

Dialogue Drama in Kenyan Political Speeches and its Pragmatic Implications

John Hamu HABWE
University of Nairobi, Kenya

ABSTRACT

Political speech animation in Kenya can be a complicated affair allowing both the speaker and the audience to equally participate in speech animation. The audience could use the dialogue opportunity to re-direct what the speech topic should be thus assigning new topics or could even influence the direction of the ongoing speech topic.

On the other hand the speech animator uses dialogue as a gauging device of his ideas and his own popularity as a member of political class, for control and coercion, engaging the audience that could otherwise feel bored and leave the rally, discussing stage managed topics, allowing the audience to lead directions in what could be an otherwise controversial topic leading to impoliteness on the part of the speech animator.

Dialogue structure in Kenya is arguably present in most speeches though to a lesser degree in formal speeches but to a greater extent in extemporaneous oral speeches. Success in speech making has got to do with mastering how to sustain both the expected monologue structure but also the dialogic structure where the audience is passive and active at the same time.

Keywords: Kiswahili, dialogue, political speech, implicature

1. INTRODUCTION

This paper uses the revised Gricean inferential model to discuss the pragmatic role of dialogue structures in Kenyan political harangues. In the revised model, the cooperative principle does not just have the four maxims of manner, relevance, quality and quantity (Grice, 1977; Leech, 1983; Portner, 2008; Marmaridou, 2000). It has incorporated the politeness maxim as one of the constitutive maxims rather than having it operate as a parasitic maxim (Habwe, 1999). The data for this research were video recorded in the two main towns of Kenya, Nairobi and Mombasa, where Kiswahili is mostly spoken owing to the cultural and linguistic diversity of their inhabitants. Kenya is a Kiswahili speaking East African country with a political arrangement highly replete with class, tribal, sectional, party religious, cultural and even racist interests.

The political system is therefore endemic to a lot of conflict and show of power that usually plays out during rally harangues. Political speech making is a time to calculate, strategize, influence, coerce, promise or even revise and declare party or even government positions.

A lot of tact and strategy is therefore needed for this purpose. Strategies like metaphor use, narratives, similes, hyperbolic usage, symbolism, humor and dialogue are extensively used to achieve various goals of speech animators which range from personal, sectional, tribal to national or even international.

This study is based on performance data collected in 1995 between april and August when the KANU regime was at the peak in terms of power, oppression, control. This was also a time when the multiparty democracy that had been reintroduced in 1991 was starting to take effect but still under heavy arm of surveillance and monitoring. It is a period that witnessed some sort of contrast in political growth. The Kiswahili variety used here may differ from the known standard variety spoken in East Africa. The study focuses on four politicians defined in Kenya as veteran with a noticeable political life span.

2. THE ROLE OF DIALOGUE IN KENYAN POLITICAL SPEECHES

Dialogue is often thought of in relationship with the concept of monologue where only one speaker is involved in speech animation (Sinclair and Coulthard, 1975; Coulthard, 1981; Levinson, 1983; Njogu, 1994; Jurafsky and Martin, 2008; Crystal and Davy, 1969; Crystal, 2003). Dialogue is technically to be understood as a discourse activity which has two or more participants alternating turns.

In a monologue speech, no response or alternating turn taking is to be expected. Njogu (1994) following Bakhtin argues that the alternating turns could be realized in the present, past or future thus making dialogue a highly fluid discourse structure with a retrogressive or progressive trait. It would seem then, from this position that most texts have the potential feature of what Bakhtin would call dialogic interaction and structure. This paper is however, concerned with a dialogic interaction that is both physically present and realized as so, redefining the speaker as animator and audience at the same time and vice versa.

3. DIALOGUE IN INITIATING SPEECH

Most of the dialogue in Kenya begins when the speechmaker salutes the audience. It would seem the greeting or salutation constitutes a formulaic opening in Kenyan speeches. A greeting could be followed by a party slogan or could be used in place of such a slogan. For example:

(1) Speaker: *Hamjambo*
Audience: *Hatujambo!*

Speaker: How are you?
Audience: Fine!

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

(2) Raila: Sisi tuko namba ngapi?
Audience: Unga! Unga! Unga!

Raila: What number are we?
Audience: Flour! Flour! Flour!

One of the political speakers, Raila Odinga at this point, Kenya's non executive Prime Minister wants to discuss development, which is regarded as a serious issue at one of the rallies in Kibera slum in Nairobi, Kenya where he is Member of Parliament in June 2008. However, the audience rejects that and instead asks him to discuss issues of inflation that have affected prices of basic commodities like flour. Raila Odinga complies with the change of topic and talks about the inflation that had taken maize flour to unaccepted levels beyond abilities of the common person most of whom he represented in parliament.

It is generally assumed in discourse literature that the *ordos naturalis* of a political speech structure is monologic. This means it is expected that one speaker will be taking the floor from the beginning of a speech to the end. However, when we look at the political speeches from Kenya given during rallies, we find dialogue like the one referred to above as one of the significant features. The use of the dialogue structure seems a violation of manner of presentation and therefore pointing to some implicature. The dialogue structure exhibited has only two slots of initiation and reply. It does not have the three-slot structure that is noticed in classroom discourse (Sinclair and Coulthard, 1975; Coulthard 1981; Oduol, 1987)

4. USE OF DIALOGUE STRATEGY IN THE TOWN OF MOMBASA

When we look at Jahazi's political speech, delivered in Mombasa in April 1995 at Majengo Town Hall organized to demonstrate against the activities of some dissident by the name of Odongo, we find a widespread use of the dialogue technique. See example below:

(3) Jahazi: Kenya nzima hailali kwa ajili ya nani?
Audience: Odongo!!

Jahazi: The whole of Kenya does not sleep because of whom?
Audience: Odongo!!

In this excerpt, Jahazi seems to be using this technique to solicit for support from the audience. Remember the audience can make the right inference of the question he is asking. It is possible that part of the audience does not believe what he is saying something that constitutes flouting the quality maxim. However, through dialogue he affords to convince the audience to agree that it is Odongo who makes the entire Kenya worried. Remember, the politician asks the question in such a way that there can be only one answer in the in the unfolding context.

A look at Jahazi's speech also reveals a very important use to which the dialogic strategy is put. When a politician gives a speech, he may not know how popular he is as a politician. One way of establishing this popularity is through speaker initiated dialogue. When the audience replies in the affirmative and support, that becomes a confirmation of his popularity. Alternatively, a speaker may want to monitor or gauge how popular what he is saying is. Dialogue in this respect becomes quite a resourceful technique for such an audience-monitoring, device since it provides a way of looking at the audience.

In Jahazi's speech, he speaks about many topics but with a position that favors his own political party-KANU (Kenya African National Union) one of the dominant parties largely associated with President Daniel arap Moi and which exerted a lot of political control to Kenyans. Sometimes exercising such extremes only comparable to other African dictators like the Congo's Mobutu Sesseko. Each time Jahazi appeals to the audience to try and gauge its stand over the issues in question. This seems a breach of the manner and quality maxim .
Examples:

(4) Jahazi: Mtu akiwa chokochoko kajificha pahali mafichoni
tukishamgundua ni haki yetu kum dai. Au siyo?
Audience: Ndiyo!!

Jahazi: If a person becomes a problem, and goes somewhere in
hiding, when we discover him it is our right to ask for
him. Or is it not so?
Audience: Yes!!

Jahazi finds this message tricky. He says something about the run-away criminals. However, he is not sure that his audience completely agrees with him or he is not sure of the truth value of his utterance. To check whether what he is saying is popular, he uses the question tag to ask: 'Au siyo?' 'Or is it not so?' first, he gauges whether the masses follow or agree with him. Secondly, he induces them to take that line of thinking by forcing agreement through dialogue. In this case, the people agree and so Jahazi proceeds. There are cases when the audience may refuse to make a positive response. In that case, a

politician might be forced to change information or strategy altogether since rally politics in Kenya has to do with telling the people what they want to hear. Another time when Jahazi checks his popularity and that of his ideas with the audience is when he says:

- (5) Jahazi: Carlos alishtakiwa Paris kwa kuwa gaidi wa dunia
nzima. Au siyo Bwana?
Audience: Ndiyo!!
- Jahazi: Carlos was indicted in Paris, France, for being a world
class criminal. Or is it not so?
Audience: Yes!!

Note, however, that the audience most of the time never disagrees with the speaker. However, it is the amount of people answering that politicians use as gauge for support. If what the politician is saying is unpopular, then, only a few people would respond. Sometimes there is total silence and this is indicative of non-compliance. If the whole audience is in compliance, then, the response is encouraging. Now this brings us to another function of dialogue. Politicians, put their supporters strategically in the crowd to keep cheering the speaker every time he initiates some form of dialogue. Haugerud and Njogu (1991) call this stage-managed drama. In such kinds of drama, the supporters know that what they are supporting is not necessarily true but it is for popularizing a certain position, agenda, party or political figure sometimes owing to threat or even bribery or promise of some favor. At some point in Jahazi's speech, the address turns almost one hundred percent dialogic with no side being dominant on the floor. At this point, the supporters of Jahazi and KANU enter into that dialogic encounter simply for dramatic reasons rather than the truth and genuine support and it is in this case that the roles of the speech animator and the audience are collapsed so that they become one. This gives the politician favor because he is being supported and popularized by the cheering audience.

- (6) Jahazi: Hata wakiwa chama kimoja cha watu kama kumi.
Nani unaamini Kenya apewe?
Audience: Hakuna!!
Jahazi: Kuendesha nchi hii
Audience: Hakuna!!
Jahazi: Kulinda watu hawa
Audience: Hakuna!!
Jahazi: Na kuleta amani
Audience: Hakuna!!
Jahazi: Kushinda Rais Moi
Audience: Hakunaa!!

- Jahazi: Even if they were a party of ten people. Who do you believe should be given Kenya?
Audience: There is none!!!
Jahazi: To run this country
Audience: There is none!!!
Jahazi: To protect these people
Audience: There is none!!!
Jahazi: And to bring peace
Audience: There is none!!!
Jahazi: Than President Moi
Audience: There is none!!!

The section that maintains this dialogue is fairly small. It helps Jahazi in implying that nobody can rule Kenya except President Moi. However, this is entirely doubtful given that multi-party democracy had given leverage and many people who could lead were available. But that is not the issue to Jahazi or to the audience. The sole aim, by using this strategy, is to popularize the name of President Moi and vilify the opposition side as being unworthy of leadership. In expressing such information, which stands high doubt, dialogue as a strategy makes most listeners draw an implicature that what Jahazi is saying not largely true but it means that he is appealing for president Moi's support. Truth is not a big question here in this rally rather the underlying implicature of what is said. The sort of implicature here can be described as particularized. It requires certain background knowledge to infer the meanings. The main issue is to have somebody say 'yes' or 'no' to questions whose answers always favour the position of the speech animator.

Important too, to the dialogue strategy, to rally harangues in Kenya is an attempt to retain and sustain the interest of the listeners. There is a high likelihood that the audience could lose interest. To keep the audience alive, happy and make them stay, you have to maintain and engage them in continuous dialogue. This way, the audience feels that it is sharing in the role of speech animation. Such a feeling helps to tie together the speaker and the audience. In this way whatever information that is being given is likely to be perceived as coming from the people. You will notice that Jahazi uses what has been described in discourse literature as the inclusive 'tu' 'we' when he speaks to show the collective and common ground of the speech animation (see Lwaitama, 1995).

Dialogue may be initiated via rhetorical questions. When it is initiated through rhetorical questions, sometimes it may serve as a politeness strategy. The meaning that is implied in the rhetorical question is later shouted by people. In that way, the speaker manages to observe politeness maxim for not uttering a face-threatening act by himself. He resorts to the use of the audience to say it as he takes cover under the rhetorical question.

- (7) Jahazi: Umpe opposition utampa nani?
Audience: Hakuna!!
- Jahazi: Give the opposition, who will you give?
(Who in the opposition would you give the presidency?)
Audience: There is none!!

Jahazi succeeds in maintaining his politeness, something that is governed by the politeness maxim of the co-operative principle. The audience shouts ‘*Hakuna*’ ‘none’. However, though that is what he implies, Jahazi can still say he never said it if put to task at some point in time.

Sometimes dialogue is generated by a genuine way of seeking information. See example below:

- (8) Jahazi: Juzi juzi yule Marcos aitwaje, sijui nani yule.
Audience: Carlo
- Jahazi: Recently that Marcos, what is he called, I do not know who is that?
Audience: Carlo

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

A look at the second speech from Kenya by Nassir. This speech was delivered during one of the public holidays in Kenya on 12 of June 1995. Ahmed Nassir who was a very powerful politician from Coast province and who was widely known for his open psychopathy during the dictatorial rule of president arap Moi reveals more or else similar strategies as found in Jahazi’s speech. Nassir like Jahazi does not use dialogue for the sake of it but as an implication of something which he and the audience understand because of their contexts and shared knowledge (Gibbs, 1981). Like Jahazi, Nassir uses dialogue to drive and solicit popular support from the audience. At some point, he says that the coast people of Kenya would like to receive the same treatment as mainland communities e.g. Luhya, Luo, Maasai etc. He is urging the government of Kenya over this matter. Wanting to gauge whether his idea has popular support, he asks the people:

- (9) Jahazi: Nyinyi watu mwakubali nyinyi?
Audience: Ndiyo, ndiyo!!

Jahazi: You people do you agree?
Audience: Yes, yes!!

This is certainly a way to gauge whether the idea he is presenting is popular. Now that the audience has confirmed with applause, it helps not only to make it a strong idea for the coastal people but also to anchor Nassir as a benevolent politician who is mindful of people's needs.

However, the people are asked whether they like what Nassir is saying. Note, again, there is a lot of stage-management in this act of dialogue in that Nassir's supporters can carry the day by shouting to popularize the idea hence popularizing Nassir. It is important to note that politicians like Nassir went to lengths of paying youths, poor supporters and whose wild, praise could easily intoxicate and indeed infect other people who thought otherwise. But again it must not be lost to us that a speaker like Nassir used such rallies to generate yet another national implicature about his character to his master, President Moi that he supported him and that behind him he had many followers. And that any time he could deliver to President Moi this group if he needed support at the Coast Province.

One interesting thing connected to stage-management in Nassir's speech is that unlike Jahazi who asks more rhetorical questions and normal questions to the audience, Nassir's audience seems to respond more on its own. This means that Nassir's dialogue in most cases is audience generated. This is a clear case of stage-management. The people interject to cheer-up by saying certain words and sometimes clap and even make noises that cannot be properly discerned. All these serve the main purpose of support of the speaker's position and ideas. Dialogue is used here implicatively as a conduit for speaker support. This is not because of the popularity of the ideas but simply a case where the stage has been managed in such a way that Nassir's supporters laud him and to imply he is a popular politician and he is in the right political party. The most interesting thing about such drama is that even the part of the audience that had been quiet now starts to cheer in support.

Nassir's dialogue comes as a result of speaking about sensitive areas in Kenyan politics. Let us look at the following example,

(10) Nassir: Leo wengine hapa, hata hawajapata uongozi,
 mwangalie yule Mwarabu.

Nassir: Today some here, have not gotten leadership,
 look at that Arab.

This is a sensitive aspect of Kenya's politics. It serves as a way of generating dialogue because of the undertone it carries. This audience knows that he implies some specific people, for that reason, they give him support.

Nassir's speech like Jahazi uses the strategy of dialogue for politeness sake. He puts rhetorical questions to the audience to let them generate the implicatures themselves. The example below exemplifies this claim

- (11) Nassir: Yuko mmoja aliwapa kazi?
Audience: Hakuna!!
- Nassir: Is there anyone who gave you a job?
Audience: There is none!!

Only the maxim of politeness can account for such rhetorical questions that end up in a dialogic structure. Remember, nobody in this highly sensitive and highly handed government can hold Nassir responsible for saying that nobody gave the Kenyan coastal people jobs. This is because he never says so. However, through a rhetorical question and then consequently through the dialogue with the audience, the implied information is brought to the fore via a contextual inference that may be hereby described conversational implicature.

It is again true to argue that Nassir solicits for direct answers from the audience, like in the following example:

- (12) Nassir: Hakuna saa ya kusingizia President Moi hataki Nassir.
Alikuambia saa ngapi? Chumbani kwako?
- Nassir: There is no time for saying President Moi doesn't like Nassir. When did he tell you? In your room?

Through such rhetorical questions, which in most cases, end up in dialogue, he succeeds in implying something to the audience and hence letting them share in the speech making and also retaining their interest. Like we have said before the audience has no obligation to stay on. It is the speaker through such strategies as dialogue that can keep it engaged.

The dialogue that is generated by both Nassir as the principal speech maker and the audience serves to show the speaker's popularity. It also serves to show the popularity of the ideas he is speaking about. A speaker who dares not use dialogue in Kenya is like a traveler who does not use a compass during his journey. This is because; dialogue for Nassir like it is for other politicians, serves as a monitoring device for gauging his popularity among people.

However, what seems to be one major function of the Nassir dialogue, mostly audience-generated, it serves to popularize Nassir and KANU as a political party. This is because whatever Nassir says the audience retorts by shouting '*Jogoo*' – KANU emblem. One can argue, the audience uses dialogue here to popularize the ideals of the political party at the same time.

When we look at the other speeches from Kenya, we still find them characterized with the feature of dialogue. The structure of dialogue manifested in the speeches from both Mombasa and Nairobi has only two slots of initiation

and reply. It tends to be different from the kind of discourse dialogue manifest in classroom discourse where there is a third slot of evaluation (Coulthard, 1981)

What then is the motivation of dialogue? What are the implications for the use of this strategy for these other politicians?

5. DIALOGUE STRATEGY USE IN NAIROBI

A look at other data from Nairobi, Kenya's capital city reveals that dialogue serves multiple functions. When we look at Kirima's speech, we find dialogue that is both audience and speaker generated.

When the speaker generates dialogue in most cases, it is meant to manipulate the audience's point of view. Kirima is like one who leads an idea in one direction. And like in Jahazi's and Nassir's speeches most of the questions asked are hardly denied. See example below:

- (13) Kirima: Kwanza ninamuuliza, si muko tiyare?
Audience: Ndio!!
- Kirima: First I ask you, are you ready?
Audience: Yes!!
- (14) Kirima: Nawambia wa... was... wasijaribu
Ku... kusumbua 'Hawker' wakawacha sababu mimi ni
wa KANU, na KANU ndiyo serikali. Ni kweli?
Audience: Kweli!!
- Kirima: I told those harassing the hawkers to stop and they
stopped because I am from KANU party and
Kirima: KANU is the government. Isn't it true?
Audience: Yes!!

Looking at these two examples from Kirima's speech during his campaigns in 1995 in Starehe constituency we can see how he, Kirima uses dialogue as a strategy to persuade the audience. Although Kirima's speech unlike the rest looks like one characterized with many false starts, hesitation and even grammatical slips, it has nonetheless many implicative strategies with enormous results. In the first example, where he asks the audience whether they are ready for voting, he manipulates them into saying 'yes'. Since he has earlier on referred to them as '*wana KANU*' being ready on their part means ready to vote for KANU party and hence Kirima. Since the question is tactfully put thus exploiting the maxim of manner, the audience is manipulated into agreeing that they are ready to vote for him. Kirima says he has told the government not to harass hawkers. He engages the audience into dialogue, by asking them to

confirm that he (Kirima) is a KANU party member and KANU party is in the government: That implies that KANU party is supreme and hence anybody who supports it will get the acceptance.

Kirima again through implication succeeds in persuading the people to believe that KANU party is government. The people confirm this through dialogue. It is not true that KANU party is the government. KANU party is only a political party. However, Kirima succeeds to make that strong implication that KANU party is powerful because it is the government and in this way, he persuades and influences people's point of view about KANU party.

Kirima also uses dialogue to engage his audience. This is a function we have seen in both Jahazi's and Nassir's speeches. Examples:

(15) Kirima: Hapa Hapa Railway si hapa?
Audience: Ndiyo eee!!

Kirima: Here, isn't the railway station here?
Audience: Yes eee!!

In this exchange, one can only see Kirima engaging his audience for general supportive reasons. In another example he says:

(16) Kirima: Hii zinaitwa matatu?
Audience: Ndiyo!!

Kirima: These are called matatu?
Audience: Yes!!

In this use again, Kirima is merely engaging his audience in dialogue to maintain and retain its interest in what he is saying. This is because he could just say that the vehicles he was pointing at were *matatus* (public taxis). However, because he wants to claim some common footing with his audience, he engages them in dialogue which at best serves to retain their interest and which implicatively points to their importance and relevance as voters.

Kirima like his counterparts uses dialogue as a conduit for rhetorical questions. He says:

(17) Kirima: Huu ni uungwana?
Audience: Si uungwana!!

Kirima: Is this gentlemanly behavior?
Audience: It is not gentlemanly behavior

Most of the rhetorical questions that Mr. Kirima uses serve the politeness function. It is more crucial for Kirima who is seeking a parliamentary seat in

Nairobi, Kenya. And like we have said before they generate the required responses.

Let us look at Kimondo who like other politicians in Nairobi held demonstrations in 1995 to show support and solidarity with President Moi in Nairobi town when he was threatened with opposition from politicians and dissidents. It was believed the opposition would tear the country apart.

Kimondo unlike the rest of the politicians uses dialogue as he opens and as he closes his speech. The opening dialogue is quite common where a speaker starts by shouting a slogan to which people reply. For example, he could say '*harambee*', meaning let us pull together and the audience would reply the same way. In his opening remarks, Kimondo greets the crowd. This helps to minimize distance between him and the audience and enable him to gain a common ground with them. The greeting, a politeness strategy, serves to achieve a unified ground from which Kimondo proceeds.

The dialogue at the end like the one at the beginning serves to strengthen the unity between the audience and the speaker. This is further strengthened by the way that '*harambee*' is used. This dialogue also serves to mobilize the audience into supporting KANU party. Kimondo like Kirima and other politicians also uses dialogue to serve as a gauge. He, for example, says:

(18) Kimondo: Nimeshakuwa 'member of parliament' na muliona
nikimwachia Kirima. Hamukuona?

Audience: Tuliona!!

Kimondo: I have been a member of parliament. And you saw me
step down for Kirima. Did you not see?

Audience: We saw!!

Kimondo here, first states that people saw him as he left the KANU party or Kirima. As if to confirm whether the people agree or not, he asks them a question which they have to confirm. So, he succeeds in gauging the people's position about that utterance. Since the people confirm that they saw him leave the seat for Kirima he uses this technique to urge for unity among KANU party people. Although Kimondo does not share the high profile latitude of the other politicians, he has been a freedom fighter and this helps him to easily mobilize, heat-up support because of the sympathy and emotion attached to freedom fighters and the liberation struggle in Kenya.

The audience-generated dialogue is another case of stage-management where the KANU supporters cheer-up the views Kimondo expresses. For example:

(19) Kimondo: Kwa hivyo sisi sote tukiwa watu wa Kenya hatuna kabila.
Kabila yetu ni Kenya.

Audience: Ndiyo!! (clapping)

- Kimondo: Therefore all of us being Kenyan people we have no tribe. Our tribe is Kenya.
Audience: Yes!!

In such cases, the audience serves to support such assertions. Like we said before, the assertions do not have to be true, so long as they imply something in favor of the goals being pursued by the political speaker. The above utterance is a fallacy which breaches the maxim of truth. However, it gains more grassroots' support. This is because other than the speaker implying that Kenya is united it is urging for further unity. The audience supports it as true and hence making it more strong. Another case of audience initiated dialogue is:

- (20) Kimondo: Na tukishikana, tutamwezesha na tutarahisisha kazi kwa Mtukufu Rais.
Audience: Very good!!

Kimondo: And if we are united, we shall make work for President Moi easy.
Audience: Very good!!

This being a day of demonstration in favor of President Moi, anything uttered in strong support of his leadership generated support and cheering from the audience.

The audience confirms that it supports what Kimondo is saying. This indicates that he is on the expected side. Note that it is not possible for anybody in this context to say anything negative against the President and still get the same support. The response here is an assurance. In many places during Kimondo's speech, the audience keeps lauding him. It brings us to another case of stage-managed drama but now in Kimondo's speech.

One may observe that Kenyan political rallies are replete with dialogic structures. However, the dialogic structures rather than being just normative serve certain pragmatic functions (See Lwaitama, 1995; Haugerud and Njogu, 1991; Mazrui, 1971.) Although it has been argued before that the dialogue serves to retain audience interest, generate support, act as a politeness strategy, it is evident that politicians use dialogue on a large scale basically to monitor the effect of what they are saying to the people. Since it is possible in oral communication to monitor (Guinchi, 1977; Brown and Yule, 1983) what one says so that one that one could change strategy or improve on it.

The dialogue structure which is a violation of the two maxims of the co-operative principle i.e. manner and relevance is an important tool for any politician. It also serves as a populist way of making an idea on a stand to get firmly ingrained in the minds of the audience. The audience expects to be guided, rallied as it maintains its active participation either as a result of stage management or spontaneous participation in political speeches. Although it violates the two maxims of the co-operative principle, the implication made by

the use of the dialogue is understood by the speakers and audience and it is consciously used by them.

6. CONCLUSION

It has been argued in this paper that Kenyan political speech animation can be a tricky affair since partisan, biased and other varied interests have to be served. It has been demonstrated that dialogue is a very central strategy for engaging the Kenyan audience. Besides being used as a monitoring device of populist ideas, popular speakers, it is used as a tool of coercing the audience into agreement. The audience on their part uses it to influence the topics of the speech animator. Normal questions or rhetorical questions could be used in initiating dialogue. The speeches from Nairobi and Mombasa are markedly different because of the grammatical ability of the speakers. In Mombasa, where Kiswahili is spoken both as a native and near native language the fluency of the speakers and the ability to speak more standardized language tends to be higher. Yet the pragmatic strategies and particularly the use of dialogue is common to all the areas. The speakers in both areas exhibit a lot of skill in using language in a more implicit way and with high characteristic of context dependency. Both speaker initiated and audience initiated dialogue is present in all the areas of Nairobi and Mombasa. It has also been noted that political rallies are not a locus of completely new information but rather a locus of ideas which even the audience is aware of. Political speech making is a venture where the speaker is as important as the listener because they are all involved in the dual process of speaking and listening and a lot of bargain has to be made on both sides of the divide.

The speech making therefore demands a lot of tact, strategy and even genius to engage the audience in a way that is meaningful and one that would not lead to reprisal from the high handed government of the day and from the audience which the politician has to appease by talking about what they want and in a way they want. The implied information can also enable the Kenyan speaker to vary his intentions of his speech when challenged to do so. The people who would otherwise get bored and leave the rally are perpetually engaged, entertained and appreciated. The dramatic strategy though being of great benefit to the speaker, as he may initiate it himself or let the audience initiate it, most times puts the Kenyan politician at the mercy of the audience who could jeer or cheer him thus calling for great skill in the use of this inferential strategy and skill. The Gricean model provides an understanding of this kind of talk where what is to be said is only implied leaving the audience with varied interpretations.

REFERENCES

- Bakhtin, M. 1981.
The Dialogical Imagination. The University Of Texas Press.
- Blommaert, J. 1990.
Modern African Political Style: Strategies and Genre in Swahili Political Discourse. **Discourse and Society**, pp. 115–131.
- Brown, G. and Yule, G. 1983.
Discourse Analysis. London: Cambridge Press.
- Coulthard, M. 1981.
An Introduction to Discourse Analysis. London: Longman.
- Crystal, D. 2003.
A Dictionary of Linguistics and Phonetics. Blackwell, Malden.
- Crystal, D. and Davy, D. 1969.
Investigating English Style. London: Longman Group.
- Gibbs, W.R. 1981.
Mutual Knowledge and Conversational Inference. **Journal of Pragmatics** II(2): 561–588.
- Grice, P. 1977.
'Logic and Conversation.' In: Peter Cole and J. Morgan (eds.), *Syntax and Semantics 3*, pp. 41–58. New York: Academic Press.
- Guinchi, P. 1977.
Understanding Spoken Discourse in a Second or Foreign Language: Pedagogical considerations. In: E.O. Keenan et al. (eds.), *Discourse Across Time and Space*. University of California: Department of Linguistics.
- Habwe, J. 1999.
A Discourse Analysis of Swahili Political Speeches. Unpublished PhD Thesis. University Of Nairobi. Nairobi.
- Haugerud, A. and Njogu, S.K. 1991.
State Voices in the Countryside: Politics and the Kenyan Baraza. African Studies Centre. Boston University.
- Jurafsky, D. and Martin, J.H. 2008.
Speech and Language Processing. New Delhi: Dorling Kindersley.
- Leech, G. 1983.
Pragmatics. London: Longman.
- Levinson, S. 1983.
Pragmatics. London: Cambridge Press.
- Lwaitama, A.F. 1995.
A Critical Language Study of Tanzanian Kiswahili Presidential Political Oratory. PhD Thesis Birmingham: Department of Modern Languages, Aston University in Birmingham.
- Marmaridou, S.A. 2000.
Pragmatic Meaning and Cognition. Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Mazrui, A.A. 1971.

The Political Sociology of the English Language: An African Perspective. Paris: The Hague.

Njogu, S.K. 1994.

Dialogic Poetry: Contestation and Social Challenge in East African Poetic Genres. Michigan: A Bell and Howell Company.

Oduol, C.B. 1987.

Maintenance of Communication in Primary Classroom: Some Evidence for the Role of Elicitation and code-switching in English in the Medium schools in Kenya. Unpublished Phd Thesis University of Aston in Birmingham.

Portner, P. 2008.

‘Meaning.’ In: Ralph Fasold and Jeff Connor-Linton (eds.), *An Introduction to Language and Linguistics.* New York: Cambridge.

Sinclair, J.M. and Coulthard, R.M. 1975.

Towards An Analysis of Discourse: The English used by Teachers. London: Oxford University Press.

About the author: *John Hamu Habwe* holds a PhD from the University of Nairobi in the domain of Discourse Analysis. He is currently an associate professor in the Department of Linguistics and Languages at the University of Nairobi where he lectures Kiswahili linguistics. He specializes in discourse, pragmatics and sociolinguistics.