Speaker-audience Convergence and Divergence in Tanzanian Campaign Discourse

*Kelvin Mathayo**

Abstract

This paper illustrates how two Tanzanian presidential candidates deploy discourse for self-legitimation and other-delegitimation purposes. It also examines audiences' understanding of the strategies the candidates used with a view to finding out whether their understanding and the dual function of the strategies converge or diverge. The paper examines four campaign speeches given by former President Jakaya Mrisho Kikwete and Dr Wilbroad Slaa during the 2010 presidential election campaign (two speeches by each candidate). The three questions guiding this paper are: How did the candidates legitimate themselves and delegitimate each other? What is the target audiences' understanding of the function of the strategies used to do so? Does their understanding depart from the function the strategies performed or not? Critical Discourse Analysis (henceforth CDA) is used to analyse the speeches. In particular, the analysis is done using Theo van Leeuwen's discursive semantic-functional approach. The findings show that the candidates deployed certain discursive strategies for self-legitimation and other-delegitimation purposes, of which some of the participants were aware. The other functions suggested by a fair number of participants are seeking to serve Tanzanians and lying. But it is shown that, if the participants had probed the candidates' language further, they wouldn't have mentioned functions such as seeking to serve. This divergence implies that consumers of campaign speeches need to pay close attention to language to understand what candidates say.

Introduction

In countries that are politically plural, anyone who intends to hold an elective public post has to seek the support of others. Thus, the political communication happening during election campaigns involves using strategies intended to influence people's thinking on candidates as well as political parties. Candidates belonging to ruling parties present opposition candidates as people who are visionless, dangerous and biased, and themselves as anything but that. In the effort to realise their objective, they also discredit or "challenge" those in the opposition (Quinto, 2014:177). For exactly the same purpose, opposition candidates background their negative

---

* Assistant Lecturer, Department of Foreign Languages and Linguistics, University of Dar es Salaam, P.O. Box 35040, Dar es Salaam, Tanzania, E-mail: kamugalo@yahoo.co.uk

traits and foreground positive ones on the one hand, and emphasise the negative traits of their opponents in power on the other.

Although competitive elections usually involve more than one candidate running for a given electoral seat, say, a presidential seat, the real battle normally tilts towards front runners. This happened in Tanzania in 2010 when President Kikwete and Dr Slaa were locked in a fierce battle as each sought a mandate to lead the country. Whereas the former was seeking re-election on the Chama cha Mapinduzi (henceforth CCM) ticket, the latter was running for president for the first time on the platform of Chama cha Demokrasia na Maendeleo (henceforth CHADEMA), the main opposition political party in Tanzania at present.

The Place of Politics in Society

Hay (2007:61–62) defines politics as "a process of public deliberation and scrutiny of matters of public concern." Acemoglu and Robinson (2012:92) conceptualise politics as "the process whereby a society chooses the rules that will govern it." Therefore, politics is a social practice involving various people dealing with issues which affect entire communities or societies, or large sections thereof. The rules Acemoglu and Robinson (2012) refer to are used to determine, among others, how power is distributed in a given society, for a limited distribution of power is bad for any society. Aristotle (1887) suggests that politics arose from the use of language to indicate what is useful and harmful and therefore what is just and unjust. The goal in doing so is to achieve "the highest good" in the interest of the citizens of a given society (Fairclough, 2018:17). Aquinas (2007:156) agrees with Aristotle that the purpose of politics is to ensure that there are "public goods" in society. Aquinas observes that the state established in a given society and the laws obtaining in that society have a duty to protect such goods. Like Aristotle and Aquinas, Hobbes (1991) acknowledges the importance of political authority, without which civilised social life would be impossible. He suggests that citizens should not undermine a lawful regime. Fairclough and Fairclough (2012) have linked politics in general and discursive legitimation or delegitimation in particular to argumentation. Self-legitimation and other-delegitimation are instances of political deliberation. This means, for example, that, through the arguments that the candidates make to legitimate themselves and delegitimate each other, both Tanzanians and the speakers are engaged in argumentation or deliberation.

Political Discourse

Reyes (2011:783) conceives of political discourse as "a genre that involves political actors speaking publically. Those speech events are commonly made in public forums in which politicians attempt to project their political agendas. They can present their agendas in more or less subtle ways, sometimes by presenting the state of affairs as a simple narrator." This conception of political discourse focuses on the making of speeches by politicians in order to advance certain political agendas. It leaves out a number of issues relative to political discourse. It is therefore important to look at other conceptions of political discourse. Chilton (2008:226) notes that "[p]olitical discourse is the use of language to do the business of politics and includes persuasive rhetoric, the use of implied meanings, the use of euphemisms, the exclusion of references to undesirable realities, and the use of language to rouse political emotions." The emotions referred to in the foregoing quote may be fear or hope, which is evoked through political discourse in order to make people react to what politicians say on occasions such as election campaigns in a certain way. Also, campaign speeches are a sub-genre of political discourse. These speeches are usually characterised by lexical, grammatical, semantic and pragmatic elements most suited to the context of an election campaign. For instance, highly emotive expressions such as *peace*, *prosperity*, *employment*, *victory* and *defeat* may be deployed in such speeches. Abdullahi-Idiagbon says (2010:30) campaign speeches are "an important tool politicians use to express views and feelings to the public with the sole intention of reshaping and redirecting the electorates' opinions to agree with theirs."

Audience and Political Discourse

Capone (2010) explains that the audience is responsible for determining the meaning of what the speaker says, which may coincide with the intentions the latter has in saying what he or she is saying. Capone makes this argument in relation to campaign speeches. If his argument is in any way correct, then the role of the speaker is solely being an animator of what the audience wants said (Goffman, 2007). Bell (1984) suggests, however, that, to suit the interests of their audiences, speakers change their styles. Indeed, Duranti (2006) and Joseph (2006) argue that political language is aimed at persuading audiences to have attitudes or opinions desired by speakers on what is said or on speakers themselves and the (political) groups to which they belong. Joseph (2006:13) is even forthright about this issue, arguing that "the inspiring orator can

also lead a people, or rather mislead them, into believing that the narrow self-interests of the governing party are actually the interest of the people as a whole." Thus, besides examining how the candidates legitimated themselves and delegitimated each other, this paper also looks at the target audiences' understanding of the function of their strategies to find out whether their understanding and the function of the strategies converge or diverge. And if they diverge, the paper attempts to establish the implication of this divergence.

Literature Review

Campaign speeches have received the attention of critical discourse analysts. Abdullahi-Idiagbon (2010) notes that three presidential aspirants, notably Okhai Mike Akhigbe, Donald Duke and Abubakar Atiku, employed a kind of language characterised by sentiments and emotions and that each concentrated on painting a good image of himself and a bad image of his opponents. Abdullahi-Idiagbon opines that the reason each aspirant used emotive or sentimental language was that he wanted to present himself to Nigerian voters as the person best qualified to hold the presidential office and bash his opponents. Allen (2007) has argued that Howard and Mark Latham deployed the pronouns *I*, *we* and *they* strategically to either identify themselves as belonging to certain political groups, with which they might be identified, or as not belonging to certain other groups, with which they did not want to be identified. Allen argues that identity change and the deployment of pronouns with more than one meaning helped the candidates to persuade many people to support them, since the two techniques led to their being identified with a broad section of the Australian populace.

Ike-Nwafor (2015) has examined eight campaign speeches. The objective of the study was to examine the ways in which ideology and unequal power relations were created and reproduced by the gubernatorial candidates whose speeches she has analysed. Ike-Nwafor shows that, in order to dominate the people in their states, the candidates used certain lexical expressions and imperative constructions in their speeches. The issue of using language to control the mind of others (voters) finds support in a study by Omozuwa and Ezejideaku (2008). The duo argues that, during election campaigns, politicians use language adroitly in order to persuade voters to cast their ballots for them. But in order for that to happen, argues the duo further, politicians need to control voters' minds using a kind of language that is characterised by emotions.

Omozuwa and Ezejideaku (2008) also argue that politicians use a kind of language bristling with negative expressions or terms to delegitimate their opponents before potential voters so that they are not supported. In a study of propaganda with respect to the 2007 Nigerian presidential campaign rhetoric, Omozuwa and Ezejideaku (2008) maintain that one of the strategies used to bash the government in power was overstatement of issues or problems. They show, for example, that the politicians who were challenging the ruling party in that election claimed that the country had a 95-per cent electricity problem, when in fact the problem was, according to them, not that big. Omozuwa and Ezejideaku (2008) also explain that another linguistic strategy candidates usually use to tarnish the image of their opponents for their own good is the use of abusive language. In particular, they say that politicians choose words or expressions with overtones of abuse in order to castigate their opponents. Apart from discrediting others, politicians employ other strategies in their campaign speeches with a view to making themselves appealing to voters.

Akubor (2015) argues that hate speech, which took the form of abusive language, was very common in the campaigns of the PDP and the APC during Nigeria's 2015 election. In respect of this, Akubor (2015:8) observes, for example, that "[…] Fasoye took his smear campaign a notch higher when he implied that Buhari, who was around the same age with (sic) his mother, wears baby 'pampers' as he no longer has control of his body system." Christian politicians, observes Akubor further, used abusive language against Moslem politicians, and vice versa. He also notes that hate speech pitied political groups, and the people generally to some extent, against each other. Mwombeki (2019) has submitted that the politicians in CCM as well as CHADEMA and UKAWA whose speeches he has analysed made various arguments to persuade Tanzanians to support their candidates or political parties at the ballot. Finally, this paper contributes some important knowledge to the area of political, discursive (de)legitimation and documents audiences' understanding of the discourse used to do that.

Theoretical Framework

This paper is grounded in CDA. Discourse is said to play a fundamental role in areas of domination, unequal power relations and (de)legitimation (Fairclough, 2003; van Dijk, 1998; van Leeuwen, 2008). Discourse production, distribution and consumption are some of the discursive aspects examined by CDA scholars to determine,

among others, what informs how discourse should be produced and who controls the distribution of discourse in society and why. It is also used to find out for whom a particular stretch of discourse is intended and why. CDA examines discourse to establish how problematic practices such as social control, discrimination and (de)legitimation are conducted, sustained and, on occasion, resisted. CDA scholars do this because they believe that such practices are "inscribed in and mediated through the linguistic system" as well as other semiotic systems such as images (Caldas-Coulthard & Coulthard, 1996:xi). According to Wodak (2001:2), "CDA aims to investigate critically social inequality as it is expressed, signalled, constituted, legitimized and so on by language use (or in discourse)." The main goal is to "help create a world where people are not discriminated against because of sex, colour, creed, age or social class" (Caldas-Coulthard & Coulthard, 1996:xi). There are other 'unacceptable' practices realised through discourse, including problematic (de)legitimation. Such social practices are usually opaque or hardly decipherable to the vast majority of people who are usually victims of the same practices. Therefore, in their studies, CDA scholars carry out critical analyses to expose the socially problematic functions that discourse performs in the interest of a few members of society at the expense of many. They expose the hidden meanings of such discourses and sometimes make practical suggestions as to how the inequities discovered may be dealt with. Since this paper examines campaign speeches (a genre of political discourse), it employs CDA in the analysis of the speeches and in the discussion of the findings.

The Analytical Approach

This paper uses the semantic-functional approach (a form of CDA) developed by Theo van Leeuwen (2008) to analyse the campaign speeches. Reyes (2011:782) notes that "legitimation is a justification of social behaviour (mental or physical)," adding that "[t]he process of legitimation is enacted by argumentation, that is, by providing arguments that explain our social actions, ideas, thoughts, declarations, etc." Reyes (2011:782) also points out that "the act of legitimizing or justifying is related to a goal, which, in most cases, seeks our interlocutor's support or approval." Van Leeuwen (2008) notes that legitimation is telling others why something should or must be done, and presumably must be done in the way proposed by the speaker. On the other hand, delegitimation is critiquing (controversial) people, actions or social practices (Vaara, Tienari & Laurila, 2006; van Leeuwen, 2008).

Van Leeuwen (2008) has proposed four strategies of legitimation which may also be used for delegitimation purposes. They are *authority*, *moralisation*, *rationalisation* and *mythopoesis*. *Authority* is legitimation of things or people by referring to people with some institutional authority or to authority derived from laws, documents, customs and traditions. *Moralisation* relates to arguing by providing values or beliefs that indicate the (im)morality of the actions or practices being legitimated or delegitimated. Legitimation through moralisation can, for example, be done using arguments that show that something is normal or natural and that certain people have good values. This means that things that are neither normal nor natural may be given attributes that show that they are in order that the audience agrees with the speaker. *Rationalisation* is legitimating actions or social practices by showing their usefulness and/or importance. It may also be used to (de)legitimate people or institutions such as political parties during election campaigns or on other occasions. In making rationalisations, experts of the areas to which social practices relate are quoted or cited. Legitimation or delegitimation can also be done using *mythopoesis*. This strategy involves telling a story in which a hero is rewarded and/or another story in which a villain gets punished. The hero gets rewarded because he has done something that is socially acceptable or has done it in accordance with certain social norms and the villain gets punished because he has done something that is not acceptable or has made some mistake in doing it. Van Leeuwen's analytical approach has been adopted because it is relevant to this study, which examines discursive self-legitimation and other-delegitimation.

Method

I obtained the campaign speeches from the Tanzania Broadcasting Corporation (TBC), two speeches by each candidate. I collected the other set of data in Kinondoni District (Dar es Salaam Region), Nzega District (Tabora Region), Same District (Kilimanjaro Region) and Tandahimba District (Mtwara Region). Since the study zeroes in on presidential campaign speeches, it was thought important to involve people from different parts of the country. I selected a sample of 60 people, 15 from each research site, and then collected the data from them using focus group discussion. The participants' years of age ranged from 28 to 80 and their level of education ranged from primary school to university education. The sample comprised petty traders, businesspeople, farmers/peasants, employed people and university students. I transcribed the speeches and identified the strategies in the light of van Leeuwen's analytical approach. I also

transcribed the data collected from the field and identified relevant extracts pertaining to the audiences' understanding of the function of the strategies. I translated the two sets of data into English in the interest of those who don't know Kiswahili.

Analysis and Findings

Self-legitimation
The candidates employ *authority*, *moralisation* and *rationalisation* to legitimate themselves as well as the political parties through which they are running for the highest office in the land. For instance, President Kikwete uses *authority*, a strategy of legitimation which is usually based on people, documents or things with some kind of authority. The candidate invokes his running mate's name and title, and uses either the first-person singular pronouns *I* and *me* or the first-person plural pronoun *we* for the purpose already mentioned. He says:

(1) *Naahidi kwamba mkituchagua mimi na Dkt Bilal tutaingoza nchi yetu vizuri. Tutatumia nguvu, uwezo, maarifa na uzoefu tulioukusanya kwa miaka mingi ya utumishi wa umma kwa ajili ya masilahi na maendeleo ya taifa letu na watu wake.*

"I promise that, if you vote for Dr Bilal and me, we will lead our country well. We will use our energy, ability, knowledge and experience which we have accumulated for many years of being public servants in the interest and for the development of our nation and its people."

The mentioning of Dr Bilal and of the speaker himself is highly likely intended to justify the request or suggestion the candidate is making to the audience. This may be the case, since the gentlemen 'hold' the two highest leadership posts in the country, namely presidential and vice-presidential posts. Therefore, mentioning them and their credentials, as well as the use to which the credentials will be put ideologically performs a legitimating function. This observation is concurrent with the one made by Vaara and Tienari (2008). In a study of a text on the shutting down of a company, these scholars note that "[t]o a large extent, the text rests on the *authorisation* provided by CEO Ole Johansson," adding that "[t]he involvement of the CEO lends credibility to the evidence provided, most clearly shown in his speech acts" (original emphasis) (Vaara & Tienari, 2008:9).

President Kikwete uses *authority* implicitly in the above excerpt. He does not say directly that because he (the president) is asking for votes the people should vote for him and his running mate. Instead, he indirectly exploits both the positions that he and his running mate 'hold' in the country and their combined experience to tell them that they are qualified to continue serving as president and vice-president, respectively. This self-legitimation is linked to the benefit (development) the people and the country more generally will get by giving the duo a mandate to lead the country again. Thus, personal authority and development are discursively interlinked to win the people's support. However, the speaker does not elaborate on the kind of development they will bring about when they have won the election. The task of determining the exact meaning of what he pledges to do is left to the audience. It may be the case that the candidate has left out the details, fearing that providing them may result in self-harm.

Dr Slaa, too, employs *authority*, mentioning Mabere Marando as he tells the audience that they want to make some constitutional reforms. He says:

(2) *Mheshimiwa Marando amenisaidia kueleza mabadiliko makubwa tunayotaka kuyaleta katika nchi hii. Amezungumzia kwa kina mabadiliko makubwa tunayotaka kuyaleta kwa njia ya katiba. Sina sababu ya kuyaeleza, ameyafafanua kwa kina. Mimi niyaseme machache. Nitayasema machache katika mabadiliko ya katiba.*

"The Honourable Marando has helped me explain the major reforms we want to introduce into the country. He has talked in detail about the major constitutional reforms we intend to make, so I'll not repeat everything. I'll only touch upon a few things in respect of the constitutional reforms."

The candidate refers to what Marando has said regarding the constitutional reforms they will carry out. For a long time, Marando worked as a barrister, representing various people in court. This made him well known; thus, what he said regarding legal issues was highly likely to be believed and perhaps supported as well. The candidate knows this and mentions Marando because he understands that doing so may help him elicit support from the audience or Tanzanians. In addition, he talks about constitutional reforms because various people have for years agitated for these

reforms. This agitation is the result of at least two things. One is that the current Constitution, which was written in 1977, is thought to be outdated.[28] The other is that the Constitution was written during the one-party era but the country is politically plural now. For example, the feeling of many is that the Constitution gives the president of Tanzania various sweeping powers, not least the power to appoint and sack public leaders without consulting any institution such as parliament. Being aware of the general feeling about the current Constitution, the candidate knows that promising to make constitutional reforms, especially writing a new constitution, may help him obtain support from some members of the public. Besides using Marando as an authority on what he says, the candidate also employs the first-person plural pronoun *we* to attribute agency to his political group. That is, he uses it to tell Tanzanians that they are the ones who will make the reforms in question. He remarks, *[...] mabadiliko makubwa tunayotaka kuyaleta kwa njia ya katiba* "[...] the major constitutional reforms we intend to make." The attribution of agency to his side is also a self-legitimation technique, for it indicates that it is the speaker and his colleagues who will carry out the reforms.

The candidate employs *moralisation* to show that it is morally wrong and unacceptable for Tanzanians to live in substandard houses. He says:

(3) *Ndugu zangu, CHADEMA tumedhamiria umasikini wa aina hii ni lazima ukomeshwe ili Watanzania wawe wanafurahia matunda ya uhuru wao. Hadhi ya binadamu, hadhi ya binadamu inaonekana kwanza katika mambo mawili. La kwanza ni aina ya nyumba anayoishi na kulala. La pili ni chakula anachokula.*

"Dear compatriots, we in CHADEMA are resolved to end this kind of poverty so that Tanzanians can enjoy the fruits of their independence. Human dignity manifests itself in two things. First, it is seen in the kind of house someone lives in. Secondly, it is seen in the kind of food he or she eats."

The candidate begins his statement by saying that they are resolved to end the poverty of housing facing the Tanzanian people. He uses the word *dhamiria* "resolved", which is a very powerful verb, in the

---

[28] In 2012 Tanzania began writing a new constitution, a process which remains unfinished to date. For further discussion on this issue, see Rutechura (2018).

sense that it makes their intention to address the problem very clear to the audience. By using this verb, he is able to make members of the audience and the public more generally see their intention to solve the problem facing countless people in the country, including them. The speaker employs deontic modality to show that the ending of the kind of poverty under discussion is a necessary, not optional, matter. Oddo (2011:297) explains that "*deontic* modality concerns social obligation, and includes such modal auxiliaries as *should*, *ought* and *must* (original italics)." Oddo (2011:297) distinguishes this type of modality from "*epistemic* modality [which] tends to qualify the certainty of given utterances – interpersonally creating more or less space for alternative viewpoints." In the excerpt, the speaker uses deontic modality, saying, *[...] tumedhamiria umaskini wa aina hii ni lazima ukomeshwe* "[...] are resolved to end this kind of poverty." Then he uses the purpose clause *ili Watanzania wawe wanafurahia matunda ya uhuru wao* "so that Tanzanians can enjoy the fruits of their independence." Through the purpose clause he implies that, since Tanzanians are facing the poverty of housing, they are not enjoying the fruits of their independence. This is a moral issue which is being exploited by the candidate to legitimate himself as well as CHADEMA.

CCM's candidate uses *rationalisation* for self-legitimation purposes. He does so as he talks about the kind of government they will form after winning the election and about those who will benefit from it. The following excerpt illustrates this:

(4) *Tutaunda serikali itayotimiza ipasavyo wajibu wake wa kikatiba kwa ulinzi na usalama na kusukuma maendeleo ya taifa letu. Serikali itakayoendeshwa kwa misingi ya kuheshimu utawala wa sheria. Kuheshimu haki za binadamu. Serikali itayoendeshwa kwa uwazi. Serikali itayoendeleza mapambano dhidi ya rushwa na uhalifu katika jamii. Serikali itakayojali maslahi ya Watanzania wote: watoto, akina mama, watu wenye ulemavu na watu wengine wenye nguvu, wenye uwezo.*

"We will form a government which discharges its constitutional mandate effectively for the safety, security and development of our nation. A government which is based on the rule of law and which respects human rights. A transparent government. A government which will fight graft as well as crime. A government which will work in the interest

of all Tanzanians: children, mothers, people with disabilities, people without disabilities and the haves."

The speaker says the government to be formed will be a transparent government and will maintain security and fight graft, among others. The candidate presents the following as the qualities of the government they intend to form: being based on the rule of law, respecting human rights and being transparent. However, the candidate does not elaborate on any of these qualities. For example, he does not say how transparent his next government will be. But presumably the candidate talks of this issue in the 'current' electoral context because his and the previous governments were accused of not being transparent enough. In particular, this was the case with most of the contracts which had been agreed with 'foreign' organisations or companies. In relation to the pacts between the government and 'foreign' electric-power generation companies, it was generally felt that the pacts had been agreed with non-existent companies so that a few people in government and CCM could swindle the public out of money (Kubenea, 2010).

As far as the issue of security is concerned, the candidate talks about it because during his first term in office the people in the country lived in a relative climate of fear. This observation partly relates to the problem of robbery that was still facing the country at the time of the campaign, as the candidate himself admits: *Ingawaje yapo matukio ya uhalifu pamoja na ujambazi yanayoendelea kutokea lakini hali haifanani na ilivyokuwa wakati tunaingia madarakani. Ukweli ni kwamba siku hizi majambazi hayaachwi kutamba yatakavyo* "Although crimes, including robbery, continue, the security situation is better now than it was when we came to power. Robbers are not left to do as they please." Therefore, as he seeks re-election, the candidate must assure Tanzanians that the government they intend to form will protect them from all manner of danger.

The candidate mainly employs parallelism and the number game in talking of the kind of government they will form if the people vote them into office again. Ike-Nwafor (2015:154) notes that parallelism "is a device in which there is the repetition of formal syntactic patterns in consecutive order in a particular text, or body of texts," adding that "[t]he essence is to achieve emphasis or sometimes to heighten the emotional tone [...]." For more or less the same purpose, President Kikwete employs parallelism thus: *Serikali itakayoendeshwa kwa uwazi, Serikali itakayoendeleza mapambano*

dhidi ya rushwa na uhalifu katika jamii, Serikali itakayojali maslahi ya Watanzania wote [...].[29] This strategy is specifically used to show that the government will be highly beneficial to the people. As a strategy, the number game "not only plays a role in argumentation and legitimation, but also in the context of political interaction, namely to signal truth and precision and hence competence and credibility" (van Dijk, 2007:82). The speaker uses this strategy to do self-legitimation. He says, *Serikali itakayojali masilahi ya Watanzania wote: watoto, akina mama, watu wenye ulemavu na watu wengine wenye nguvu, wenye uwezo* "A government which will work in the interest of all Tanzanians: children, mothers, people with disabilities, people without disabilities and the haves." Specifically, the number game is deployed to tell the people that voting for Kikwete is for their own good, i.e. they will benefit from the work of the government, from which not a single Tanzanian will be excluded.

Other-delegitimation

The candidates also delegitimate each other, including the political party on whose platform each is contesting the presidency. Dr Slaa uses *authority* by drawing upon some documents to bash the president's government. He remarks:

(5) *Uchafu ndani ya serikali uko kila sehemu; tunazo documents. Kwenye serikali za mitaa huko ndo usiseme; ufisadi wao ninaujua kila sehemu. Kwa ufupi serikali nzima imeoza na haina uwezo wa kujisafisha.*

"The whole government is dirty; we have got documents showing this. The local government authorities are the worst. I am aware of the extent of corruption in these authorities. In short, the entire government is rotten and it cannot clean up itself."

The candidate contends that the government is corrupt to the core and singles out the local government authorities as the worst. He deploys a metaphor to argue that the government is rotten, as though it were the body of a living organism like a human being. He also shows, through the same metaphor, that the government is so rotten that it cannot clean up itself. In addition, he uses the word *[u]chafu* "dirt or filth" to further describe the state of the government, insofar as corruption is concerned. The candidate gives

---

[29] The text has not been translated into English in order to maintain parallelism. However, its translation was given in excerpt (4).

this description so that the people get the picture he wants them to get, namely that corruption has reached a fatal stage in Tanzania. The candidate talks about corruption to denounce CCM and its candidate so that they are voted down. And saying that the government cannot clean up itself means the people should vote for CHADEMA and him, for they are supposedly able to address the problem, while Kikwete and CCM are not.

President Kikwete denounces Dr Slaa and other opposition politicians using *moralisation*. He shows that they are lustful for power and that they are ready to use whatever means possible to realise their goal. It should be pointed out, however, that, although the speaker includes other opposition politicians in his argument, it is clear that he is targeting his major challenger, as will be shown later. In excerpt (6), he says:

(6) *Tusiwape nafasi viongozi wa siasa wenye tamaa ya madaraka iliyokithiri.Hatakama watu watakuja kuuwana, watakuja kuumizana yeye hajali bora tu amefika pale [Ikulu]. [...] Achaneni nao. Hawana tija hawana manufaa hawana masilahi na nchi hii hata kidogo. Wana masilahi yao binafsi. Tamaa zao. Wanahubiri, "Unajua tutamwaga damu, tutafanya hiki. Siogopi vifaru vya nani." Tafadhalini sana Watanzania msiwasikilize. Achaneni nao.*

"We mustn't vote for political leaders who are lustful for power. Even if people die or get injured, he does not care, so long as he has got there [State House]. [...] Just ignore them. They are useless and they are not pursuing the interests of this country at all. They have got personal interests. Bad desires. They say, "You know, blood will be shed. We will do this and that. I am not afraid of anyone's military tanks." Please, Tanzanians do not listen to them. Just ignore them."

The candidate uses negatively valued constructions like *viongozi wa siasa wenye tamaa ya madaraka iliyokithiri* "political leaders who are lustful for power" and *Wana masilahi yao binafsi* "They have got personal interests" to castigate the opposition. But as noted above, he deploys these constructions and similar others so that Dr Slaa is perceived as someone who wants very much to be the next president of Tanzania and who wants to be so at any cost. This observation is concurrent with Taiwo's (2008:86) observation that "[t]he goal [in doing so] is to discredit the opposition and damage their chances in

the election." The speaker says, *Hatakama watu watakuja kuuwana, watakuja kuumizana yeye hajali bora tu amefika pale [Ikulu]* "Even if people die or get injured, he does not care, so long as he has got there [State House]." The implication of a statement such as this is that Dr Slaa is ready to see Tanzanians get injured or even die, provided that he realises his presidential ambitions. The negative construal of the opponent is also done through direct speech containing expressions which indicate that his major challenger is a dangerous person. He remarks: "They say, *Unajua tutamwaga damu, tutafanya hiki. Siogopi vifaru vya nani* "You know, we will shed blood. We will do this and that. I am not afraid of anyone's military tanks."" Through the direct speech, the speaker says that the opponent wants to shed blood and that he is not afraid of military tanks. Intending to shed blood and being unafraid of military tanks imply that he is a very dangerous man. In fact, in and of itself, the word *damu* "blood" is enough to evoke fear in the listeners' minds and hearts. As noted earlier, in certain parts of the excerpt, the candidate speaks as though he is referring to the opposition as a whole, but it is clear that he is talking about CHADEMA's candidate. For example, the pronoun *yeye* "he", which he uses in the second sentence, shows clearly that he is referring to Dr Slaa. Indeed, it was Dr Slaa who had said he was not afraid of military tanks. Here is what Dr Slaa said: *Na Dkt Slaa huwa haogopi kutamka. Uwe na vifaru uwe na nini mi siogopi* "And Dr Slaa is not afraid to speak the truth. I am not afraid, whether you have military tanks or whatever."

President Kikwete also delegitimates Dr Slaa using *mythopoesis* thus:

(7) *Unawaahidi watu kila kitu bure na kodi utapunguza. Sasa ukishaahidi kila kitu bure maana yake ni kwamba serikali ndiyo inayogharamia. Ukishapunguza na kodi maana yake ni kwamba ni ahadi haitekelezeki kwa sababu hautakuwa na mapato ya kutekeleza. Hatuwezi kujenga matumaini katika nchi hii tukawapa watu matumaini, "Msiwe na wasiwasi vitu vyoote hivi buree." Ndugu zangu, nchi hiyo duniani haipo. Nchi hiyo duniani haipo. Pepo hilo. Alifikiria Karl Marx. Walijaribu Urusi ikashindikana. Wamejaribu Uchina imeshindikana. Kwa hiyo nasema hivi wakati mwingine maneno haya ni mazuri kweli. "Msiwe na wasiwasi. Hiki bure, hiki bure." Sisi tulijaribu. Mwaka 1986 tulibadili. Na mwenyekiti wa chama tulipofanya uamuzi wa mabadiriko*

hayo ni Julius Kambarage Nyerere. Kwa kukubali ukweli tu kwamba dhamira ni nzuri uwezo mdogo. [...] Lakini nawaambieni hata mkimpa hatafanya. Hatakuwanazo raslimali za kufanya hivyo.

"You promise the people that everything will be free and that you will cut taxes. Now, if you promise that social services will be free, then it is the government that pays for them. And if you cut taxes, it means the pledge is impracticable because you will not have the resources with which to fulfil it. We cannot pep up the people's hopes. "Don't worry, everything will be free." Dear compatriots, no country in the world can do that. No country in the world can do that. That's a demon. Karl Marx thought about it. Russia tried to provide free social services but failed. China tried to do so but failed. Therefore, I say the words are sweet sometimes. "Don't worry, everything will be free." We, too, tried to do it but failed. We changed the policy in 1986. And when we took the decision to change the policy the chairperson of the party was Julius Kambarage Nyerere. We knew that the intentions were good but we did not have the money with which to pursue them. [...] But I tell you, he will not provide free social services even if you vote him into office. He will not have the resources to do so."

The speaker brings into his speech examples drawn from inside and outside the country to show that social services cannot be provided free of charge. From outside the country, experiences are drawn from Russia and China, which, he states, once tried to provide free social services but failed. What the candidate does not say is whether these countries failed because they lacked sufficient resources, on which his argument is premised. He invokes the name of Karl Marx, the German philosopher who once came up with the idea of communism. The reference he makes to the past experiences, both internal and external, is intended to serve as a caution; he is warning the people that, if wrong decisions are made in the present, problems will occur in future as they did in the past when similar decisions were made either inside or outside the country. The mentioning of Nyerere's name, like that of Marx, is purposeful. Nyerere is someone whom countless people in the country hold in very high regard mainly because he was a visionary, honest person and a great statesman (Butiku, 2017). Nyerere is also highly respected outside Tanzania. Thus, the candidate says that when they made the decision to end the policy on the provision of social services free of charge the

chairperson of the party (CCM) was Nyerere because he thinks that the people are likely to believe and follow what was done in the presence of President Nyerere. In other words, the candidate is criticising the pledge and thus castigate his opponent using Nyerere's and Marx's names. He is forthright in his delegitimation of CHADEMA's candidate. He says, *Lakini nawaambieni hata mkimpa hatafanya. Hatakuwanazo rasilimali za kufanya hivyo* "But I tell you, he will not provide free social services even if you vote him into office. He will not have the resources to do so." This is geared towards making the people not vote for Dr Slaa.

Audiences' Interpretation of the Strategies

The target audiences mention four kinds of function which, according to them, the candidates' strategies or language played: *self-legitimation*, *seeking to serve*, *lying* and *other-delegitimation*. For instance, some participants say that the candidates legitimated themselves as they campaigned. In relation to President Kikwete's campaign rhetoric, TN1 says:

(8) *Ee hii lugha ambayo aliitumia kwa uelewa wangu kwa sababu alicho yaani ile ilkuwepo ni ahadi kwenye kampeni ili akubalike maana alitakiwa atoe ahadi ya kwamba atafanya hichi atafanya hichi. Sasa matokeo kwamba hakufanya yaani sikuyaona yale ambayo aliyaahidi. Sasa hapa ndo pale sasa narudi kwamba kumbe viongozi inawezekana wakaahidi kitu wasitekeleze. Uwezekano huo naona mpaka dakika hii naona kwamba inafanana kwamba mtu alichoahidi akawa hakukitekeleza basi nabaki kujua kwamba kumbe serikali au viongozi wanaweza wakaahidi kitu lakini wasikitekeleze. Hilo ndo maana yangu kwamba sasa hivi najiuliza yaani katika kujiuliza sasa napata majibu kwamba kumbe anaweza kuahidi mtu kitu halafu hasitekeleze.*

"Er he used that kind of language, in my view, to make promises during the campaign so that he could be supported. He had to say that he'd do this and that. But he didn't fulfil his pledges. This makes me realise that leaders can make a certain pledge and yet not fulfil it. I mean, I've come to realise that the government or leaders can promise something and yet not fulfil it."

In addition, NZ11 posits that Dr Slaa deployed his credentials to legitimate himself. For example, the candidate is said to have talked about his character and his track record. NZ11 remarks:

(9) *Aa yeye alikuwa akizungumza kwamba kutokana na anavyojijua yeye mwenyewe, utendaji kazi wake lakini pia kwa jinsi wananchi wanavyomfahamu kwamba hana scandals. Kwa hiyo anadhani ni mtu sahihi kuongoza serikali na kusimamia yale anayoyaamini.*

"Er he said that on the basis of his character, track record and the people's understanding that he'd not been mentioned in any scandals, and so he was the right person to lead government and defend what he believes (sic) in."

The candidate mentioned by NZ11 had served as a very efficient Secretary General of the Tanzania Episcopal Council, an MP for Karatu, a national Deputy Chairperson of CHADEMA and a Secretary General of the same party from 2004 to 2015. During this time, and especially during his time as a politician, he was never mentioned in any graft scandals which were very common in the country at the time (Mkumbo, 2014; Mtatiro, 2015). It was some of these credentials that the candidate was drawing upon as he campaigned. Van Leeuwen (2008:106) calls this "personal authority legitimation." In doing self-legitimation which is based on individuals' own authority, speakers usually refer to "their status or role in a particular institution," as the candidate did so as "to elicit people's support" (Reyes, 2011:784). The kind of support the candidate was seeking was political support so that he could be elected as president.

Some of the participants understand the strategies to mean that the candidates' objective was to serve Tanzanians. They think that the candidates wanted to help their country make progress. The issue of helping the country make progress is mentioned in relation to the various pledges they made during the 2010 election campaign. The pledges included reducing the cost of building materials, providing social services free of charge, ensuring security in the country, fighting graft and abuse of office, protecting national resources and building infrastructure. The participants, some of whose contributions are examined in this section, think that the candidates made these pledges and others because they wanted to serve Tanzanians. In respect of President Kikwete's language, SM5 says:

(10) *Alikuwa na lengo la kuwasaidia wananchi pamoja na kuboresha. Yaani Tanzania kwa ujumla.*

"He wanted to improve the situation in Tanzania, including the lot of citizens."

Other participants mention that the candidates were lying when they were campaigning. Such participants note that the candidates hoodwinked the people so that they might vote them into power. NZ2 remarks:

(11) *Mimi naona katika ugombeaji wake ulikuwa kama vile udanganyifu kwa sababu mtu huna ofisi, huna kitu cha kuwasaidia wananchi. Angalikuwa kama ule mfano anataka kuwasaidia wananchi, angejitokeza kama alivyojitokeza Nyerere. Nyerere aliweka mipango ya vijana. Kabla hajafanya kazi alipokuwa anataka kugombea urais, vijana aliwaboreshea. Aliweka maduka ya vijiji, aliweka viwanda kabla ya hajaingia katika masuala ya kuwa kama awe rais.*

"I think he was a liar. If he doesn't have office space, he doesn't have the means to help the people [...]. If he really wanted to help the people, he should have done like the late Nyerere. Nyerere laid a foundation for the benefit of the youth. He improved the welfare of the youth. He set up shops in the rural areas and factories before he ran for president."

In the above excerpt, NZ2 is totally dismissive of Dr Slaa's rhetoric, arguing that the candidate was telling lies. He says this in relation to two things: party internal challenges and 'unpreparedness'. To begin with the former, the participant is of the opinion that CHADEMA was facing various internal challenges, including office space. The participant mentions the issue of limited office space as one of the challenges which the party's officials in various parts of the country were facing. The participant thinks that, before promising to solve Tanzanians' problems, the candidate and other CHADEMA leaders and supporters should have dealt with the problems afflicting the party.

In addition to saying that the candidate was lying, the participant compares the candidate to President Nyerere. He states that Dr Slaa is not like Nyerere, who laid a foundation for the benefit of

Tanzanians before he declared his intention to run for president. But since Dr Slaa did not start by doing that, he is a liar. Three points need to be made with respect to what NZ2 says in the above extract. The first is that President Nyerere did not do the things he says he did before he became president. Instead, the president led Tanzanian Mainlanders (formerly Tanganyikans) during the struggle for independence from Britain. Secondly, the president did what the participant says while he was in power. Indeed, in an effort to implement his socialist policies, the president established, among others, various public parastatals in the agricultural sector (Bomani et al., 2011). Thus, he had used public resources to do so. Thirdly and finally, the participant does not think that Dr Slaa, who for years had been agitating for the amelioration of Tanzanians' living standards, could have fulfilled his pledges.

Respecting other-delegitimation, SM12 says:

(12) *Lugha hiyo kwanza anaitumia kujiamini kwamba yeye ni bora kuliko yule pale kwa sababu sio bora kama yeye. [...] Ndiyo lengo lake kwamba mkinipa mimi nina uwezo wa kutekeleza yale ambayo nimeyafanyaje nimeshayaahidi. Lakini yule pale yeye hawezi.*

"That kind of language is used to show that he is better than the other candidate. [...] His objective is to tell voters that he is more capable of fulfilling what he has promised than the other person is."

The participant shows that, in doing other-legitimation, a candidate contrasts himself or herself with his or her opponent(s) by showing that he or she can fulfil pledges better than the opponents. He says this with respect to President Kikwete, who averred that he was more capable of fulfilling the pledges than Dr Slaa was of fulfilling the pledges he was making. The participant interprets the president's argument as being aimed at discrediting CHADEMA's candidate.

Discussion
Candidates present themselves as people who allegedly want to serve those whose support they are seeking. They choose strategic expressions or constructions and talk about issues relating to people's social, economic and political interests such as improved social service provision. The choice and use of such strategies is

intended to influence people's thinking on candidates as well as political parties. It has been demonstrated in this paper that discursive strategies such as *authority* and *moralisation* are employed for that purpose. In their campaign speeches Dr Slaa and President Kikwete present themselves as being wholly altruistic and ready to get Tanzanians out of the social, economic and political quagmire they have wallowed in for many years. This positive personal portrayal is akin to the image European explorers and missionaries presented of themselves and of the colonialists who succeeded them. Using language adroitly, these agents of colonialism showed that both they and the colonialists were highly concerned about Africans' woes and had thus come to Africa to save and serve them. They persuaded Africans to welcome them and let them do what they had come to do, which, of course, had nothing to do with either saving or serving them.

In the electoral contest, from which the campaign speeches analysed in this paper were taken, we see language being used in the same way. Each candidate shows that he is the messiah from God with the key to the door to paradise. In doing this, each deploys emotively loaded expressions and constructions and discusses various problems facing the people to paint his messiah-ness so that Tanzanians elect him as president. For instance, Dr Slaa shows that it is morally wrong for the people to live in substandard houses and that CHADEMA is resolved to end this problem. He talks about flat-roofed houses which he has allegedly seen in many different parts of the country and to which CHADEMA, if it is successful at the ballot, will call a halt. For his part, President Kikwete promises the people that everyone will benefit from the work the government they intend to form will do. It must be stated here that many people in the country complained, for example, that only some of the people in government and in CCM, to an extent, benefited from the nation's financial and innumerable natural resources during the president's first term in office. That's perhaps why the candidate pledges that everyone will benefit from the government they'll form. It is possible that the candidates have intentions other than the intention to serve Tanzanians. But in order for the people to uncover the candidates' real intentions, they need to keep in mind the fact that, since both are running for president, they must necessarily make pledges such as the foregoing. But in addition, they need to ask themselves questions like the following: Why, in addition to legitimating themselves, do the candidates engage in such a fierce battle? What does each stand to gain from being president? And in relation to

President Kikwete, they may have to pose these questions: If he truly intends to serve us as he claims he does, why didn't he serve us during his first term in office? What prevented him from serving us before? If he didn't do so then, how can we believe that he'll serve us now? What has changed?

The data from the field suggests that some of the participants asked themselves such questions. For example, some of them said the candidates had legitimated themselves and delegitimated each other. It is obvious from the findings, however, that apart from this convergence, the participants did not look at the broader purpose of the candidates' language. This observation brings us to the divergence noted in the data. Some of the participants mentioned that President Kikwete and Dr Slaa wanted to serve the people or were lying. According to those who held the former view, for instance, the candidates were seeking to be president so that they could serve Tanzanians. But if such participants had asked themselves questions such as those posed earlier perhaps they'd have perceived their language differently. This divergence alerts people (Tanzanians in particular) to the necessity of stretching their thinking contours to establish the meaning of candidates' campaign speeches. In this regard and in addition to asking themselves the above questions and others, they need to look at a candidate's ability, track record and sincerity in conjunction with careful consideration of the context in which such speeches are made, namely the electoral context where every candidate wants to make people vote for him and/or the political party on whose platform he is running for public office, to understand what candidates say.

Conclusion

This paper has looked at how Dr Slaa and President Kikwete legitimated themselves and delegitimated each other and at some of the audiences' understanding of the function of the candidates' discursive strategies. The purpose was to find out whether their understanding converges or diverges from the dual function the strategies performed, as well as showing the implications of such convergence or divergence. This paper used CDA to analyse the speeches and discuss the findings. It has been found that Dr Slaa and President Kikwete deployed *authority*, *moralisation*, *rationalisation* and *mythopoesis* to legitimate themselves and delegitimate each other, functions which some of the audiences were aware of. The other functions suggested by a fair number of participants are seeking to serve and lying. But if the participants

had probed the candidates' language further they wouldn't have mentioned functions such as seeking to serve. This divergence implies that consumers of campaign speeches need to pay close attention to candidates' language to understand what candidates say on the campaign trail.

References

Abdullahi-Idiagbon, M. S. (2010). Language Use in Selected Nigerian Presidential Election Campaign Speeches: A Critical Discourse Analysis Perspective. *Journal of the Nigeria English Studies Association*, 13(2): 30–44.

Acemoglu, D. & Robinson, J. A. (2012). *Why Nations Fail: The Origins of Power, Prosperity, and Poverty*. New York: Crown Publishers.

Akubor, E. O. (2015). Campaigns and Electioneering: Reflecting on the 2015 General Elections in Nigeria. Paper presented at a Two-Day National Conference on "The 2015 General Elections in Nigeria: The Real Issues" in Abuja, on 26–29 July 2015.

Allen, W. (2007). Australian Political Discourse: Pronominal Choice in Campaign Speeches. In M. Laughren & I. Mushin (eds.). *Selected Papers from the 2006 Conference of the Australian Linguistic Society*.

Aristotle. (1887). *The Politics of Aristotle I*. Oxford: The Clarendon Press.Bomani, F., Justine, G. & Minja, S. (2011). Democratic Practices in Tanzania. *CETA Journal*, 9: 11–51.

Butiku, J. (2017). Mwalimu Julius K. Nyerere and the Making of Tanzania. *Tanzania Zamani. A Journal of Historical Research and Writing*, IX(2): 68–128.

Caldas-coulthard, C. R. & Coulthard, M. (1996). Preface. In C. R. Coulthard & M. Coulthard (eds.). *Texts and Practices: Readings in Critical Discourse Analysis*. London: Routledge: xi–xii.

Capone, A. (2010). Barack Obama's South Carolina Speech. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 42(11): 2964–2977.

Chilton, P. (2004). *Analysing Political Discourse: Theory and Practice*. London: Routledge.

Duranti, A. (2006). The Social Ontology of Intentions. *Discourse Studies*, 8(1): 31–40.

Fairclough, N. (2003). *Analysing Discourse: Textual Analysis for Social Research*. London: Longman.

Fairclough, I. & Fairclough, N. (2012). *Political Discourse Analysis: A Method for Advanced Students*. London: Routledge.

Fairclough, N. (2018). CDA as Dialectical Reasoning. In J. Flowerdew & J. E. Richardson (eds.). *The Routledge Handbook of Critical Discourse Studies*. London: Routledge Taylor & Francis Group: 13–25.

Goffman, E. (2007). Footing. In L. Monaghan & J. Goodwin (eds.). *Voicing: Reported Speech and Footing in Conversation*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge: 396–400.

Hay, C. (2007). *Why we Hate Politics*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Hobbes, T. (1991). *Leviathan*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Ike-Nwafor, G. N. (2015). Critical Discourse Analysis of Selected Political Campaign Speeches of Gubernatorial Candidates in South-western Nigeria 2007–2014. Unpublished PhD (English) Thesis, Nsukka: University of Nigeria.

Joseph, J. E. (2006). *Language and Politics*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Kubenea, S. (2010, December 22). Wezi wa Dowans hawa. *MwanaHALISI*.

Mkumbo, K. (2014, November 1). Dk Wilbrod (sic) Peter Slaa: Muadilifu na Mchapakazi Mwenye Nakisi ya Hekima na Weledi. *Raia Mwema*.

Mtatiro, J. (2015, June 6). NANI NI NANI URAIS: Dr Wilbroad Slaa: Katibu Mkuu wa Chadema. *Mwananchi*.

Mwombeki, G. (2019). Strategic Maneuvering in the 2015 Tanzanian Presidential Election Campaign Speeches: A Pragma-dialectical Perspective. Unpublished PhD Thesis, Stellenbosch University.

Oddo, J. (2011). War Legitimation Discourse: Representing 'Us' and 'Them' in Four US Presidential Addresses. *Discourse & Society*, 22(3): 28–314.

Omozuwa, V. E. & Ezejideaku, E. U. C. (2008). A Stylistic Analysis of the Language of Political Campaigns in Nigeria: Evidence from the 2007 General Elections. *OGIRISI: A New Journal of African Studies*: 40–54.

Quinto, E. J. M. (2014). Stylistic Analysis of Deitic Expressions in President Benign Aquino III's October 30th Speech. *The Southeast Asian Journal of English Language Studies*, 20(2): 1–18.

Reyes, A. (2011). Strategies of Legitimation in Political Discourse: Form Words to Actions. *Discourse & Society*, 22(6): 78–807.

Rutechura, F. (2018). Linguistic Features of Persuasion in Parliamentary Debates: The Case of the 2014 Constituent

Assembly in Tanzania. Unpublished PhD (Linguistics) Thesis, University of Dar es Salaam.

St Thomas Aquinas (2007). *Commentary on Aristotle's Politics* (trans. Richard J. Regan). Indianapolis: Hacket Publishing Company, Inc.

Taiwo, R. (2008). Legitimization and Coercion in Political Discourse: A Case Study of Olusegun Obasanjo Address to the PDP Elders and Stakeholders Forum. *Issues in Political Discourse Analysis*, 2(2): 79–91.

Vaara, E., Tienari, J. & Laurila, J. (2006). Pulp and Paper Fiction: On the Discursive Legitimation of Global Industrial Structuring. Organization Studies, 27: 789–810.

Vaara, E. & Tienari, J. (2008). A Discursive Perspective on Legitimation Strategies in Multinational Corporations. *Academic of Management Review*, 33(4): 985–993.

Van Dijk, T. (1998). *Ideology: A Multidisciplinary Approach*. London: SAGE.

Van Dijk, T. (2001). Multidisciplinary CDA: A Plea for Diversity. In R. Wodak & M. Meyer (eds.). *Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis*. London: SAGE Publications: 95–120.

Van Dijk, T. A. (2006). Discourse and Manipulation. *Discourse & Society*, 17(2): 359–383.

Van Dijk, T. A. (2007). War Rhetoric of a Little Ally: Political Implicatures and Aznar's Legitimatization of the War in Iraq. In L. Chouliaraki (ed.). *The Soft Power of War*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company: 61–84.

Van Leeuwen, T. (2008). *Discourse and Practice: New Tools for Critical Discourse Analysis*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Wodak, R. (2001). The Discourse-Historical Approach. In R. Wodak and M. Meyer (eds.). *Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis*: London: SAGE Publications: 63–94.