LAIKIPIA UNIVERSITY JOURNAL OF SOCIAL SCIENCES, EDUCATION AND HUMANITIES

Pronominal Choice in the Positive Self and Negative Other Representation of Hate Speech in Selected Kenyan Political Speeches

June Chebet Chelule, Jacinta Ndambuki, Evelyn Mahero
Department of Literary and Communication Studies, Laikipia University, Kenya
*Corresponding Author

Abstract
Politicians often employ the pronouns 'us' to show solidarity which is contrasted with 'them' used to exclude or to portray the out group(s) often in a negative way. All pronominal choices can be interpreted to give diverse meanings. The objectives of this qualitative study were to identify instances of hate speech in sampled Kenyan politicians' speeches on the YouTube platform and to interrogate pronominal choices in the political speeches considered as hate speech in Kenya. This study identified pronouns as a discursive strategy on hate speech. A purposive sampling of data was carried out and a total of ten political speeches were collected between the period 2015 and 2020. The speeches were transcribed and translated then thematically analysed guided by the Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) framework; in particular the Foucauldian theory and Discourse Historical Analysis (DHA) approach, and Relevance theory. This paper focuses on pronouns and how the speakers advance the positive self and negative other representation in ten sampled speeches. The findings on pronouns reveal that the speakers intentionally select pronouns and use them to achieve exclusion, solidarity, authority, opinions and collectivization among other functions. Pronouns reveal the speakers' intentions which enable understanding in order to mitigate the risks of hate speech. The findings are useful to politicians in making informed speech choices, educating listeners to be discerning and to policy makers in understanding and controlling hate speech.

Keywords: Critical discourse analysis, discursive strategies, hate speech, political discourse, pronominal choice

Introduction

This study aims to interrogate pronominal choices as a linguistic strategy in Kenyan political speeches particularly as it relates to hate speech. In Kenya, the National Cohesion and Integration Commission (NCIC) was created by the government with a mandate to control the practice of hate speech (GoK, 2008). The NCIC Act (2008) Section 13(1) specifies the parameters of hate speech in their definition. 'A person engages in hate speech in use of threatening language, insulting words or behaviour or displaying, publishing or distributing any written material, or visual images with intent to stir up hatred based on race, ethnicity, religion, gender, age, language and nationality'**.** Generally, hate speech refers to utterances that incite against and exclude others based on their identity. The speech may be construed as a call for action against these groups and may lead to hate crime. This study explores the ways in which pronominal choice is used to talk about hate speech in YouTube.

Volume 1, Number 2, 2022 ISSN N0 2791-190X

Scholars who have carried out studies on pronominal choice include; Levinson (1983), De Fina (1995), Fairclough (2003), Ndambuki and Janks (2009). They observe that pronouns demonstrate and display critical aspects relating to identity, power, solidarity and representation among others. De Fina (1995) argues that pronominal choice in political discourse reflects differences in the way in which speakers present themselves with respect to other individuals and groups in the political arena and in relation to the situation in context.

The phrase 'hate speech' became more noticeable than before in Kenya after the 2007/8 Post Election Violence (PEV) and the International Criminal Court (ICC) cases of key Kenyan political personalities. In Kenya, there have been instances of discourse considered as hate speech in political speeches and it is often heightened during campaigns. This is a common pattern every election cycle (i.e., every five years in the country). This study perceives the term 'politics' in the sense in which Chilton and Schaffner (2002) define it as 'a struggle for power between those who seek to assert and maintain their power and those who seek to resist it'.

Political discourse (Fairclough, 1992; Wodak, 2001) is one of the main areas of enquiry for Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA). Chilton (2008) defines political discourse as 'the use of language to do the business of politics. It includes persuasive rhetoric, the use of implied meanings and euphemisms, the exclusion of references to undesirable reality, the use of language to arouse political emotions and the like'. Yieke (2008) observes that language could be the missing link in resolving political conflicts. Mediation can be used to avert crisis witnessed in the country, the region and the world. Therefore, the study of pronouns contributes to the discussion on language in politics.

Conflict is part of discourse, and in its solving, harmony might be achieved in the society. Ndambuki (2013) observes that Africa has experienced conflict and crisis which is often seen to be synonymous with the region. The current study revisits the utterances by Kenyan politicians on YouTube perceived as hate speech, how the speakers revealed the grievances and if they led to ultimate resolution of the crises created by conflicts. Although there is legislation on hate speech, the practice is still rampant in Kenya. This means further research on the concept is needed to understand it better.

In this study, the underlying socio-political environment is explored in relation to the positive self and negative other representation. Social media makes it easy for content creators to share their content with a large audience. In Kenya, YouTube had 9.29 million users in early 2022 which is approximately 16 per cent of the population. The cyberspace is of interest since it is a vibrant site for fast spread and relatively permanent archive of hate discourses that can be retrieved and shared several times.

The Problem

This study sought to give an insight into the problem of hate speech by analysing the manner pronouns are used by speakers; notably political leaders. The use of pronouns in engaging in hate speech is of interest since there is need for further research to demystify the concept of hate speech in order to avoid its negative effects. This study aimed to explore pronominal choices in hate speech and fill in the existing gaps from an applied linguistics perspective. As one of the discursive strategies, pronouns are powerful and understanding them can reveal the intentions of the speaker and the expected reactions of the audience. A number of studies have been done on hate speech and they have been reviewed to identify gaps. The gaps are in the understanding of what exactly constitutes hate speech and how utterances can be interpreted or misinterpreted by the listeners.

Volume 1, Number 2, 2022 ISSN N0 2791-190X

Review of Related Literature

In this study, pronouns are identified as a discursive strategy in the sampled speeches. Other studies have been done on political discourse and they have been reviewed in this section to identify the gaps. According to Fairclough (2003), the choice of pronouns may be tied to relations of power and solidarity. Pronouns appear to be useful tools for positioning of subject in either the in-group or the out-group. The construction of the in-group simultaneously means construction of the out-group (exclusive reference), either by implication or through direct use of pronouns such as 'they', 'them' and 'their' as well as the deictic reference expressions such as 'there', 'that' or 'those'. This construction of different groups is what Derrida (1981) calls the process of 'Othering', which he argues is very essential in the construction of the Self. This establishes how social class ideologies or perceptions are embedded in the features of discourse.

Pronouns and Contexts

Socio-pragmatics as advanced by Leech (1983) focuses on the relationship between linguistic action and social structure and is concerned with the influence of socio-contextual factors in language as social action. After identification of the specific topics of a discourse, the discursive strategies are investigated. The linguistic means of the discriminatory stereotypes are then studied. The current study is guided by these approaches.

Among the thematic concerns in hate speech is the struggle for power in the country. Chelule et al. (2022) observe that the presidential position is hotly contested in the country. Their study reveals that the thematic concerns in the sampled discourse include negative ethnicity, xenophobia, class struggle and political intolerance. Irimba (2021) observes that Facebook and Twitter provide an active cyberspace in which hate speech is rampant. He observes that the comments revolve around ethnic profiling and political intolerance, defamatory slander, incitement, gender stereotype and extremists' sentiments. He identified pronouns in the sampled comments and memes in the cyberspaces. He observes that the participants are driven by hateful slander and use pronouns to exclude others based on their identity.

This has been observed in the current study on the pronominal choice in the positive self and negative other representation of hate speech in selected Kenyan political speeches.

Discursive Strategies

Inclusive and exclusive reference refers to use of various deictic expressions that show the spatial difference aspect of referents. Pronouns such as; 'we', 'us', 'our' and deictic expressions such as 'here', 'this' and 'these' were frequently used in the construction of the in-group. Yieke (2008) documents how in Kenya, utterances that urged people from particular ethnic groups to return to their region of origin expressed 'politics of inclusion and exclusion' that related directly to longstanding land disputes and the movement of ethnic groups prior to the 2007 post-election violence. Negative labelling, markedness and 'us' and 'them', ebonics and languages other than the lingua franca are strategies associated with negative ethnicity and hate speech identified in her study and which are identified in the current study.

Barasa (2014) employs CDA in analysing the discourse of the co-principals in the 2008 coalition government and their efforts at peace keeping. In the communication between His Excellency (the late) President Mwai Kibaki and former Prime Minister Raila Odinga, she observes that pronouns are used to index the speakers' roles and for referencing. Both studies aim to identify strategies that achieve a certain effect in political discourse with the current study being on YouTube data with focus on hate speech.

Volume 1, Number 2, 2022 ISSN N0 2791-190X

In their study, Ndambuki and Janks (2009) represent the mismatches in representation of women's voices by examining the discursive strategies, of which among them were pronouns. They argue that the women use the collective pronouns *tu* (we) and the impersonal third person plural suffix *ma* (they) to present inferior power relations. The leaders also use the same deficit discourse to portray women as having a lower place in society than the men. Using the plural 'we', they portray themselves as a 'suffering community' in need of a leader to give them direction. Their suffering is foregrounded more than the actions which sustain their families. In this study, the choice of the collective pronoun is also observed. It serves as a form of solidarity between the speakers and their audiences.

Theoretical Framework

Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA), Foucaldian and relevance theories provided the theoretical underpinnings for this study. CDA examines ideologies and power relations involved in discourse. Language connects with the social through being the primary domain of ideology, and through being a site of, and a stake in struggles for power. Ideology has been called the basis of the social representations of groups, and in psychological versions of CDA developed by van Dijk (2008) as well as Fairclough and Wodak (1997). The historical dimension in critical discourse studies plays an important role.

The analytical framework for Critical Discourse Analysis of 'the communicative event' that can be categorized into three dimensions:

Text
Discourse Practice
Sociocultural practice.

In the framework for CDA, Fairclough provides a clear distinction between the three main elements of the communicative event as text, discourse practice and sociocultural practice.

Foucault (2002) adopted the term 'discourse' to denote a historically contingent social system that produces knowledge and meaning. He noted that discourse is distinctly material in effect, producing what he calls 'practices that systematically form the objects of which they speak'. Discourse is, thus, a way of organising knowledge that structures the constitution of social (and progressively global) relations through the collective understanding of the discursive logic and the acceptance of the discourse as social fact.

The relevance theory is also utilized in this study. In 1987, Sperber and Wilson used Grice's idea that communication is based on intentions and interpretations to propose a framework for looking at communication from a cognitive perspective, starting with the assumption that people tend to pay most attention to what they perceive as most relevant in a given situation (Sperber & Wilson, 1986; 1995, p.156). Instead of the simple process of encoding and decoding information, Sperber and Wilson postulate that the very act of sending a message implies that the sender assumes that the message is relevant. In other words, when someone says something, they must think that what they have to say is important enough to try to communicate it. This is relevant in this study particularly in exploration of hate speech in political speeches because once an utterance is made, it creates an expectation of being relevant and it should capture the hearer's attention in order for it to fulfil the role of being maximally relevant.

Research Methodology

The study is largely qualitative and the data was collected from online Kenyan political discourse However, the quantitative design was employed in assigning numerical value in some data, for

Volume 1, Number 2, 2022 ISSN N0 2791-190X

example, in the frequency counts of pronouns. A combination of both qualitative and quantitative methods is inevitable in research as argued by Silverman (2013).

The discussion focuses on Kenya but other countries may be mentioned for comparative purposes. After purposive sampling, the main data was collected from YouTube. Ten speeches delivered between 2015 and 2020 were collected, and the frequency counts of strategies occurrences were carried out and the findings presented in table form. Data was collected through electronic searches on the YouTube platform following Barasa (2014), Mwithi (2016) and Irimba (2021). Irimba (2021) noted that the internet is a site for hate speech. It was therefore an appropriate area for data collection. Library research was also conducted from primary and secondary sources.

Following guidance for thematic analysis by Braun and Clarke (2006), the researcher familiarized herself with emerging data then manually developed initial codes from the data. Next, the related codes were collated and merged then used in searching for themes. Finally, the emerging themes were reviewed and defined. The pronouns were identified from the sampled speeches, counted and discussed as used in the contexts. The use of pronouns, their contexts and the impacts are reported in this study. In the data, the ten names have been replaced by L1, L2, L3, L4, L5, L6, L7, L8, L9 and L10 where L represents the specific leader and the number (1, 2, 3, etc) represents the oldest to the most recent at the time of data collection; 10. This aimed at maintaining the confidentiality and anonymity of the speakers due to ethical considerations.

Pronoun Use in Speakers' Utterances

Traditional grammarians grouped words into parts of speech (Quirk, 2010). They defined pronouns as word classes used instead of nouns. Pronouns are grouped according to person and number. The speakers often employ 'we' *(sisi)* versus 'them' *(wale)* pronouns that aim to give a sense of belonging with the listeners and to exclude those they are criticising. They also ask rhetorical questions to portray that what they are saying is agreed to by the audience.

The frequency in the overall use of pronouns in each speech is summarised in table 1 where the pronouns are identified and the ten speakers are listed with the frequency of use for each presented in numbers. There is a high frequency of use of second person 'You' which brought out the direct address strategy. Similarly, the self is well contrasted with the other(s) and the positive and negative is brought out through the first person contrasted with the third person voice.

Volume 1, Number 2, 2022 ISSN N0 2791-190X

Table 1: Frequency of Ocurrence of Pronouns

Pronouns	L1	L2	L3	L4	L5	L6	L7	L8	L9	L10
I	4	11	7	7	7	10	10	9	16	12
You		29	13	22	9	16	6	11	12	35
He	3	11	4	8		1	1	12	6	3
She	0	0	0			0	0		0	0
It	4	1	2	10		4	3	20	4	4
We	13	8	4	52	3	10	11	30	12	11
They	1	2	6	20	7	3	4	20	11	5
Them	1	2		3		3	8	5	1	2
Us	1	1	3	6	1			7	7	9
Him	3	4		1				4		3
Her	0	0								
Me		2	4	1	1	7	1		4	
Yourself										
Myself										
Whoever/ Anyone		1								1
Themselves					1					
Nobody									1	
Himself				2						

Source: Authors (2022)

A detailed analysis of the pronouns as a strategy for discursive construction of hate speech are provided in the next sections. In a thematic analysis of the findings, the pronouns have been identified from the speeches and discussed under sub topics. The contexts are briefly discussed to enable understanding. Pronouns such as 'we', 'us', 'our' and deictic expressions such as 'here', 'this' and 'these' were frequently used in the construction of the in-group. The leaders made conscious choices in their use of pronouns in order to achieve desired effects. They often use the phrase *hawa watu* (these people) when they refer to their opponents, and *sisi* (we) to show inclusion and solidarity. The subject pronouns 'I', 'we', 'you', 'he', 'she' and 'they' and the object 'me', 'us', 'you', 'him', 'her' and 'them' are used. The possessive 'mine', 'ours', 'yours', 'hers', 'his' and 'theirs are also common.

Pronouns for Authority

Among those who speak in the first person singular, L2 shows his support of the government at a rally in Mombasa. He refers to the official leader of opposition as the devil among other personal attacks.

Text 1:

L2 - *nawajua* (I know them) to convince the listeners that he knows much about the opposition.

The choice of the first person is for authority and persuasion.

In a public holiday celebration audience, L1 addresses those who do not respect his party leader Raila Odinga, and claims that a few people must die for Raila to be president.

Volume 1, Number 2, 2022 ISSN N0 2791-190X

Text 2:

L1 - *nami* (I) to show that what he is saying was his idea.

He tells the named individuals who include Moses Kuria and Aden Duale to stop acting like mad people and mentioning Raila his party leader. Moses Kuria was then the Member of Parliament (MP) for Gatundu South and Aden Duale the MP for Garissa Township Constituency.

In his speech against the government and the Cabinet Secretary for Internal Security and Coordination of National Government, Fred Matiang'i, L3 shows his authority.

Text 3:

L3 - *mimi* (I) to show he is speaking his mind.

L7 engages in xenophobia when he gives notice to foreign traders to leave or they will be forcefully ejected. He discriminates against this group due to their nationalities.

Text 4:

L7 - *Mimi* (me or I) he selects the first-person pronoun to show that he speaks with authority and he is personally involved. He takes credit for solving local traders' problems. He claims to know the challenges of the local traders.

L7: ***na****taka* (I want) is a first person he uses to show his authority and plans.

L7 *najua* (I know).

langu (mine) shows that L7 takes responsibility to do the duty he promises of protecting local traders.

Engaging in ethnic exclusion, L9 addresses his perceived threats to his community. He argues that non-locals should not seek leadership positions. He uses the first person singular to articulate his expectations and to show authority and leadership.

T**ext 5:**

L9 - *mimi* (me) to show he speaks on his behalf and with authority.

L9 - *nimesema;* I have said. He speaks on behalf of his people; the Maasai as he feels that he has authority and power to represent the group.

In an attempt to seek a collective voice, L4 asks Nairobi residents if they are of a similar opinion. He then asks whether they voted the gentleman; *huyu* (This one) pointing at Uhuru Kenyatta. This is a demonstrative pronoun used in the close proximity. He intentionally uses the second person pronoun when he asks them if they decided *muliamua* (You decided) and *mulisema* (You said). He wants to portray that the choice was made by the people he is addressing. This creates a sense of belonging. He is confirming that the audience voted and his preferred candidate is more popular than their opposition.

The leader refers to Raila Odinga as *yule* (that). This excludes him as he is shown to be removed from the group. He also says the plural form *wale* (them). This creates a feeling of us

Volume 1, Number 2, 2022 ISSN N0 2791-190X

versus them. He asks questions that suggest the listeners agree with him and support them. He says *yenyu* (yours) on the voters' decision, when he claims that their will was subverted by the Supreme Court. The leader portrays the out group when he says *wa-lienda* (**they** went) when recalling how the opposition went to court. He says s*isi* (we) when speaking on behalf of the Jubilee party. He addresses the supreme court and the chair of IIEC Chebukati as 'you' in a threatening tone. He uses the plural pronoun ''us when he is speaking for Kenyans. As he dares the opposition leader, he says ***na-taka*** (I want) and *tu-namwambia* (**we** are telling) we being either the Jubilee party or the government. He is referring to Raila. He tells him the exams will not be postponed and the polls will proceed as planned. He uses the first person singular to show his power, authority and personal opinions.

Pronouns for Solidarity

The collective pronoun 'we' is used more than the singular first-person pronoun. This is an attempt to identify with the audience and to show solidarity.

Text 6:

L1 - *sisi* (we) in reference to Western region inhabitants. He assures they are in support of Raila Odinga.

L1 - *Sisi (*We) refers to his party Orange Democratic Movement (ODM). He suggests he is speaking for his preferred presidential candidate. This shows solidarity.

L1 - *tumekubaliana* (we have agreed). The speaker appears to be presenting the collective views of his party and his party leaders.

L1 - *tunataka* (We want). This is the plural collective pronoun. The leader is confident he has the authority to speak for others in particular Raila Odinga and the party. This suggests that he is close to the leader.

Drug addiction is a problem in the coast and L2 refers to addicts.

Text 7:

L2 - *tuko na*; (we have) referring to the number of addicts in Mombasa.

The use of the pronoun 'we' seeks to make him part of the problem which he is addressing.

L2 - *tukakutana* (We met) when referring to him, Orengo and Kiraitu.

This aims to give a first-person account and witness to what he saw. In case of doubt, Kiraitu can be consulted to prove him right.

While defending the opposition, L3 lists former ministers now referred to as cabinet secretaries who have in the same docket and have died using the pronoun 'we'.

Text 8:

L3 - *tulikuwa* (we had).

Volume 1, Number 2, 2022 ISSN N0 2791-190X

He lists George Saitoti and Joseph Nkaissery who died in office then refers to Cabinet Secretary Fred Matiangi as the late to suggest he will also die. The two were former cabinet secretaries formerly known as minister. George Saitoti was the assistant minister for internal security at the time of his death in a plane crash in 2012, while Joseph Nkaissery died in 2017 after a sudden heart attack. He was the cabinet secretary for Internal Security and Coordination of National Government. The collective is intended for inclusivity.

L3 uses the collective pronoun 'we' to show he is speaking on behalf of his group using h*atutacheka* (we will not laugh). As observed by Barasa (2014), the findings indicate that political solidarity is marked by the use of personal pronouns. The leaders use the first person singular to demonstrate personal responsibility and the first-person plural to indicate solidarity towards a shared goal.

In a highly charged speech, L7 who is then an MP does not like the presence of foreign traders in his constituency. He complains that they should go back to their homes.

Text 9:

L7 - t*ulichukua* (we took) and we in this context refers to the leadership (ruling class) which is a group he belongs to. He claims they took the initiative to assist with cargo clearance.

L7 - *tu-mekuwa* (we have had), as he puts himself in the same category of local traders to identify with them.

L7 - *sisi* (we). The choice of the first-person plural indicates the leader is speaking on behalf of local traders. It shows inclusion and solidarity.

L7 - *tutaingia* (**we** will enter) local traders,

L7 - *tutawatoa* (**we** will remove them) foreign traders.

In the texts, the leader uses the first-person plural to show inclusion and solidarity. The speaker claims that Pakistan traders have taken over the car business using the pronoun 'they'.

After the handshake, L8 who is then senator feels that his community has been alienated. In his speech, he praises the deputy president and criticises his opponents.

Text 10:

L8 - *(tuliambiwa)* we were told.

Before the 2013 elections the supporters of the president and his deputy were told about a ten years' tenure for both. He talks of the agenda that they should focus on using plural we; the leaders. This is a group he belongs to and this choice signifies inclusion. He claims that they are distracted by the opposition (they).

Text 11:

L8 - *tu-nataka* (**we** want). He demonstrates authority when he speaks for the deputy president supporters. He demands for respect.

Volume 1, Number 2, 2022 ISSN N0 2791-190X

Text 12:

L8 - *sisi* (we) for deputy president supporters reveals solidarity.

The pronoun 'we' also refers to his community the Kalenjin. The choice of the pronoun reveals that he has authority over the group decision and he speaks for the 'collective'.

Similarly, L9 is a supporter of his community that he feels are alienated and hopes that the Building Bridges Initiative (BBI) will provide with solutions. This was an attempt to change the constitution with an aim to bring Kenyans together after the handshake between former President Uhuru Kenyatta and former Prime Minister Raila Odinga.

Text 13:

L9 - *sisi* 'we' for Maasai to demonstrate identity with his ethnic group, that is he is one of them and he belongs. He uses 'us' for the leaders. He therefore demonstrates his identity first among his ethnicity and second as a leader.

Talking about the country L10 shows possession or ownership. The first person plural has been used for group identity and solidarity.

Text 14:

L10 - *yetu* (ours).

L10 - *Sisi* (we) for Kenyans. This is used for collective voice and identity.

L5 uses the pronoun 'you' in its various forms to show the listeners it is their decision to swear him in. This is to show that the event is a popular initiative. Inclusion is achieved using the second person pronouns *zenu/ kwenu/ nyinyi/yenyu* (you). He reminds them they decided *Wakipiga* (when they vote) t*utapiga* (we will vote). He uses the collective possessive pronoun *yetu* (ours) to show they are taking a collective decision. The use of the second person voice is appealing for inclusion of the audience.

Pronouns for Exclusion

When portraying the outgroup negatively, L2 mentions individuals he accuses of some wrongdoing.

Text 15:

L2 -a*likuwa* (he was) when he is referring to, a governor of Mombasa County. The speaker does not mention his name but one can tell who he is talking about from his descriptions.

L2 - *hawa watu*; these people to discuss the opposition. He separates himself from them when he refers to them thus compared to *sisi* (us) to refer to the in group.

Text 16:

L1 - *hawa watu* (those people) chosen by L1 when talking of Ruto and Kenyatta, the presidential candidate at the time. This shows exclusion as he does not specify but presents them in abstract form.

Volume 1, Number 2, 2022 ISSN N0 2791-190X

L1 - *huyo (*That) when referring to Moses Kuria and Aden Duale. The two have been vocal in their attack of the opposition party and leader.

T**ext 17:**

L3 - *yake* (his), *yule ambaye* (the one which is) and *hawa watu* (these people) to refer to the government officials. These words demonstrate exclusion.

Text 18:

L3 - *walishika* (they arrested) in which they refer to the police with instructions from the government.

The third person plural is used to exclude those he is referring to and to demonstrate that it is impersonal and ambiguous. L7 discusses what the Cabinet Secretary for Internal Security and Coordination of National Government Fred Matiang'i, said.

Text 19:

L7 - *alisema* (**he** said). This is to show exclusion.

L7 - *hawa watu***;** those people.

L7 - *wamechukua* (they have taken) against foreign traders.

The choice shows that the speaker distances himself from his referent. The speaker seeks to exclude his referent and to create distance between them and himself. This is commonly used in exclusion. He threatens to mobilise violence.

The choice of the third person plural pronoun portrays exclusion. He excites his audience by promising to participate and this demonstrates solidarity as he will be a part of what he is telling them to do. He uses the collective in mobilising violence and this reassures the audience that he will actually accompany them to the streets.

Text 20:

L8: *wale* (those) for the opponents of the deputy president.

This is exclusion of the out group. L8 refers to 'you' when addressing the perceived opponents of the deputy president, and the exclusion pronoun 'they' for Raila Odinga and his associates.

In his personality attacks, L10 dares the president to kill him like his late father did to his opponents.

Text 21:

L10: *yeye* (him) in reference to the late president Jomo Kenyatta.

L10: *yeye* (him) telling him to work together.

Volume 1, Number 2, 2022 ISSN N0 2791-190X

He however refers to the deputy president William Ruto but in a positive portrayal. Pronouns are used to show, give and deny identity. Use of indefinite pronouns are not common apart from in a few instances. L1 begins his speech with one.

Text 22:

L1: *atakayeita* (whoever will call/ anyone who will call).

Whoever/ anyone is an indefinite pronoun he first uses either to avoid mentioning names or to hint that he does not care who the person will be. L9 uses the plural pronoun 'they', as he speaks as an observer of his community the Maasai which he is part of.

Text 23:

L9: hawa Maasai (These Maasai) since the venue of the meeting is Narok.

This is meant to show that they have suffered. Discourses of suffering are common when the speakers seek sympathy.

Text 24:

Ll0: *Hii* (This) refers to Keriako Tobiko to show him he is not important.

This pronoun *hii* is used for objects and referring to a person using it is the highest form of exclusion. It is an attempt to dehumanise his referent and has been a precursor for wars and genocide like in Rwanda genocide.

The positive self and negative other representation is common in the used pronouns. L6 employs the pronoun 'us' (Akamba) versus 'them' (Somalis) to create distance between the two groups. She addresses the audience in the collective pronoun 'we' to create solidarity with them. She reveals her decision that those who burn charcoal and harvest sand should be dealt with. The leader adopts her opinion as the group resolution by using tag questions which her listeners automatically say yes. She says *Mavuti aa* (these guns) that the police are carrying to show they are accessible and to make her listeners aware of the powers of their bows and arrows. It confirms that metaphors are important in political speeches. When she refers to bows and arrows as guns, there is a deeper meaning as they are so to her and the audience as noted in Ndambuki (2013).

Conclusion

The pronouns are used to show authority especially when one speaks on behalf of a group using 'we', or 'us', to show personal opinion using first person singular, for solidarity through first person plural, to issue warnings in the second person direct address, and to exclude the out groups through the third person references. Both subject and object pronouns are used. The plural pronoun 'them' is used to distance the speakers from the referents. The first person singular 'I' becomes 'we' in plural. It is often used to reiterate solidarity. The second person 'you' modal is retained in the plural and is useful in direct address. He/She/it are the singular third person forms and the plural is they. It is often used to portray the outgroups. The speakers employ we *(sisi)* versus them *(wale)* pronouns that aim to give a sense of belonging with the listeners and to exclude those they are criticising. They also ask rhetorical questions to portray that what they are saying is agreed to by the audience. In most of the speeches, the pronoun is derived from the word as Kiswahili

combines the verb with the pronoun. The feelings are evident from the pronoun choices and the inclusion and exclusion is clearly brought out.

References

Barasa, M. (2014). *Discursive strategies in Kenya's 2008 Post-election consultation discourse.* (Unpublished PHD Thesis). Laikipia University, Kenya.

Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 3(2), 77-101.

Chelule, J., Ndambuki, J.M. & Mahero, E. (2022). A critical analysis of hate speech in Kenyan political discourse. In M. Amutabi, & L. Hamasi. (Eds.) *Annals of African Development*. pp 19-28. Nairobi: Centre for Democracy, Research and Development (CEDRED) Publications.

Chilton, P. (2008). 'Political Terminology'. In Karlfried Knapp and Gerd Antos (eds.). *Handbook of communication in the public sphere*. *Handbook of Applied Linguistics* Vol. 4. Walter de Gruyter GmbH & Co. 226-42

Chilton, P., & Schaffner, C. (2002). 'Introduction: Themes and principles in the analysis of political discourse'. In P. Chilton & C. Schaffner (Eds.) *Politics as text and talk: Analytic approaches to political discourse* (1-29). John Benjamins Publishing Company.

De Fina, A. (1995). Pronominal choice, identity, and solidarity in political discourse. *Text & Talk*, *15*(3), 379-410. https://doi.org/10.1515/text.1.1995.15.3.3

Derrida, J. (1981). *Margins of philosophy*. University of Chicago Press.

Fairclough, N. (2003). *Analysing discourse: Textual analysis for social research*. Routledge.

Fairclough, N. & Wodak, R. (1997). 'Critical Discourse Analysis'. In T. van Dijk (Ed.). *Discourse studies: A multidisciplinary introduction.* Sage.

Foucault, M. (2002). *The order of things: An archaeology of the human sciences*. Routledge.

Government of Kenya (GoK) (2008). National Cohesion and Integration Commission Act. https://www.ilo.org/dyn/natlex/docs/ELECTRONIC/85000/115497/F1161795073/KEN85000%202012.pdf

Irimba, M. (2021). Hi-Tech hate in the online narratives of violence in Kenya: A forensic linguistics approach to hate speech in Facebook and Twitter. Unpublished PhD Thesis. Laikipia University, Kenya.

Kenya National Commission on Human Rights (KNCHR) (2008). On the Brink of the Precipice: Human Rights Account of Kenya's Post-2007 Election Violence. Nairobi: KNCHR.

Leech, G. (1983). *Principles of pragmatics.* Longman.

Levinson, S. C. (1983). *Pragmatics*. Cambridge University Press.

Mwithi, F.M. (2016). Social media discourse: A linguistic study of Facebook among a selected group of Kenyan Internet Users. Unpublished PhD Thesis. Laikipia University, Kenya.

National Cohesion and Integration (Amendment) Act. (2019). Nairobi: http://www.parliament.go.ke/sites/default/files/201903/National20Cohesion

Ndambuki, J. M. (2013). Local community leaders' constructions of women's interests and needs: Inhibiting developmental crisis resolution in Kenya's development crisis. In A. de Rycker & Z. M. Don (Eds.) *Discourse and crisis* (pp 239-272). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Ndambuki, J. & Janks, H. (2009). Political discourses, women's voices: Mismatches in representation. *Critical approaches to discourse analysis across disciplines* http://caadad.ne/ejournal vol 4(1) 73-92.

Silverman, D. (2013). *Doing qualitative research: A practical handbook* (4th ed.). London: Sage.

Volume 1, Number 2, 2022 ISSN N0 2791-190X

Sperber, D. & Wilson, D. (1995). [1986]. *Relevance: Communication and cognition*. 2nd ed. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers Ltd.

Wodak, R. (2001). What is CDA about: A summary of its history, important concepts and its development. In R. Wodak & M. Meyer, *Methods of critical discourse analysis*. Sage.

Quirk, R. (2010). *A comprehensive grammar of the English language*. Pearson.

Yieke, F. A. (2008). The discursive construction of ethnicity: The case of the 2007 Kenyan general elections. Paper read at Governing the African Public Sphere, Yaoundé, Cameroon.