



library@chuka.ac.ke; www.chuka.ac.ke

ROLE OF LANGUAGE IN PEACE BUILDING: A CASE OF KENYA'S 2008 COALITION GOVERNMENT

Barasa, M.N., Ndambuki, J.M. and Telewa, V.K.

Kisii University, Email: barasamargaret@yahoo.com;

Laikipia University, Email: jmdambuki@laikipia.ac.ke; Email: vkhasandi@laikipia.ac.ke

Citation:

Barasa, M.N., Ndambuki, J.M. and Telewa, V.K. (2015) Role of Language in Peace Building: a Case of Kenya's 2008 Coalition Government. In: Isutsa, D.K. and Githae, E.W. *Proceedings of the First International Research Conference held from 29th to 31st October, 2014 in Chuka University, Kenya*. 188-197pp.

ABSTRACT

A study on conflicts around the world found that many countries were at high risk of instability and of these, most were in Africa. Although the African continent continues to glamour for the dire need of peace, it has continued to witness political conflicts arising out of disputed elections. This has often resulted in the formation of coalition governments as a mechanism to securing peace and stability. In doing so, various conflict mechanisms such as mediation, arbitration, negotiation and peacekeeping have been employed by different bodies and/or agencies to restore peace in conflicting states of Africa. However, little attention has been paid to the use of language by the coalition leaders as a mechanism to conflict resolution and peace building. This is informed by the fact that language is the primary means to negotiate power and therefore cannot be ignored. This paper examines lexicalisation in the discourse of the two principals in the Kenyan 2008 Coalition Government negotiation for Portfolio Balance. Four written texts were purposively sampled and accessed from the official website of the former President and former Prime Minister. The study applies Fairclough's approach of Language and Power and Social Theory anchored in Critical Discourse Analysis to tease out the lexical choices. The findings revealed that the two principals employed language that was mitigated, personalized and highly restrained in relation to hate speech. The language of political persuasion which guided citizens' orientation and behaviour encoded respect, tolerance, optimism and reassurance for continued political support notwithstanding the underlying power struggles. Policymakers should incorporate the aspect of language in national laws and policies as a guiding principle in conflict resolution and peace building.

Key words: *Lexicalisation, Kenya, Negotiation Discourse, Portfolio Balance, Critical Discourse Analysis*

INTRODUCTION

Background to the Study

There are numerous challenges facing the African continent today. Most of these challenges arise from conflicts confronting these African countries such as political conflicts. The begging question has always been the means of conflict resolution adopted to address such destabilizing conflicts in Africa. In the words of Ikejiaku, there is no doubting fact that conflict pervades many countries in the African continent. The African continent over the past three decades, particularly in the 1980s and 1990s, has faced greater challenges to stability and progress in all ramifications than ever before. In particular, threats to peace have been much more pronounced and indeed have increased in scale and intensity. It is important to note that most of these political conflicts are attributed to disputed elections which often result in the formation of coalition governments as a measure to securing peace and bringing stability in otherwise collapsing states. This has been the case with Zimbabwe, Kenya and recently, the Southern Sudan. A study on conflicts around the world conducted by the University of Maryland's Centre for International Development and Conflict Management found that 33 countries were at high risk of instability and of these, 20 were in Africa (Dare, 2001) cited in Ikejiaku 2011: 62).

In the recent past, most elections held in most African countries have been disputed by the political candidates. In our view, this has become a common current trend especially in the African Continent. This discontentment over Presidential elections more often than not foment violence and chaos in the countries involved. However, it can be contended that for most leaders, the coalition governments have proved elusive to manage up to the end of the term and as a result, most have collapsed resulting into fresh violence or call for fresh elections. This political crisis has and is bedeviling most African countries. Constant and perennial infighting and subsequent collapse of coalition governments slow down development. In view of the foregoing precedence, it is important to find amicable ways of managing and resolving such conflicts. This paper brings to our understanding of how language can be used as a negotiator to manage and resolve otherwise contentious issues of national concern in coalition governments, therefore, averting unprecedented political conflict. Consequently, this would sustain the signed Agreements, secure the earned peace therefore bringing coalition governments to the end of their term.

It is important to note that in 2008, the first Grand Coalition government was formed in Kenya. Long-term electoral change in the whole of Africa indicates this may not be a one-off situation, that in future coalitions may become more common in the region. Despite the fact that most African countries are opting for coalition governments as a way of resolving political conflicts, available literature has revealed that most of such governments have failed within the shortest time possible due to the dangers inherent in such governments. We opine that the manner in which coalition partners negotiate divisive issues of national concern is crucial to the success of such governments. In addition, such negotiations cannot materialize without the use of language. As a result, in Wodak's and Meyer's words, language becomes a medium of domination and social force, and for this reason, the linguistic choices are ideologically driven. This study sought to demonstrate that language is a powerful tool that people in leadership positions and those seeking power, particularly, politicians can use not only to communicate their policies and ideological positions, but also manage, resolve conflicts and in addition gain political mileage. Our argument in this study is that notwithstanding the historical social struggle and the unforeseen loopholes in the National Accord, the former President, Mwai Kibaki and the former Prime Minister, Raila Odinga, must have employed discursive strategies which necessitated the amicable resolution of the Portfolio Balance stalemate. This was an indicator that any arising future contentious issues of national concern would be resolved in the same grain. Consequently, this approach would enable them to steer the country together as coalition partners up to the end of their term. We would like to point out on the onset that the type of coalition government referred to in this study is one of power-sharing arrangement which was formed in response to the 2007 disputed elections in Kenya. Therefore, in this case, inclusive mandate resemble risk-averse politics where efforts to prevent conflict trump political competition.

Consequently, the Kenya, the National Accord and Reconciliation Act (2008) sanctioned the existence of the 2008 Grand Coalition government which was anchored in the Portfolio Balance. The principle of the Portfolio Balance was on the basis of power-sharing between the main parties viz: the Party of National Unity (PNU) headed by Mwai Kibaki and the Orange Democratic Movement (ODM) headed by Raila Odinga. There have been several Agreements established in some African countries to secure peace and stability in failing states, Kenya being one of them. Few agreements succeeded while most failed. Therefore, it should be mentioned that in relation to the Kenyan case, the success of the power-sharing agreement in large part hinges on the political will of the two sides notwithstanding the unforeseen loopholes in the Agreement.

Kenya's coalition Agreement lacks most of the elements that have been found to sustain such arrangements elsewhere. Instead, the Kenyan deal outlines only broad principles for power-sharing and includes minimal guarantees of inclusion. Thus, given the limited scope of the Agreement, its durability depended on how it was implemented over time by the signatories. This brings us to the main objective of this study which is an attempt to investigate how the two principals employed language to negotiate contentious issues of national concern and specifically, the Portfolio Balance and in one way or another sustaining the Agreement.

Statement of the Problem

Initial investigations of the discursive relationship between the two Coalition partners in the Kenyan government reveals considerable intellectual interest in the linguistic strategies the principals used in their attempts to negotiate the contentious issues in the Portfolio Balance. However, this interest is confined primarily to their political ideological backgrounds and objectives. Yet without a good understanding of the discursive factors that inform the processes of negotiations involved, it is difficult to fully appreciate the critical positions that the principals occupied in Kenyan life and the impact that their decisions had on the direction of the nation as a whole. This study therefore

seeks to investigate the lexicalisation strategies in the discursive resources employed by the Principals in the negotiation for Portfolio Balance in the then Kenyan coalition government.

Research Question

What type of lexicalisation do the two principals employ in the 2007 post-election consultation negotiation discourse on Portfolio Balance and what are the underlying implications?

LITERATURE REVIEW

Conflict and Peace Building in Africa

Conflict has destabilized most African countries. Wayande (1997) cited in Ikejiaku (2011:62) discloses that the cost of conflicts in Africa in loss of human life and property, and the destruction of social infrastructure is enormous.

Hundreds of thousands of people have been killed in many of the countries in which the conflicts occur. Many others have also suffered and continue to suffer untold psychological trauma associated with conflicts [...] once conflicts occur, scarce resources are inevitably diverted to the purchase of military equipment at the expense of socio-economic development.

Ikejiaku (2011) avers that given these trends, it may seem odd to talk of optimism in most African countries where conflicts have become common, as the table below illustrates. The table above indicates that conflict bedevils most African countries to the recent time and therefore the need for conflict resolution and peace building if Africa is to develop. Conflict resolution refers to all those activities that are concerned with transforming destructive and armed conflict along constructive and nonviolent channels (Haus, 2001). Various conflict resolution mechanisms such as arbitration, mediation, negotiation and peacekeeping have been employed by different bodies or agencies, such as local communities, the governments of conflicting states, the Economic Commission for Africa (ECOWAS), the African Union (AU), and even the International Community, such as the United Nations (UN), in order to bring peace and stability in conflicting states of Africa.

Table 1: Country and Nature of Conflict

Country	Period	Nature of conflict
Southern Sudan	2014	Community clashes
Kenya	1991/1992, 1997 20003,2007	Riots, communal clashes, violent demonstrations
Zimbabwe	2004 (ongoing)	Riots, violent demonstration and communal clashes
Sudan	1983-2003	Civil war
Uppsala	2003	Civil war
Liberia	1989-2003	Civil and regional wars
Angola	1975-2002	Civil and regional wars
Somalia	1981-2002	Civil war
DRC	1996-2001	Civil war
Sierra Leone	1991-2000	Civil and regional wars
Burundi	1991	Ongoing civil and regional wars
Rwanda	1990	Ongoing civil and regional wars

Source: Content adopted from Ikejiaku (2011:62) and modified in a table by the researchers

Based on this background and given the fact that in coalition governments, the peace Agreements are solely signed by the Party leaders, it is opined that it is the prerogative of such leaders to make important negotiations resulting into decisions that benefit the whole country. Therefore, the importance or the role that language plays in these negotiations cannot be ignored. We contend that it could be the missing link towards fruitful governance.

The Nature of Coalition Governments in Africa

The practice of coalition formation has become quite common in recent years especially among the newly emerging democracies in Europe, Latin America and lately Africa (Oyugi, 2006). While coalition formation has become increasingly common, opinion is still divided about the efficacy of coalition governments whenever the system is in operation (Oyugi, 2006). Similar views are held by Kaverenge (2007) and Sullivan (2005). They argue that coalition governments do have inherent dangers which usually threaten the very existence of that coalition. Nonetheless, Oyugi (2006) states that the actual behaviour of the coalition partners will ultimately be influenced by the socio-

political dynamics at play. Kaverenge (2007) also supports Oyugi's argument in relation to the African experience. In our view, the way coalition partners negotiate divisive issues that pose a threat to the existence of the coalition government could be resolved amicably through language use.

The African Union, for example, has often recommended and encouraged the coalition partners to honour their commitment to initiate dialogue with a view to promoting peace, stability, democracy and reconciliation (Ikejiaku, 2011). In our view, such dialogue cannot be carried out without the employment of language. In other words, the way leaders negotiate divisive issues of national interest may either make or break the nation (Sullivan 2005). Language use might be the variable factor that cause or worsen conflicts in Africa. As Yieke (2008) states, language could be the missing link in resolving political conflicts.

Further, Oyugi (2006) observes that most of the coalitions that have been formed, especially in Kenya, Mauritius and Malawi have been characterized by opportunism because of the weakness of the party system in many African countries. This assertion is also supported by Masime and Oesterdiokoff (2012) who observed that once formed, there is usually no loyalty to the coalition as such. Factions soon emerge which jostle for power and privilege. In Masime and Oesterdiekhoff's words, coalition governments require that parties with divergent policy opinions or preferences should enter a bargaining process to arrive at a compromise. Similarly, Sullivan (2005) contends that incomplete implementations of Coalition Agreements are attributes of failures of inclusive governments in Africa. The way in which the parties negotiate their political differences on divisive issues would determine the success (the word successful is used in this study to mean that the coalition runs its term) of the coalition. In the Kenyan context, this was because the success and stability of the coalition government largely depended on the actions of the two principals whether verbal or non-verbal. Furthermore, the National Cohesion and Integration Commission (hereafter, NCIC) observed that sustaining peace and calm that was secured depended on how political leaders reconciled their political differences as the country moved towards the general election on 4th March, 2013. Thus, the NCIC argued that use of "hate speech" among the main participants would lead to incitement hence regeneration into violence.

The survey of the literature on coalition formation recognizes that the nature and form which coalition formation takes is a function of the unique circumstances prevailing in a given country. The literature further demonstrates that the experience of coalition formation has been characterized by highs and lows. Only a few countries, notably in Europe, have had experience with stable coalitions. Elsewhere, coalition governments have been characterized by instability and frequent break-ups. This has been the case especially in the Caribbean and Africa (Oyugi, 2006). With regard to successful coalition governments, Lijphart (1999) observes that only 3 inclusive governments in Africa had been successful out of a total of 16. Kenya being one of the newest successful coalition government raises the question of how the two principals were able to manage a post-conflict country to the end of the coalition term given that the coalition government was made up of over 135 political parties then. It is our view that since language is the means through which negotiations are made, the initial investigation into the linguistic and discursive strategies of the principals reveal that the two principals faced the challenge of collective bargaining in the course of their governance of which they had to negotiate contentious issues of national concern.

Language as a Means to Conflict Resolution and Peace Building

Habermann (2003) attributes the success of coalition formation to four conditions: firstly, the political leaders must be able and willing to work together in the spirit of trust: they must be able to rely on each other and show mutual respect-both in their personal contacts and in public pronouncements about each other. Every coalition needs a personal basis of trust among the key political leaders. Their personal closest aides must help create this atmosphere. Secondly, agreements on government programmes must be pursued as part of a coalition government. Thirdly, the coalition should be as concise as possible and as detailed as necessary and when parties form a coalition for the first time, they should lay down comprehensive and detailed policies for all spheres. Lastly, every coalition agreement should contain a provision stating that the coalition parties will form a coalition committee whose duty is to deliberate on important issues needing coalition consensus.

In view of attribute one and two above, our argument is that more often than not, mutual respect is evidenced in language use same to drafting of clear agreements/policies. Furthermore, with regard to the fourth condition, deliberation of divisive issues require appropriate use of language, since language is the primary means to appropriate and negotiate power (Fairclough, 1989). All policies and any issues that require coalition consensus rely on appropriate language use. The fundamental issue is how to achieve stable coalition governments, with a focus on

language use, as a major factor, which no coalition government can wish away without the coalition being forced to face internal wrangles which may lead to break-ups of the agreement resulting in conflict.

Therefore, our argument is that ignoring language in any political engagements can be counter-productive. Rather it is a challenge in two directions (Habermann, 2003). First, we all need to realize that language is dynamic and allows for continuous change, whether positive or negative. Secondly, to recognize that language is the means through which power is appropriated, distributed and negotiated (Fairclough, 1989). This is based on the observation that communications, especially in situations of ethnic, political, class and gender diversity, are complex and fluid endeavours (Fairclough, 1989; Habermann, 2003).

Preliminary literature review indicate that no scholar has undertaken a comprehensive evaluation of the role that language has played in informing the decisions that the two principals have made within the context of the Kenyan Coalition Government since its constitution to the end of the term. In order for the value of the problem of power negotiation within the Kenyan coalition government to be appropriately understood, this study sought to find out the role of language as the primary medium through in peace building especially with regard to coalition governments.. In addition, some of the available information that touches on the issues of governance in Kenya consists of a number of reports that were sponsored either by the government or Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs) that sought to investigate the ramifications of the post-election violence of 2007-2008. While the reports are considerably informative, their general focus is on the consequences of inflammatory discourse rather than on the intermediary role that language plays in negotiations for power within coalition contexts. Among the reports are the National Council of Churches in Kenya (NCCCK) Task Force Report of 1992, the Kiliku Parliamentary Report of 1992, the Human Rights Watch Report of 1993, the Murungi Report of 1992, the Nyukuri Report of 1995 and the Waki Report (2008).

Furthermore, the numerous reports by national and international organizations that document the threatening atmosphere and violence before, during and after the general election in 2007 in Kenya, all mention the role of hate speech as a feature of the conflict (Bayne, 2008; EU, 2008; IREC, 2008; Kiai,2008, KNHCR,2007;2008). These reports state that the rhetoric of politicians and political operatives prior to the election made it clear that voters should organize along ethnic lines and defend ethnic interests, a tactic also used in the 2002 election. Further, available literature review confirm that when leaders produce this kind of speech, and thereby make it acceptable for public discourse, their actions can be highly detrimental. Therefore, there is need to investigate the role that language plays in conflict resolution and peace building.

The review of the relevant literature also established that several scholars have underscored the link between the concepts of language, power and knowledge to “nationhood.” Studies in CDA have been undertaken by various scholars to analyse the language used by Heads of State during their tenure. The studies revealed that such leaders had employed a variety of lexicalisation strategies to sustain party ideologies, persuade the citizens to vote for them, push for a change in the mode of governance, preach peace, inter alia. The urgency of this study was informed by the dangers that are inherent in coalition governments, for example, frequent break-ups leading to violence or fresh elections such as what happened in Rwanda (Sullivan, 2005). This research addressed itself to one major instance namely: the negotiation for Portfolio Balance, where former President Mwai Kibaki whose key political party was the Party of National Unity (PNU) and the former Prime Minister Raila Odinga (Orange Democratic Movement (ODM) party, were supposed to negotiate on this issue of national concern.

It is important to point out that there were other negotiations made by the two principals on such matters of public interest but this study only focused on that of Portfolio Balance. This is because it was the first political litmus test for the implementation of the National Accord Act (2008). Further, it was necessary to study the discursive strategies of the two principals on this one occasion because it was bound to unearth important knowledge regarding their relationship, mode of governance and the important role the two principals play in the stability of coalition governments in general and the Kenyan nation in particular.

Lexicalisation

Lexical patterning relates to word choice and word creation devices deployed by the writer for some purposes. Consequently, the social actor’s choice of words says and means a lot. In addition, lexicalization involves ideology (“ideology is essentially linked to the process of sustaining asymmetrical relations of power to maintaining domination by disguising, legitimating or distorting those relations,” Thompson, 1984:4). This means that ideology

is always the tool or property of dominant social groups. Stated otherwise, lexicalisation is the study of meaning of words, the structures of propositions, coherence and other relations between propositions (Wodak and Meyer, 2001:103). According to Wodak and Meyer (ibid: 103) these meanings may have social consequences. Janks (2009) defines the term lexicalisation as the choice/selection of wordings. In her view, different words construct the same idea differently. For the purposes of this study, both definitions were adapted in the linguistic analysis of data because they both address similar view of lexicalisation being concerned with the meaning of words. In addition, lexical cohesion (created by synonymy, antonymy, repetition or collocation) was also analysed (Janks, 2009).

MATERIALS AND METHODS

The data gathered for the purposes of this study were extracted from the former President's and former Prime Minister's website and the Public Communications Office of the Government Spokesperson. The discourses in texts focused on the instance of the Formation of the Grand Coalition Government in Kenya in 2008, specifically the Portfolio Balance. Permission to use these texts for this research was sought and granted by the National Council for Science Technology and Innovation. In total, four texts were purposively sampled for a Critical Discourse Analysis.

The data was modified by numbering the sentences for easier reference during analysis. Thereafter, lexicalisation strategies were analysed based on Fairclough's (1989; 2003) theories of Language and Power and Social Theory. Critical Discourse Analysis is premised on the assumption that language is not only a product of society but also an important force in (re)shaping social practices, both positively and negatively (Wodak and Chilton, 2005; Fairclough 2010, 2003). CDA is characterized by concepts: critique, power, history and ideology. With such foci, CDA naturally lends itself to the investigation of the ways domination and discrimination are embedded in and mediated through language use (Ietcu, 2006). In studying the relationships of power in modern society, language cannot be ignored. Language in society has a decisive social function. This is because in carrying out a critical discourse study, it aims to show up connections which may be hidden from people. Critical language study analyses social interactions by focusing upon their linguistic elements, which sets out their generally hidden determinants in the system of social relationships as well as hidden effects they may have upon that system (Fairclough,1989).

In this study, CDA was used because it brings out the social issues that are a characteristic of the country's political conflicts. It also reveals the discursive sources of power and shows how these sources of power are initiated and maintained within the Coalition Government. In this study, a critical discourse analysis was fundamentally concerned with exploring the relationship between discursive practices, texts and social structures in the speeches of the two principals in the post-consultation negotiation discourse for Portfolio Balance. Analysing opaque as well as transparent structural relationships of power and control and the implications of the linguistic strategies employed in the texts were focused on.

Critical Discourse Analysis endeavours to make explicit power relationships which are frequently hidden, and thereby to derive results which are of practical relevance. Fairclough and Wodak (1997:271-280) sum up the basic assumptions of CDA as follows: all discourses are historical and can therefore, be understood with reference to their context; language is a social phenomenon; texts are relevant units of language in communication; readers/hearers are not passive recipients in their relationships to texts.

In view of the above tenets, this study adopted all of them. Texts in the post-consultation negotiation discourse were first described to establish the specific contents; interpreted to reveal the discourse strategies employed and then the linguistic means identified; and finally an explanation given. CDA deals with discourse as the instrument of power and control as well as the instrument of social construction of reality. For CDA, language is not powerful on its own; it gains power through the use of powerful people who make use of it. In texts, discursive differences are negotiated and governed by differences in power which are themselves in part encoded in and determined by discourse and genre. Therefore, texts too are often sites of struggle in that they show traces of differing discourses and ideologies contending and struggling for dominance.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

In this final section, analysis and findings were compared and contrasted in order to reveal how lexical choices are used to convey information about the two principals in terms of their relationship and representation. This in turn help the writer/speaker to negotiate positioning of the reader's beliefs and ideologies. The differences indicate that the two main principals in the then Grand Coalition Government in Kenya evidence social struggle and control as a

political milestone. The following is an analysis of the lexicalisation strategies and ideological implications in the discursive resources of Mwai Kibaki and Raila Odinga during the negotiation for Portfolio Balance.

Lexicalisation in the Post-election Consultation Negotiations Texts

As mentioned earlier, the choice of words by the speakers in the context of the Post-election consultation negotiation suggest their voice on the issue of Portfolio Balance (Horvath, 2000). In order to have an in-depth understanding of lexicalisation, a keyphrase analysis of both frequently used words and connotations and phrases was undertaken. This type of analysis was informed by other researchers using CDA to analyse political discourse such as (Horvath, 2000; Hunter, 1991; Morris, 2004). We point out that in this study, the keywords were selected in tandem with the divergent issues raised in the Portfolio Balance. This exemplified in the Table 4.1 as follows.

The above key phrase analyses indicate that the phrases, Portfolio Balance” and “Grand Coalition Government” have the highest frequency count of 8 and 7 respectively in Raila’s initiator text and reiterated by Mwai Kibaki in his frequent use Coalition cabinet(7repeats). Raila foregrounds the contentious issues Viz: dissolution of current cabinet (1 frequency count); equal partnership (3 frequency count), allocation of ministries (4 frequency count), formation of coalition cabinet (5 frequency count), and sharing of executive powers (1 frequency count. Kibaki’s response is evidenced in textual silences.

The expression “Grand Coalition Government” is among the leading phrases with 7 frequency count and appears to have a semantic link to other use of key phrases such as “equal partners” (3 frequency count), “sharing executive power” (4 frequency count), “formation of government” (4 frequency count), and “Portfolio Balance and its collocations” (8 frequency count by Raila Odinga and (10 by Mwai Kibaki respectively, which might be interpreted to attest to the divergent decisions on the issue of power. Further, the use of this expression is in agreement with the use of the key word “cabinet” and “consultations.”

Table 4.1 Frequency Count of Lexicalisation in the Texts

Key phrase and collocations vs Portfolio Balance	PB 4.1	PB 4.2	PB 4.3	PB 4.4
Portfolio balance (stalemate)/this matter	08	10	02	00
Dissolution of half cabinet	01	00	00	00
Allocation /cede of Ministries	04	00	04	00
National Accord and Reconciliation Act	04	02	05	07
Equal partners/spirit of partnership	03	00	00	03
Grand Coalition government	07	00	03	00
Constitution/amendment/law	01	00	02	03
Coalition cabinet(formation)	05	07	05	03
Expanded/enlarged /bloated cabinet	01	01	01	01
New preconditions and ultimatums	00	01	00	01
Sharing (monopolize)executive power	01	00	02	04
Transfer of power	00	00	00	01
Consultation(s)/ meeting(s)	02	03	00	01
Joint team of four members	01	00	01	00
Concrete Agreements	01	00	04	00
Retraction/renege agreements	00	00	02	00
Unilateral appointments	00	00	01	00
Government coalition	00	00	00	08

Source: Author’s Analysis (2014)

LEXICALISATION IN RAILA ODINGA’S TEXTS

Lexicalisation portrays the principals’ attitude and decision towards the resolution of contentious issues in the Portfolio Balance. *The meeting adjourned...after you **declined** further discussions... and **insisted** on your proposed allocation of Ministries* (Line 2 PB 4.1).

This opinion is also evidenced in the use of key words like “decline”, and “insisted“ which implies despotic behaviour, accusatory tone and a non-compromisable attitude on the part Kibaki as concerns the contentious issues.

- ... our party now **maintains** that the Grand Coalition cabinet should not exceed 34 ministries. (11 PB 4.1)

- *It is important I reiterate that the above **represents and remains** our party's **irreducible minimum** position (13 PB 4.1). The bolded words indicate a hard liner negotiation and presupposing assertion of power by Raila. The words reveal threats, distrust, adversarial conception which all point out to brinkmanship and applying pressure to negotiate.*
- *Our party is **deeply concerned** ...is increasing **uncertainty and anxiety** in the country. It is **escalating mistrust** that we as leaders were expected to eliminate by establishment of the Grand Coalition (3 PB 4.1)*

The choice of the bolded words above by Raila construct Raila as a hard liner who applies pressure through threats to negotiate. This further reveals underlying power issues.

- *The National Accord and Reconciliation Act is already in force. It **must be understood** that ODM and PNU **are equal partners** in the Grand Coalition (4 PB 4.1)*

The use of “must” and “equal partners” also presuppose the threat and a warning/reminder about the issue of having equal powers as the former President.

- *With cries of jubilation and Happy New Years, (sic) Kenyans on 28th February began to breathe freely again as the National Accord brokered by Mr. Kofi Annan was signed by President Kibaki and myself. The **terror and fear** they had been living under the **hands of mobs, militias and government forces** was finally over...(1PB 4.3)*
- *But since then Kenyans have observed with **growing dismay and anxiety** that not a single concrete agreement has been achieved on any aspect of the new coalition government. **Our nation is a drift and without direction**, and with each passing day, **our problems are mounting**. (2 PB 4.3). To overcome this **terrible impasse** and another **looming crisis**..., (3PB 4.3).*

The choice of the words depict lawlessness especially before the signing of the Accord. They invoke paranoia and paints a country on the verge of collapse. His lexicalisation thus evidence the art of brinkmanship and consequently a call which creates fear into the citizens to side with him in his front for the formation of the Coalition Government.

- *On Saturday, I received from Ambassador Muthaura a letter **unilaterally** indicating that the cabinet to be announced would be formed on the basis of an enclosed list of ministries and their **allocations that we had rejected** on 2nd April! **The agreements we reached in our 3rd April meeting were nowhere to be seen.** (8 PB 4.3)*

The bolded words advance the argument that Kibaki is a soft bargainer because he yields to others' demands which reveal different centres of power apart from the two Principals. It also reveals single party dominance and power hoarding by the PNU side.

- *This latest crisis in Portfolio balance captures the astonishing lengths PNU is willing to go to ensure that it continues to **monopolize power** (5 PB 4.3).*
- *In PNU's interpretation, the Constitution grants the President **exclusive executive power to run this country on his own, and that these powers supersede all the provisions of the Accord.***

REJOINDER FROM MWAI KIBAKI

- *The meeting yesterday was **a culmination of several consultation meetings between myself and Honourable Raila Odinga, in accordance with the National and Reconciliation Act, 2008.**(2PB 4.2)*
- *I have accorded this matter **my personal attention and highest priority** throughout.(3 PB 4.2)*
- *I **realize** the importance of this matter to all Kenyans and the anxiety it is causing and it was **my personal desire** to have this matter concluded today.(4PB 4.2)*

The highlighted words serve as legitimation against the FTA levelled against him by Raila. The words portray Kibaki as a principled negotiator –reference to the Accord. However, they also construct him as a soft bargainer – views the negotiation as being close to competition thus chooses a gentle style of bargaining which is also evidenced by textual silences elsewhere in the texts.

The choice of words depicts him as avoiding confrontation since he presents himself as having good relations with his fellow negotiators evidenced in the use of the first person pronouns.

- *I, on my part, have been ready since last week and was expecting to announce an expanded cabinet yesterday and have been ready to do so today.(10 PB 4.2)*

- *I remain ready and willing to conclude the formation of the Coalition Cabinet at the earliest possible opportunity.*(11PB 4.2)

Mwai Kibaki's lexicalisation shows his optimism in resolving the Portfolio which is evidenced in the repetition of the words; *...been ready; [11 PB 4.2] ...I remain ready and willing to conclude the ... Cabinet.* The repetition of the word '*ready*' stresses his political commitment to end the crisis as well as expediting the negotiation process.

- *Government Coalition has been surprised by the statement made by ODM in regard to the implementation of the National Accord Act and the related Constitutional Amendment. The ODM in their statement allege that the Government Coalition is dragging its feet in the formation of the Cabinet. This is untrue and contrary to the reality. In actual fact, the Government Coalition is the one that has been prodding ODM to respond to the urgency of formation of Cabinet and the ball has been in their court for the last two weeks. (1 PB 4.4)*

Note the repetition of the phrase "**Government Coalition.**" In fact it is repeated 7 times in the whole text. It is used as a unification strategy and as a collectivism. The implication being that when confronted with weighty issues of national concern, the leader seek for strength and support from their in-group. This may imply that they use their group to rubber-stamp their decisions. Further the use of the idioms signal a legitimating strategy against the FTAs and rationalizing their actions.

- *Bearing all these activities it is, therefore, dishonest on the part of the ODM to claim nothing has happened since the signing of the Accord on February 28, 2008 (3PB 4.4)*
- *Greater progress will be made through working together as coalition partners and not through confrontational public shows. ODM should now move from confrontational and activist politics of the opposition into responsible politics of governance (4PB 4.4).*

The highlighted words reveal a deprecatory tone which act as a warning to the ODM side to cease from using intensifying discourse which could polarize the nation. The warning also is an indicator of power.

- *The sharing of power, as clearly spelled out in the Accord is within the framework of the Constitution with all the checks and balances therein. In this regard, sharing of power in the Accord does not mean TRANSFER of power. What we have is indeed sharing and apportionment of responsibilities (5PB 4.4).*
- *The ODM should understand clearly with no uncertain terms that the Executive Authority of the state is vested in the President. The assumption that these powers are irrelevant as a result of the National Accord and Reconciliation Act is irresponsible, reckless and distortion of the facts and the law (6PB 4.4)*

Through reference to the Constitution, Kibaki presents himself as a principled bargainer but the fact that he disregards the Accord on the issue of the powers of the PM, portrays him as a hard bargainer whose ultimate goal is to assert his power and single party dominance by relying on the Constitution only. The choice of the words, "dishonest, irresponsible, reckless, distortion of facts..." reinforce his argument that the PM does not have executive powers. This implies that he was the one holding the veto power therefore the underlying social struggle between the former PM and the former President.

CONCLUSION

Both Mwai Kibaki and Raila Odinga chose their words carefully to exonerate themselves from the face threatening acts presented by either side. Conclusively, both principals adopted a register that was personalizing. Their lexicalisation signals their power, political position as well as practical reasoning strategies in influencing each other. At the interaction level, politeness is signaled by the formal modes of address like your Excellency," Prime Minister, throughout exchanges, both principals presents their message in a defensive tone following the counter-accusations made by the other side, respectively. Furthermore, the use of the words like "invite", 'appeal', and 'willing' presents them as being ready to continue with the discussions on the Portfolio Balance list.

From the foregoing discussion and findings, we can observe that the former Premier uses slightly intensifying words while the former President tries to smooth over divides, which might point to the alleged "stolen victory" convictions on the part of the former. The former PM was known for his strong connection to the ideology of "Restoration of Democracy" in Kenya since the 1980's. As mentioned earlier, the former President is more restrained in his choice of words and appears to be more "passive" to the tense political connotations expressed by the former PM in his discourse. However, he does not divert from the same view. It can be argued that the direction of criticism in the discourses is one significant difference between the two Principals.

The role of language as the medium through which power is appropriated, negotiated, deployed and distributed cannot be overemphasized. This study established that language played a great role in informing the actions and decisions of the two principals in the Kenyan Grand Coalition post-consultation negotiation discourse, whenever an inappropriate or otherwise demeaning or inciting language was adopted by one party, the other was quick to amicably point it out and request for moderate use of language. This provided checks and balances against any inflammatory discourse therefore the sustained peace and calm amidst an otherwise explosive situation.

Last but not least, the principals used language that was mindful of the other, it revealed rational arguments that could be justified using the legal documents, particularly, the National Accord and the Constitution of Kenya (2010), persuasive language encoding tolerance and optimism and also reassurance for continued political support notwithstanding the competition for power. A conclusion can therefore be made that despite a contested, competitive and precarious relationship between the coalition partners, notwithstanding the loopholes in the Agreement, a respectful, reasonable, mindful, mitigated use of language during negotiations on contentious issues of concern served resolve the Portfolio Balance issue and as a result averted conflict leading to successful negotiations. This positive use of language by the coalition partners to negotiate their political differences is important for the success of any coalition government.

REFERENCES

- Bayne, S. 2008. Post-Election Violence in Kenya: An Assessment for the UK Government. London: DFID Kenya – UK Government.
- Fairclough, N. 1989. *Language and Power*, New York: Longman.
- Fairclough, N. 2010. *Critical Discourse Analysis: Critical Study of Language* 2nd Ed. Harlow, Pearson Education.
- Fairclough, N. and Wodak, R. 1997. *Critical Discourse Analysis*. In: T. Van Dijk [Ed.]. *Discourse Studies. A Multidisciplinary introduction*, volume 2.
- Habermann, C. 2003. “Deputy Head of the Office of the President of the Federal Republic of Germany.” Speech read at the Hilton Hotel, Nairobi, December, 4, 2003 and Boulevard Hotel, December 5, 2003.
- Howarth, J. 2000. *Critical Discourse Analysis of Obama’s Political Discourse*. Institute of British and American Studies. Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- Ietcu, I. 2006. *Discourse Analysis Argumentation Theory*. Bucharest Editura Universitatii din Bucuresti.
- Ikejiaku, B. 2011. African Union, Conflict, and Conflict Resolution in Africa: A Comparative Analysis of the Recent Kenya and Zimbabwe Conflicts. *International Journal of Development and Conflict* 11:61-83.
- Janks, H. 1997. *Critical Discourse Analysis as a Research Tool in Discourse*. *Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education* 183: 329-342.
- Kaverenge, S.T 2007. *Political Party Formation and Alliances. A Case of Kenya*. Unpublished Doctorate Thesis: Atlantic International University.
- Kenya Government. *The Constitution of Kenya*, 2010. Nairobi. Government Printer, 2010.
- Kiai, M. 2008. *Speech Power and Violence Hate Speech and the Political Crisis in Kenya*. Kenya National Commission on Human Rights KNHRC 2007. “Still Behaving Badly.” Second Periodic Report of the Election-Monitoring Project. Nairobi: Kenya National Commission on Human Rights.
- Lijphart, A. 1999. *Patterns of Democracy: Government Forms and Performance in Thirty-six Countries* New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Masime, K. and Oesterdiekhoff, P. 2010. *Institutionalizing Political Parties in Kenya*. Nairobi: Centre for Governance and Development and Friedrich Ebert Stiftung. Masime, K. and Morris, L. 2004. *The War for America*. Lincoln: Universe.
- Mugenda, O. and Mugenda, A. 1999. *Research Methods Quantitative and Qualitative Approaches*. Nairobi: Acts Press.
- Oesterdiekhoff, P. 2010. *Institutionalizing Political Parties in Kenya*. Nairobi: Centre for Governance and Development and Friedrich Ebert Stiftung.
- Orodho, A.J 2003. *Essentials of Education and Social Science Research Methods*. Nairobi: Masola Publishers.
- Oyugi, O. W 2006. *Coalition Politics and Coalition Governments in Africa*. *Journal of Contemporary African Studies* 24 1 Routledge Taylor and Francis Group.
- Republic of Kenya: Public Communications Office of Government Spokesperson, Nairobi. 2008.
- Thompson, J.B. 1984. *Studies in the Theory of Ideology*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Waki Report 2007/2008. *Post-Election Violence in Kenya*: Nairobi.

- Wodak, R. and Chilton, P. 2005. *A New Agenda in Critical Discourse Analysis: Theory, Methodology and Interdisciplinary*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Wodak, R. and Meyer, M. Ed 2001. *Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis: Introducing Qualitative Methods*. London: Sage Publications.
- Yieke, F.A. 2008. Discursive construction of ethnicity: The case of the 2007 Kenyan general election. Paper read at Governing the African Public Sphere, 12th General Conference, at Yaoundé, Cameroun. April, 2010.