa sawa. Tunasema primary na secondary education free. Tumesema vijana watapata kazi; vijana wetu watapata kazi, uchumi itapanuka.

Nimehesabu wakenya ambao waliuawa kinyama. Mtoto wa nyoka ni nini?

**Resp:** Nyoka X 2

**SIMBA:** Simba hajaua mtu. Hata baba yangu Jaramogi Oginga hakuua mtu

**Resp:** (*Vuvuzela/cheers*)

*The data below consists of utterances selected from a JUBILEE campaign rally.*

**KIBOKO:** Tulieni... safari imekuwa ndefu. Wale ambao tunapingana nao hakuna sera ambayo wameuza. Mambo yao yamekuwa ya matusi, na sisi tumewaachia hayo. Wamezunguka wakisema Kiboko na Sungura hawatasimama wako na makesi kule ulaya. Mwenyezi Mungu amefungua hiyo barabara na wakenya ndio wataamua

**Resp:** (*Vuvuzela/Cheers*)

**Kiboko:** Wamezunguka wakisema ya kwamba eti yao ni ya reform; sisi tunawaambia ya kwamba reform niya wakenya wote; serikali ya JUBILEE ita-transform taifa la Kenya na kuhusisha kila mkenya. Wamesema ya kwamba Kiboko ni mwizi wa mashamba; Nilimuuliza kwa debate machomacho ataje moja akaanza kurukaruka...

**Resp:** (*Vuvuzela/Cheers*)

**Kiboko:** Tunaelewana wenzangu

**Resp:** Eeh (*Emphatically*)

**Kiboko:** Na ndipo tukiwa hapa, mimi nawaambia, the choice is simple; unaweza chagua wale ambao wamezoea ya kwamba yao ni ya mdomo; yao ni vitisho; yao ni ya matusi; yao ni ya chuki au mnaweza chagua team ambayo itabadilisha mwananchi wa kawaida wa Jamhuri yetu ya Kenya.

*The data below consists of utterances selected from AMANI Coalition campaign rally.*

**Nick Salat:** Mimi nikiwa katibu mku wa chama cha KANU chama cha baba na mama mambo mengi sitasema. Jana nilishukuru mwenyezi mungu kwa kuwa hai. Mimi nawambia ndugu zangu wa kutoka Western, nyinyi mnaletewa ufalme mnakimbia. Tutawalazimisha mchukue ufalme.

**Resp:** *(Cheer/Vuvuzela)*

**Salat:** Ukitaka kujua utamu wa ufalme uliza jamii ya wakelenjin; ni tamu

**Resp:** *(Cheers/Vuvuzela)*

**Salat:** Ukitaka kujua utamu wa ufalme uliza jamii ya ndung zetu wakikuyu; ni tamu. Mbona nyinyi mkiletewa ufalme mnakimbia? Mfalme ndiye huyu.

**Resp:** *(Vuvuzela/Cheers)*

**Salat:** Sisi tuko na nyinyi kabisa. Na sisi hatutaita nyinyi shetani.

**Resp:** *(Vuvuzela/Cheers)*

**Bonny Khalwale:** Asalam Allaikum

**Resp:** Alikumsalam

**Khalwale:** Mimi ndio Khalwale; mimi ndio Dr Bony Khalwale mjumbe wa Ikolomani na katika Bunge la Kenya, mimi ndiye mtetezi wa wanyonge wote wa Kenya.

**Resp:** *(Cheers/Vuvuzela)*

**Khalwale:** I come before you, distinguished delegates with the message that just like you I know Hon. Musalia NDOVU; But unlike you, I share the same DNA with Hon. Musalia NDOVU.

**Resp:** *(Cheers/Vuvuzela)*

**Khalwale:** And because of what you have done today, I want to disclose to my brother, president-in-waiting a responsibility that for seven month that I have walked with him to reach where we are today. Hon. NDOVU's mother is a sister of my father.

**Resp:** *(Cheers/vuvuzela)*

**Khalwale:** And in Luhya culture the person who bears the greatest share are the uncles of the son of their sister. Hon. Musalia NDOVU, the people of your mother's clan, for the last seven months I have been walking, they told me that I walk with a trouser without an underwear so that should you; should you make a reverse gear, I lower my trouser. I am so grateful that you have not let us down. We say thank you and you delegates, Musalia NDOVU is an embodiment of the best you can get from our community. And I have been asked from now to tell you Kenyans that

we are today surrendering Hon. Musalia NDOVU to you and from today Musalia will be first Kenyans, before he reverts to his community.

**Resp:** *(Cheers/Vuvuzela)*

**Khalwale:** Ladies and Gentlemen allow me to take one step back in history; our community, we are humble community. Ten years ago, two of our sons were poised to become Presidents; Hon. Michael Kijana Wamalwa and Hon Wycliffe Musalia NDOVU. But in that year 2002, Wycliffe Musalia NDOVU took a step backwards and donated his support to KIBOKO

**Resp:** *(Cheers/Vuvuzela)*

**Khalwale:** The same year, as we remained poised for Presidency, Hon. Michael Kijana Wamalwa, marehemu, took a step backwards and supported Mwai Kibaki.

**Resp:** *(Cheers)*

**Khalwale:** Supporting others is the real measure of leadership. And therefore, I want to come to where we are; and observe how forgetful we are. The same has happened this year with two of our sons poised to become President: Hon. Wycliffe Musalia NDOVU and Hon. Eugene Wamalwa.

*The data below consists of utterances selected from speeches at a JUBILEE campaign rally.*

**Mike Mbuvi Sonko:** Vijana aaa!

**Resp:** Aah

**Sonko:** Sungura aaa!

**Resp:** Aaa!

**Sonko:** Kiboko aaa!

**Resp:** Aaa!

**Sonko:** Asanteni sana wananchi wa Nairobi, Kama unaniona mara ya kwanza, mimi ndiye Sonko wa Ma-Sonko wote wa duniani.

**Resp:** *(Cheers)*

**Sonko:** Bado mimi ni hustler wa ma-hustler. Bado mimi ni mtetezi wa wanyonge.

**Resp:** *(Cheers)*

**Sonko:** Na nikisimama hapa kama mtetezi wa wanyonge, mimi si wazimu kufuatana na hawa viongozi wa JUBILEE. Mimi si mjinga nifuatane na hawa viongozi wa JUBILEE. Kwa sababu gani?

Kwa miaka hamsini sasa, sisi vijana ndio tuko na asilimia sabini ya kura nyingi sana hapa nchini Kenya lakini sisi Vijana, kura yetu imekuwa ikitumiwa kama toilet paper; Kura yetu imetumiwa kama rubber stamp. Mnakubaliana na mimi vijana wa Nairobi?

**Resp:** Eeh! (*whistling/Cheers*)

**Sonko:** 70% ya vijana wale ambao wako hapa bibi zao wanaenda kulala njaa kwa sababu ya umaskini.

**Resp:** (*Cheers*)

**Sonko:** Kwa hivyo vijana wenzangu, nataka mwenye akili afikirie, mwenye macho aangalie, mwenye masikio asikie, hausemi hatutaki wazee katika serikali yetu ya JUBILEE; hapana. Tuna haja ya kufanya kazi na wazee. Lakini tunataka wazee watusaidie mheshimiwa Kiboko ambapo anapoanza kuongoza tarehe nne mwenzi wa tatu.

**Najib Balala:** JUBILEE wapi?

**Resp:** State House

**Balala:** Kiboko wapi?

**Resp:** State House

**Balala:** Sungura wapi?

**Resp:** State house

**Balala:** Leo tuko hapa Nairobi. Tunataka kuwaambia wakenya safari imeanza ya kuleta mabadiliko Kenya. Tunamwambia Mwai Kibaki; umefanya kazi nzuri, wewe ustaafu uende nyumbani salama salmin. Tunamuambia Simba pia aende nyumbani kama Mwai Kibaki

**Resp:** (*Cheers*)

**Balala:** Tunamuambia CHUI umekuwa serikalini kwa miaka thelathini kwa hivyo uende nyumbani na Mwai Kibaki.

**Resp:** (*Cheers*)

**Balala:** It is the era of the digital generation. The world is switching off the analogue generation; we are switching on the digital generation. Digital generation ni vijana chipukizi. Inawezekana kubadilisha Kenya hii. Kule Mombasa tuliahidiwa, lakini ilikuwa ahadi ya vitenda wili. Tuliambiwa bandari itakuwa huru na bandari haijakuwa huru. Lakini JUBILEE ikiingia, vijana wetu KIBOKO na J2 watahakikisha bandari yetu iko kama ile ya Dubai.

**Resp:** (*Cheers/vuvuzela*)

**J2:** Nairobi mpo ama hampo?

**Resp:** Tuko

**Sungura:** Muko tayari ama hamuko tayari?

**Resp:** Tuko tayari

**Sungura:** Kuna jamaa mmoja wa analogue; eeh!

**Resp:** *(Cheers)*

**Sungura:** Wacha niwapatie story; kuna jamaa mmoja wa analogue amekwama kwa referendum iliyopita. Bado anaongelea mambo ya referendum iliyopita kwa sababu ni analogue na upgrade inachukuwa muda.

**Resp:** *(Cheer/Vuvuzela)*

**Sungura:** Katiba ni ya wakenya wote na sasa wakenya wanataka uongozi ambao utazalisha uchumi; Hiyo ndio priority ya wakenya kwa sasa. Tuko pamoja ama hatuko pamoja?

**Resp:** Tuko pamoja

**Sungura:** Mambo ya opinion polls: sisi hatuna shida na kampuni ya familia ya mwenzetu ambae tunashindana naye ambaye ako CORD. Mnaweza endelea na opinion polls. Sawa sawa?

**Resp:** Eeh! *(Cheers/vuvuzela)*

**Sungura:** Kile ambacho tunaomba kwa wenzetu CORD, tarehe nne mwezi wa tatu; wakenya wakipiga kura waamue serikali ni JUBILEE Coalition wawe kuwa tayari kusalimu amri, wasituletee kasheshe kwa sababu ya mambo ya opinion polls.

**Resp:** *(Cheers)*

**Sungura:** Tuko pamoja ama hatuko pamoja?

**Resp:** Tuko Pamoja

**Sungura:** We are telling them, we have no problem. You can continue enjoying yourself in opinion poll. But on 4<sup>th</sup> of March 2013 when the people of Kenya go to the ballot to decide on the leadership of this country be prepared to surrender when the people of Kenya decide that it is JUBILEE Coalition going to form Government. Do not use opinion polls to go to and try to organize demonstrations because we know you are good at it.

**Resp:** *(Cheers/Vuvuzela)*

**Sungura:** Tuko ama hatupo?

**Resp:** Tuko

*The data below consists of utterances selected from speeches at a CORD campaign rally*

**Kalembe Ndile:** Nashukuru Simba na CHUI kwa kushikana

**Resp:** *(Cheers)*

**Kalembe:** Na nimesema hapa, mimi naamini kamwe kwa uongozi wao. Sitaitwa mtoto wa squatter tena. Kenya tumekuwa na tabia ya kulinda wanyama kuliko binadamu. Ukienda hapa Kenya, the only city with National Park ni Nairobi. Mtoto wa fisi, mtoto wa nguruwe amelindwa na bunduki vizuri na mtoto wa binadamu hana pa kuishi.

**Resp:** *(Cheers)*

**Kalembe:** Waheshimiwa mkipata uongozi, chungu kabila zote; usiangalie mkikuyu; usiangalie mjaluo; kila kabila lina umaskini. Kenya yetu, hata development imeingia ukabila. Juzi, ukambani tumefunguliwa Syokimau, eti station ya gari ya moshi. Eti sisi wakamba tukitoka pande hiyo, tuache magari yetu Syokimau eti tuingie gari moshi hiyo mtungi eti tushuke Nairobi! Na wao wakitaka kwenda Nairobi, wakitoka Cental wanapanda hiyo barabara iliyo juu ya ngazi waje wa park magari yao Nairobi.

**Resp:** *(Cheers)*

**Kalembe:** Huo ni ubaguzi wa maendeleo.

END OF SELECTED TEXT