

Identity in Political Discourse: The Case of Kenyan Parliamentary Debates

Dr. Christine Atieno Peter

P. O. Box, 491, Chuka

(Postal Code - 60400)

Kenya

Abstract

Speech is manipulated by the speaker to perpetuate ideology and enact various identities. When this is the case, language becomes something more than just a medium for communicating the propositional knowledge. Whereas language is generally intended to be communicative, it has, sometimes done more than that due to manipulations. This paper examines the use of language by Kenyan members of parliament during debates to perpetuate socio-political dominance. The objective was: to discuss the socio-political identities enacted in Kenyan parliamentary debates. Descriptive research design was used. The study purposively sampled texts from the Hansard which portrayed aspects of identity creation. Data was collected using a guiding card and analysed using Foucauldian Discourse Analysis (FDA) theory which investigates how the society is moulded by the various power relationships reflected through language. The study identified language that created dominance and it also examined identity creation. The socio-political identities enacted during debates in parliament are presented. Finally, it was established that positioning, categorisation and indexicality were approaches used by parliamentarians to create identities. The findings will contribute to Discourse Analysis, Pragmatics, Sociolinguistics and theories in linguistics. It will also add to knowledge in terms of characteristics of language used in parliamentary debates, and the role of language in creation of social political dominance.

Keywords: Identity, positioning, categorisation, indexicality, dominance

1. Introduction

Language is used as an instrument to combine and manipulate ideas and relationships for the purpose of power and control (Fowler, 1985). Ilie (2010a) and Jakaza (2013) argue that with the emerging paradigm shift and the polarisation in politics, it is becoming absolutely necessary to examine the language discourse that expresses the political agenda, the argumentation strategies and the deeper motivation of the politicians as they transact their debates and actions. Politicians are not known to be consistent. Quite often they present arguments geared towards endearing themselves to either the powers that be or, retrospectively, toward supporting their side of the political divide.

The varied linguistic strategies applied in debates and speeches by, politicians, particularly members of parliament have a great impact on the laws as well as the citizenry of the land. Parliaments are institutions in which members debate legislative proposals and scrutinize the operations of government through interrogative questioning which at times appear negative (Jakaza, 2013). Members of Parliament use language in debates with an intention to manipulate other people so that they may dominate them in the process.

Discourse knowledge is ideological knowledge related to larger units of discourse (Bekalu, 2007). It has knowledge on content and the genre of the text or the type of text. This includes parliamentary etiquette, turn taking and other types of language that are rule governed. For example, there is always one speaker at a time and when the speaker is on the floor they [s/he] stand while the others are seated. Further, the Speaker of the National Assembly is at all times in control of who should be speaking. He is charged with the responsibility of chairing all the activities during the debate. The other speakers have to channel their contributions through him.

Culture and history influence the type and nature of discourse used in parliament (Jakaza, 2013). According to Fairclough and Fairclough (2012), debates get their discursive nature from the content and rules of a critical discussion. This is a complex speech act that is dialogically aimed at the persuasion of an interlocutor by giving reasons. Debates take place in a context within a certain setting. This could be in the chambers or the National Assembly.

This study was conducted on language used by MPs during debates in parliament. Parliamentary debates may or may not give new information. Therefore, it is notable that debates can be categorised according to levels of the differences in the opinion and knowledge of the participants (van Dijk, 2003). Politics is a game of power and dominance.

It is argued that power is a force that circulates in a web of social interactions between individuals who exercise as well as undergo power Foucault (1980). It is the argument of this article that members of parliament see themselves truly as the elements just aforementioned; elements of power. They always want to be felt not only by the people they serve, but also by their fellow parliamentarians. That is why; they will use all that it takes for that dominance to be felt. This includes the language they use on the floor of the house.

2. Literature Review

2.1 Ideology

An ideology is a set of beliefs on which individuals or groups base their actions. It is a set of ideals of a social group that explains how society should work. Political ideologies are concerned with many different aspects of society including power allocation. Ideologies are frameworks for organizing the social cognitions that are shared by members of a group. In a discourse, participants engage each other as individual or groups. In such situations, there can be domination by one group and resistance to this by the other (van Dijk, 2005). Players especially in a political discourse will tend to portray themselves as upright and good while placing the others in negative light. Ideology, which refers to how language accrues socio-political meaning (Kroskrity, 2000), organizes and enables all cultural beliefs and practices as well as the power relations that emerge.

Social and political aspects of life are regulated by ideology (Jorgensen & Philips, 2002). Ideology in this sense brings about identity formation which contributes to socio-political dominance. This is cemented gradually and if this ideology is spread to cover broader areas and is shared by more people it becomes a belief (van Dijk, 1995). Ideology plays out in Kenyan parliament during debates as MPs reorganize themselves into cells that identify who belong to which party or group. It brings about the categorization of MPs, causing identity creation. The activities that each group participate in are directed by the ideology that they ascribe to. This affects their views and how they relate with group members and others from opposing sides.

Ideology can be either positive or negative (van Dijk, 2005). It all depends on who is making the observation and what the individual's perspective is. Generally, this political discourse almost always places government and opposition on antagonistic fronts. The government would strive to defend its stand on an issue while opposition would strive to criticize and question government in an attempt to play the oversight role and keeping the government on check.

2.2 Discourse and Parliamentary Language

Discourse is a wide term that refers to a whole variety of meanings (Titscher, Meyer, Wodak & Vetter, 1998). It is not just a meaning in a text or an utterance, but it is finding many meanings that can be decoded from a text. It is a process of social interaction (Fairclough, 1989). Discourse can also be defined as an exercise that characterises the world by demonstrating it, creating and assembling it in meaning (Fairclough, 1992). Discourse is a way of speaking and writing about information, societal practice that mirrors and produces the structuring of the area and language is viewed as a window into people's minds. It is as a discursive resource which individuals utilise to perform various discursive functions (Chalebois, 2010). Discourse can thus be viewed as a system of thought that is systematically constructed in a discussion through which power relations produce speaking subjects (Foucault, 2003).

Politics is concerned with the influence to make resolutions, to control resources and other people's behaviour and their values. This involves the need for politicians to select their words and phrases carefully because they believe in the influence of language on an individual's thoughts. Discourse in a socio-linguistic approach and conversation analysis is an interactional order which emerges in social situations; therefore, it is an interactionist concept (Angermüller, 2007). There is need for models that feature beliefs which remain implicit, such, make meaning clear and leads to presupposed discourse, (Wodak & van Dijk, 2000).

Discourse can be involved in dominance which van Dijk refers to as power abuse in the (re)production of social inequality. In the national assembly, the Members of Parliament (MPs) interact during debates and in so doing use language to express their views and opinions .

Language is used as an instrument to combine and manipulate ideas and relationships for the purpose of power and control (Fowler, 1985). This is crucial as the MPs use language in debates with an intention to manipulate other people so that they may dominate them in the process.

2.3 Identities

Identity is a public creation (Coulmas, 2005; Holtgraves, 2002), and it traverses language and socio-political cultures in a civil setting. Politics use language as an identity marker (Mendoza-Denton, 2002) and politicians' activities are, mostly, linguistic in nature. This leads to political discourse (Bayley, 2004). The creation of socio-political identities plays out in electoral campaign discourse, (Bwenge, 2009), just like it does in parliamentary debates in the Kenyan National Assembly. Identity has an identifier and the identified. There is the individual 'self' and society is the main identifier of 'others'. There is no identity without its 'other' form. Identity is defined by 'other' and this leads to hostility, contradictions, denying and negating the 'other'. The constructions of identity are done through inclusive process of same values of identifier and exclusive process of elimination of the other identities. Electoral discourse and language use in election campaign rallies are considered in relation to parliamentary political culture and the manipulation of identity (re)construction. Language and politics facilitate the projection of identities in a socio-political space. Bwenge (2009), investigates how parliamentary candidates manipulate Swahili (National and electoral designated language) with linguistic elements from ethnic language and English for the purposes of emphasizing their national, ethnic and elitist identities. A campaign speech constitutes socio-political space through which all identities that matter flow (Bwenge, 2009). The study demonstrates how language and political principles overlap in facilitating the projection of identities that are important in a given socio-political space.

This study looks at strategies that MPs use to create dominance. The different forms of identities are constructed through the use of positioning, categorisation and indexicality.

2.3.1 Performance

Performance is a deliberate and self-awareness display of an action in a social setting. In everyday speech, this is an aesthetic component that is available for evaluation by an audience (Bauman, 1977). Performance is marked speech events that are more or less sharply differentiated from very ordinary and uninteresting interaction. It is evident in frequent interactions in daily life (Bauman, 1986; Hymes, 1972). The production of identity depends on ideology to make that identity recognizable and legitimate. Identity is created by participants in a social interaction. Debates in parliament are such situations and the discourse that is reproduced confirms that this creation is a social process (Frogner, 1999).

2.3.2 Positioning and Identity

Identity is the act of being recognized as a certain person by others, (Gee, 2001). It is also a collection of significant stories and narratives about individuals. Positioning provides the means for understanding how social and psychological phenomena are manifested in discourse. Therefore, conversation is interaction of position, the utterance and the storyline.

2.3.3 Categorization

Categorization is the process in which ideas and objects are recognized, differentiated, and understood. It is fundamental in language, prediction, decision making and in all kinds of environmental interaction. This is a discursive process of creating identity where language serves a social function. It is the nature of interactional construction of social meanings in discourse.

Bwenge (2009) relates discourse patterns to the creation of social categories in which identity construction is fixed. Through speech, the speaker is given an opportunity to present himself as an actor in a social world and he can negotiate his present self with the listeners (De Fina, 1995). When discourse is a practice, it creates a producer and a consumer.

2.3.4 Indexicality

This is a semiotic operation of juxtaposition, whereby one entity or event points to another. Signs or indices function through repeated or non-accidental co-occurrence (Silverstein, 1985). For example smoke is an index of fire. Linguistic structures become associated with social categories indirectly through a chain of semiotic associations (Ochs, 1992). Indexicality produces identity through practice.

3. Methodology

The target population for the study is the speeches made by the parliamentarians between 1992 and 2010 in the National Assembly. The utterances of members of the Kenyan Parliament during debates as recorded in the Hansard are used as the primary source of the information and extracts that formed the basis of the undertaking.

4. Data Analysis

The following categories were identified as aspects that contribute to identity creation: blame game, management of resources, fault finding, professionalism, liability, law, and the gloater. These aspects are discussed based on identity constituents summarized in table 1.

Table 1 Identity Constituents

Utterances	Identity Strands	Mechanisms
UTT 1	Corruption	Evasion, Explicit expressions and pronouns
5. UTT 2	Economic and Social imbalance	Persuasion , gloating and pronouns
UTT 3	Misuse of resources and insensitivity	Evasion, authoritative language and passivization
UTT 4	Misuse of resources	Explicit expressions and demonstrative adjectives
UTT 5	Misconduct and violence	Gloating, Evasion, implicit expressions and pronouns
UTT 6	Interference and unfavourable working conditions	Evasion, Explicit expressions and pronouns
UTT 7	Corruption	Derogatory, Intimidating, implicit expressions and Rhetorical Questions
UTT 8	Extravagance	Persuasion , Coercion, Evasion and pronouns
UTT 9	Discrimination	Explicit, Authoritative language, Demonstrative Adjectives and Pronouns.
UTT 10	Vengeance	Derogatory, Evasion, Explicit expressions and Pronouns
UTT 11	Misuse of State Resources and Nepotism	Intimidating, Evasion and Pronouns
UTT 12	Arrogance and Insensitivity	Gloating, Deceit, Coercion, Evasion and pronouns
UTT 13	Insensitivity, Plight of Common men	Explicit expressions, Antagonistic and Evasion
UTT 14	Misconduct	Explicit expressions, Indifference, Pronouns and Demonstrative Adjectives.
UTT 15	Extravagance	Implicit, Explicit expressions, Confrontational and Pronouns
UTT 16	Nepotism/ Sectionalism/ Tribalism	Explicit expressions, Authoritative, Evasion, Praising, and Pronouns
UTT 17	Nepotism, Unequal Distribution of Resources	Explicit expressions, Inciting, Authoritative, and Pronouns
UTT 18	Economic Imbalance and Violence	Gloating, Evasion and Pronouns
UTT 19	Ignorance	Explicit expressions and Pronouns
UTT 20	Economic Imbalance	Imploring, Convincing and Pronouns

Findings

5.1 The Blame Game: Corruption

The members of parliament from both government and the opposition were constantly involved in the blame game in a bid to create socio-political identities. The following is an explication of the different mechanisms used to do this.

UTT 7

Mr. Maore: ...when the language is used that we all share the responsibility of bringing down the economy, I say no! . . .
Mr. Angwenyi: ...Is the honourable member from some part of Meru on order to say that in the DOD, they now pay one for supplying air? Have they ever paid him for air?
(Hansard: 15th April 1998).

The speaker uses rhetorical questions that are meant to intimidate the opposition member. This is a direct accusation of corruption in government by the opposition, who exonerate themselves from collective responsibility. The utterance indicates the state of affairs in the government. It points at what the speaker does in trying to evade the questions. He chooses to ask rhetorical questions. There is categorisation of people; the Hon. Member and his associates are put in the group that represents liars and those from certain areas that the speaker ranks very lowly. The speaker asks many questions and in this way he implies that the opposition member is fabricating the information that he is giving. The utterance is used to represent the tough stance that the government will take to attack those that are pointing at its shortcomings.

5.2 Misuse of Power

The blame game is further propagated through misuse of power, discrimination and nepotism. The opposition accuse the government of favouring people from certain parts of the country in employment to public offices. The government on its part counters this by accusing the opposition of doing the same while they were in power.

UTT 16

Mr. Ojode: You will remember that the list I tabled...from the Kenya Revenue Authority showed that there was some skewed manner in which employment was done... Look at the office of the President's staffing. People from one particular region took charge of very good Ministries...which are heavily funded are given to people from one particular region.
(Hansard: 12th September 2007).

The government is presented as discriminative. The identities are created based on discrimination and nepotism. The speaker makes use of explicit explanations, evasion and pronouns to do so. Through indexicality there is creation of identity. This is how the identities are presented. This utterance has been made to indirectly express social representation, which is an indirect way of relating social and political groupings. The speaker has withdrawn himself from the identity of what he is talking about, that is, those who have been favoured through the appointments. He has also used meaning association, (Van Dijk, 2009).

There is the use of pronouns 'us' and 'them' to refer to those who are disadvantaged and those who are benefiting respectively. The speaker indicates the state of affairs in the records. In his speech, he points out issues of favouritism that help in creation of identity. Here, the speaker is using indexical aspect which is non-referential or pure indexicality. There is the use of intensifiers: 'very good', 'very powerful', and 'heavily funded'. These are indices that show social identities in context. Another aspect is that there is a possibility, especially where the speaker is talking of actual situations. In rheme, the utterance is significant in that it will contribute to interpretation of the meaning the speaker intends. The sign is that there are those who enjoy the situation based on where they come from, that is, the "...one particular region." The negative profiling is done to the 'others' group. This is done by making inflammatory utterances about them.

There is positioning of self in a specific relationship in this utterance. The assumption is that the speaker is opposed to the control that certain regions have over others (Chilton, 2004). The speaker uses the following utterance in defining 'self' and 'others'. This utterance is made through the use of occupation of social and verbal spaces. It is in opposition of others (Wilson, 1990; De Fina, 1995). The speaker does this by using opposition to construct identities in speech. For example: "People from one particular region..." By doing this, the speaker expresses other people's political identities as being 'Them', the favoured group (Wilson & van Dijk, 2006). In this utterance, the speaker positions others as the privileged ones. On the other hand, he positions himself as the "us" against "them". He is also the author of the speech. Finally, the principal in this case is "them" that is, people from a certain region. The said appointments favour these individuals.

5.3 Management of Resources

In terms of resource management, the government is depicted as displaying a cautious stand. It does not want to get involved in a business that it already knows is not profitable. Its generosity is evident in the way it is ready to support others to participate in the same. The opposition on the other hand is persistent in its concern for the masses and in painting the government as inconsiderate. The speaker insists that the transport system worked in the past and should do so even in the present era.

UTT 2

Mr. A. H. Ahmed: The government does not have plans to establish a Lake Transport System to connect the fifteen Islands in Mbita Constituency with the mainland.

Mr. Ogur: Mr. Speaker Sir, these Islands were there even before the British came to Kenya. When they came here and found the Islands, they thought it fit to start a transport service the Islands via Karungu Bay to Muhure Bay and back. Is it in order for the Assistant Minister to say that there is no need for this now or there is no plan for what had been planned for long ago? **(Hansard: 2nd November, 1993).**

The government is presented as a perpetrator of unequal distribution of resources to various regions. In this utterance identity is created by focusing on equitable distribution of resources and economic imbalance. The speaker places himself and the government in a position of power and authority. He uses this place to portray power by causing imbalance in the country. The country is divided into areas that are developed and those that are not. This is intriguing since it is expected that there should be equity in developing the whole country.

The speaker represents the government and those with authority. It is clearly put: the government will not engage in developing the transport system. The member presenting the query is a representative of the marginalised and he reminds members that the colonialists had started the transport service because they saw the potential in the region, which, ironically, the government side seems not to be keen to develop. Less powerful groups, and in this case the dominated, tend to highlight rights (Harre, R., Moghaddam, F., Cairnie, T.P., Rothbart, D. & Steven, S. (2009). This presents the opposing identities of those in government and the opposition members.

5.4 Government: The Master Planner

In its operations, the government displays its systematic and accountability traits. Its belief that due processes should be followed to the letter is evident in the treatment of the officers after coming back from the peace keeping mission. An imprest should be surrendered within the stipulated time.

UTT 3

Mr. Sunkuli: ...The police officers who were assigned duties in Yugoslavia were given an imprest of kshs 180,000 each and an allowance... Earlier arrangements were that the officers were to purchase their winter clothes in London...but the flight route was changed. The clothes were bought immediately on their arrival in Yugoslavia and issued to them... **(Hansard: 4th October 1994).**

Through the speaker, the government is portrayed as being insensitive to the plight of its citizens. The identity created in this utterance is based on insensitivity and misuse of resources. The government is impervious to the plight of the officers. The speaker places himself and government as providers of funds to the officers in a peace keeping mission. His speech is designed to elevate him and what he represents. These identity strands are presented by the following strategies: Cleft sentence, "It was an imprest which they were to spend and afterwards account for the expenditure." The officers are presented as people who suffered due to the cold weather they had to bear and now their salaries were being deducted. Another linguistic strategy is passive sentences, where the speaker excluded the agent of the action because, arguably, what the government does is embarrassing.

5.5 Fault Finding

Part of the role of the opposition is to put the government on check. They do this by auditing the performance of the government. This can be done in a way that appears to be malicious.

UTT 13

Mr. Tarus: ... The Government will not halt military exercises in Samburu range as it is government trust land availed for military training back to pre- independent times. (Hansard: 20th May 2004).

The identity strand is insensitivity to the plight of a common man. The government portrays itself as firm in its operations and sticks to its plans; the opposition is bent on presenting it as insensitive to the plight of its people. The linguistic strategies are: explicit and persuasive language. He uses explicit language while pleading with the members to behave well. This utterance is placing the government in a position required for it to respond by answering the questions. The speaker as part of the government states that they are not aware of what is being asked about and that they will not stop the activities in the Samburu Range. The speaker is antagonistic which arguably shows the government as being irresponsible in the way it handles matters that affect the citizens. This speech is used to indicate the stand of the government. Reference is employed to show this stance by the regime. The two opposing sides express their views openly as observed in the statements in the utterance: “Sir, it is quite outrageous. One can control his anger...” The behaviour of the government is predictable showing its lack of concern for its subjects.

5.6 Professionalism

The speaker from government depicts it as law abiding and is categorical about debating on issues that are before the courts. This speech presents the opposition as ignorant of basic matters.

UTT 19

Mr. Kabando Wa Kabando: The disbursement of the fund has been and continues to be, done in accordance with the laid down procedures. The constituency component of the fund is disbursed by the community committees of which the area honourable member of parliament or his representative is a member...I must actually note that nearly thirteen months after the honourable member was sworn in he has not had an opportunity to sit at the constituency YEDF committee...I would advise the honourable member to consult his constituency youth officer so that he gets that corrected. (Hansard: 3rd February 2009).

While the government is depicted as procedural in executing its responsibilities, it is also patient in explaining the operations of the YEDF. The opposition member is presented as irresponsible. Identity is based on irresponsibility and ignorance. The creation of identities in this utterance is done by the speaker using several linguistic aspects. These include: pronouns. The first person pronouns ‘I’ refers to the speaker and also makes him take responsibility. The use of pronoun ‘He’ refers to the ignorant Member of Parliament who does not seem to know that he should be sitting on the committee in his constituency. Another aspect used is explicit explanation. The speaker is pointing out facts that other members of parliament should know. He is also taking the opportunity to pass important information to the members. The statement is a means of giving facts to the ignorant members. The passing of this information helps create the identities socially and politically.

The use of passive sentence is a linguistic strategy that the speaker applies to be polite by not stating who does the action because he believes that everyone present knows what has been happening. In the sentence “The disbursement of the fund has been and continues to be done...procedures” it is not important to mention the agent. This utterance portrays the speaker as knowledgeable in the way he states that the process through which the money was disbursed. This statement is made with clarity. The questioner on the other hand is from the opposition side and he is presented as ignorant and irresponsible since he appears not to be aware of the procedures involved; “I would advise the honourable member to consult his constituency youth officer...” The opposition member is not keen on his work because he should have known that he ought to sit in the constituency YEDF committee meetings where such information is discussed.

The speaker is a representative of those in the ruling class. The speech is a way of categorising the government side. This group is presented as being organised and orderly in its operations. While the questioner is in the group that is governed and so represents those that information should be disseminated to. He is clear about who is in charge and what the governed should do to get correct information.

5.7 Liability

Though the government is stringent on the process of the issuance of the identification cards, it admits the difficulties that it goes through in trying to protect the members.

The speaker is frank in admitting that there are challenges in the process of the issuance of the identification cards in the border regions. The opposition accuses it of denying some Kenyans their legal rights.

UTT 9

Mr. Samoei: ... I admit that identification cards are a necessity to all Kenyans ... This is a border district and we have to take extra care in the issuance of identification cards... We have a committee of elders who help in vetting to determine true Kenyans... **(Hansard: 18th October 2000).**

The opposition portrays government as being discriminative. Through the use of demonstrative adjectives and pronouns the speaker addresses the issue of discrimination as a way of forming identity. The use of pronouns “I” and “We” in this utterance, is to indicate personal involvement of the speaker. “Those areas”, the demonstrative adjective ‘those’ show that the speaker distances himself from the regions. He is pointing out the actions that they have taken, that is, the committee of elders. When the speaker says: “I am not aware that people in Turkana cannot meet the necessary conditions for the issuance of national identification card...” It is a response to the question of discrimination against other peoples especially those in the border districts. ‘I’ represents the speaker on behalf of the government.

The government uses its position of authority to set up a committee of elders to aid in vetting the applicants so that they can determine true Kenyans. This suggests that the regime is correct in being extra vigilant in the issuance of identification cards in the region. The opposition is placed in a position of irresponsibility in wanting the government to just issue identity cards without proper scrutiny. In relation to this, the speaker explains why they need to be vigilant in certain areas. This utterance presents the government as responsible and careful in matters that touch on the security of its people. The speaker in this utterance believes that people in the out flanked districts must be scrutinised more than other Kenyans because they may be foreigners. In the speech, the speaker explains the measures that they have taken. This vetting of a category of individuals, reassures the people that all strategies have been laid down to provide identity cards for the people in these regions.

5.8 Law

The law should be followed to the letter, but sometimes when this happens, there could be some aspects of repression. In the following utterances, the line between these two is not very clear

UTT 5

Mr. Sunkuli...I do not answer pompous questions. If somebody out of his own character calls me childish then I am not obliged to such pompous questions.... If the honourable members of the opposition want a good answer, then they must be courteous enough... Otherwise we cannot sit down and be provoked. **(Hansard: 30th October 1996).**

Government institutions such as the police force are properly manned by trained personnel who are professional in carrying out their duties. The speaker is honest as he admits that there was violence in some areas. The opposition is represented by government as dishonest. The members from the opposition are biased in giving information. They down play the truths and highlight the wrong things. The speech portrays the government as an abuser of power and office. The opposition are unruly, for example the way they took over some polling stations and ask question. Identity creation is on the basis of power abuse. The strands that explain this is misconduct and violence. The opposing sides are positioned as antagonistic towards each other. There is an exchange of words and the speaker says that there are questions that he will not answer. Pronouns are used as linguistic strategies that portray the abuse of power and creation of identity. Pronouns ‘he’ ‘his’, ‘them’ and ‘they’ are references to the opposition.

The speaker uses these pronouns to isolate himself and direct his speech to the opposition and the rest of the House. the speaker and the government side is referred to as, ‘I’, ‘me’ and ‘we’. These pronouns are inclusive in nature; they express the speaker’s involvement in the activities and the taking up of responsibility. The members of the opposition are presented as rough, aggressive and violent. The speaker is arrogant when he says that he will not answer the question because he feels that he has been insulted by being called “childish”. He places himself in an offended party position where the opposition becomes the offender.

Other linguistic strategies used in the creation of identity are: gloating and antagonistic language. Since the speaker is in power, he feels free to answer only the questions that he wants, and the dominated group cannot do much to force an answer out of the speaker.

Further classification as a mark of identity creation is in the speaker representing those who follow the law and those in leadership. He says the answer is in the law *to* confirm that they are guided by the constitution. He says that the police are not partisan when dealing with political violence. He states that he may choose to answer the questions or not to, depending on how it is framed. Representation here is seen as radical regulator that includes influence of speech (Chilton & Schaffner, 1997).

Active sentences are a linguistic way that the speaker uses to take responsibility of any action. Attention is put on the agent and the listeners are convinced that the forces are performing a noble duty. Topicalization as a linguistic aspect is used by the speaker to draw the attention of the listener to his (speaker's) words and the intended meaning. By using this strategy, the speaker takes ownership and expresses certainty on the matter. He is able to front what he feels is important.

5.9 The Gloater

In enacting identity, the speakers especially those in power sometimes allow their victory to mar their objectivity. When this happens they begin to gloat. The government speaker is dishonest about when speaking about saving money by using old president Kenyatta's currency.

UTT 12

Mr. Mwiraria: ... we found that bank notes printed in 1978 bearing the portrait of the first President of the Republic of Kenya were still kept in the vaults of the Central Bank of Kenya and we released them into circulation...we are completely at liberty to continue printing the late President Kenyatta's notes, if we so wish.
(Hansard: 23rd July 2003).

The speaker uses gloating and evasive language to express the issue of insensitivity which is an identity strand. He is gloating at the opposition now that they have taken over government. He tries to justify his position and that of government, as he explains why they are using currency bearing the late President Kenyatta's portrait, while the ones with the portrait of the immediate former president are still available. He claims that they decided to do so in order to avoid wastage of resources.

6.0 Summary of Findings

The study found out that the following social political identities were created by the MPs in their presentations in Parliament: in-groups and out-groups; inclusivity and exclusivity; 'us' and 'them'. It is evident that there are two distinctive sides in parliament: the government and the opposition and The MPs are religiously faithful to their side. At all times they use language that clearly identifies them with their side. The identity strands that are used to bring out this include: corruption, economic and social imbalance, misuse of resources and insensitivity, misconduct and violence, interference and unfavourable working conditions, discrimination, vengeance, misuse of state resources and nepotism, sectionalism, tribalism and ignorance.

References

- Angermüller, J. (2007). Research Report: Major Research Centers in Discourse Analysis in France. *Forum Qualitative Social Research* 8 (2) pp 4.
- Bauman, R. (1977). *Verbal Art as Performance*. Prospect Height, IL: Waveland Press.
- Bauman, R. (1986). *Story, Performance and Event: Contextual Studies of Oral Narrative*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bayley, P. (2004). The Whys and Wherefores of Analysing Parliamentary Discourse. In Bayley, P. (Ed). *Cross-cultural Perspectives on Parliamentary Discourse*. PP 1- 44. Amsterdam. John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Bwenge, C. (2009). Linguistic Identity (re)Construction in Electoral Politics: The Case of 2005 Tanzanian Parliamentary Campaigns. In Akinloye, O. and Lioba, M. (Eds). *Selected Proceedings of the 39th Annual Conference on African Linguistics*. PP 166- 178. Scriverville, MA: Cascadilla Proceedings Project.
- Charlebois, J. (2010). The Discursive Construction of Feminities in the Account of Japanese Women. In *Discourse Studies*. Vol. 12, PP 699. UK: Sage.
- Chilton, P. (2004). *Analysing Political Discourse: Theory and Practice*. London: Routledge.

- Chilton, P. & Schaffner, C. (1997), Discourse and Politics; In van Dijk, T. (ed). *Discourse Studies: A Multidisciplinary Introduction*, Vol. 2: Discourse as Social Interaction. London: Sage.
- Coulmas, F. (2005). *Sociolinguistics: The Study of Speakers' Choices*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- De Fina, A. (1995) *Pronominal Choice, Identity and Solidarity in Political Discourse*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Fairclough, N. (1989). *Language and Power*. London: Longman.
- Fairclough, N. (1992). *Discourse and Social Change*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Fairclough, L. & Fairclough, N. (2012). *Political, Discourse Analysis: A Method for Advanced Students*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Foucault, M. (1980). *Power/ Knowledge: Selected Interviews and Other Writings (1972- 1977)*. Colin Gordon (ed) New York (NY): Pantheon Books.
- Foucault, M. (2003). *Society Must be Defended*. New York (NY): Picador.
- Fowler, R. (1985). Power. In van Dijk, T. A. (ed). *Handbook of Discourse Analysis*. PP 61 – 82. London: Academic Press.
- Frogner, T. (1999). European Identity: A Perspective From a Norwegian. In *Reflections on European Identity*. Working Paper: European Commissions.
- Gee, J. (2001). Identity as an Analytic Lens for Research in Education. In W, Secada (ed), *Review of Research in Education (vol.25, pp.99-125)* Washington, DC: American Educational Research Association.
- Harre, R., Moghaddam, F., Cairnie, T.P., Rothbart, D. & Steven, S. (2009) Rights and Duties: Recent Advances in Positioning Theory. In *Theory and Psychology* vol 19 pp 5-31.
- Holtgraves, T. (2002). *Language as Social Action: Social Psychology and Language Use*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Hymes, D.H. (1972) "On Communicative Competence" In Pride, J. and Holmes, J. *Sociolinguistics*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.
- Ilie, C. (2010 a). Introduction: Analytical Perspectives on Parliamentary Extra – parliamentary Discourses. *Journal of Pragmatics 42 Oxford: Elsevier, PP879- 884*
- Jakaza, E. (2013). *Appraisal and Evaluation in Zimbabwean Parliamentary Discourse and its Representation in Newspaper Articles*. Unpublished Ph.D: Thesis Stellenbosch University.
- Jorgensen, M. & Phillips L. (2002). *Discourse Analysis as Theory and Method*. London: Sage.
- Kroskrity, P. (2000). *Regimes of Language Ideologies, Politics and Identities*. Santa Fe, NM: School of American Research Press.
- Mendoza- Deton, N. (2002). Language and Identity. In Chambers, J.K. and Trudgill, P. and Schilling – Estes, N. (Eds). *The Handbook of Language Variation and Change*. PP 475- 499. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Ochs, E. (1992). Indexing Gender. In A. Duranti & C. Goodwin (eds), *Rethinking Context: Languages as an Interactive Phenomenon*. (pp.: 335-358). Cambridge. Cambridge university Press.
- Silverstein, M. (1985). Language and the Culture of Gender: At the Intersection of Structure, Usage and Ideology. In E. Mertz & R.J. Parmentier (eds), *Semiotic Mediation: Socio-Cultural and Psychological Perspectives*. (pp.: 219- 259). Orlando, FL: Academic Press.
- Titscher, S.; Meyer, M.; Wodak, R. & Vetter, E. (1998). *Methods of Text and Discourse Analysis*. London: Sage.
- van Dijk, T.A. (1995). Esoteric Discourse Analysis. In *Discourse and Society*. Vol. 6 pp 5-6.
- van Dijk, T.A. (2003). The Discourse Knowledge Interface. In Weiss, G. and Wodak, R. (Eds). *Critical Discourse Analysis: Theory and Interdisciplinarity (PP 85 – 109)*. Houndmills: Palgrave Macmillan.
- van Dijk, T.A. (2005). Contextual Knowledge Management in Discourse Production: A CDA Perspective. In Wodak, R. and Chilton, P. (Eds). *A New Agenda in (Critical) Discourse Analysis: Theory Methodology and Interdisciplinarity. PP 71- 100*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- van Dijk, T.A. (2009). *Society and Discourse: How Social Contexts Influence Text and Talk*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Wilson, J. (1990). *Politically Speaking: The Pragmatic Analysis of Political Language*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Wodak, R. & van Dijk, T.A. (2000). *Racism at the Top*. Klagenfurt: Drava Verlag.
- Wrong, D. H. (1979). *Power. Its Form, Bases and Use*. Oxford: Blackwell.