

Modality in Kenya's 2008 Post-Consultation Discourse

by

Margaret Nasambu Barasa, Ph.D.

barasamargaret@yahoo.com

Lecturer, Department of Language and Linguistics

Kisii University, Kisii, Kenya

Jacinta M. Ndambuki, Ph.D.

jmndambuki@laikipia.ac.ke

Senior Lecturer, Department of Literary and Communication Studies

Laikipia University, Nyahururu, Kenya

&

Vicky Khasandi Telewa, Ph.D.

vkhasandi@laikipia.ac.ke

Senior Lecturer Department of Literary and Communication Studies

Laikipia University, Nyahururu, Kenya

Abstract

This paper is part of a larger project whose overall aim is to investigate the discursive strategies of the principals' in Kenya's 2008 Coalition Government. This paper explores the ideological underpinnings of modal auxiliary verbs in the post-consultation discourse of former president Mwai Kibaki and former Prime Minister Raila Odinga. The paper demonstrates perceptibly that modal auxiliaries have the propensity to reveal the ideologies underlying political discourse. Grounded in Critical Discourse Analysis research paradigm, the analysis reveals that modal auxiliary verbs are used in the post-consultation discourse to give a message of commitment, desirability, responsibility, obligation in a strategic attempt to persuade the citizens. The modal auxiliaries are also illustrative of power struggle and hegemony as the underlying ideologies. The findings of the study bear implications for the theory of modality and discourse analytical studies on political speeches, particularly, on political negotiations in coalition governments.

Introduction

Language has power to influence people at the ideological level. By observing the effects language can have on people, it is apparent that not all aspects of language have the same persuasive weight. It is against this assumption that this paper investigates how modality plays a role in ideologically manipulating hearers/readers. Specifically, the paper investigates the role modality plays in reflecting the ideological positions of Mwai Kibaki and Raila Odinga as coalition leaders in the 2008 post-consultation discourse. This is done by providing a critical approach to interpreting ideology in discourse through a systematic analysis of modality. The specific aim of this paper was to relate the linguistic feature of modality to that central aspect of social structures referred to as ideology. The study focused on two main modality systems (the epistemic and deontic) as playing a decisive role in indicating the type and degree of involvement a speaker has in the content of his/her message, and ultimately, an attitude/position towards the subject of his/her message (Palmer, 2001). This attitude/position is directly related to the notion of ideology in the light of a view of an existing relationship between modality and ideology in discourse. Therefore, the study was based on the framework that an analysis of modal expressions of Mwai Kibaki and Raila Odinga in the 2008 post-consultation discourse, can give us at least a reading of, if not access to the ideologies communicated in the texts.

Ideology and discourse intersects and interact in a complex manner. This study adopted Fowler's (1985) definition of ideology as "a system of beliefs which has come to be constructed as a way of comprehending the world." The implication is that ideology is both a social and a cognitive phenomenon, as well as highlighting the principal intermediary role that language plays. The social aspect of ideology corresponds to those shared values and beliefs which result from the individuals' interaction with society and its institutions (Fowler, 1985). In a similar way, language plays a central role in acting as a primary medium responsible for transmitting different ideologies in a social community (van Dijk, 1998). It is in this sense that ideology refers to socially and politically dominant set of values and beliefs which are constructed in and through language (Fairclough, 1989, van Dijk, 1998). Based on this ideological framework, this study analysed the multifunctional view of language where language is regarded as a tool of social interaction, as well as an instrument of control. In this light, language becomes a distinctive and central site of struggle since it can be used by powerful groups to re-enforce a dominant ideology (van Dijk, 1998).

According to Ravelli (2000), the attitudes and opinions of the writer are realized through modality. Modality is realized through modal auxiliaries such as *can*, *should*, *must*, *may*, and *ought*. There are five types of modality by which writers negotiate information (Halliday, 1994). These are as follows: Usuality e.g. Mary and John would visit regularly. Probability e.g. Kenya will doubtless redouble its efforts to improve the economy. Obligation e.g. You must fight for our rights. Inclination e.g. I would have gone to the market had I been given a chance. Ability e.g. It can be done as suggested. It is also argued by Ravelli (2000) that the degree of strength of the opinions is evident from the modals used.

For example, ‘must’ and ‘should’ were considered high modality while ‘may and’ ‘could’ are considered low modality. In other words, Modals allow the writer to grade his/her opinion and to acknowledge the possibility of other voices and opinions. Epistemic modality would reflect, in various degrees; the speaker’s certainty in the truth value of the proposition they make leading to, their various degrees of epistemic authority in presenting information as factual or as doubtful. On the other hand, the presence of deontic modality reflects the speaker’s level of interpersonal power in relation to other participants (Halliday, 1994). These strengths in positions are in turn related to the force of the ideologies communicated in each text. In this study, analysis of modality was aimed at revealing the dynamics of the power relations between the former President Kibaki and former Prime Minister, Raila Odinga, highlighting the level of strength of each position and each character.

Modality indicates the degree of obligation (positive or negative) involved in a given statement. The scale of obligation would include such notions ranging from permission to command including duty, obligation and, insistence involved in a given statement, (Palmer, 2001; van Dijk, 2006), for example:

You may/ can come	Low
You should come	Median
You must/will come	High
Come	Command

Source: Authors’ examples (2014) which are not based on the analysis of data.

The lower end of the scale corresponds with the weaker level of authority while the upper with the stronger one. In this study, the researcher also focused on grammatical metaphors also referred to as metaphors of modality. Fairclough (1989) explains a grammatical metaphor as one that “...extends the concept of ‘metaphor’ from its conventional application to the meanings of words to grammar.” This transference is mainly the result of the process called nominalization which involves re-concretization of metaphors being conceptualized as nouns. In the case of metaphors of modality, nominalization has a significant effect. It is highly prevalent in persuasive discourse (like the press releases) where one common technique is to objectify opinion by nominalizing it so as to make it difficult for the reader to disagree with it (Thompson, 1996). The form, of first person, present tense ‘mental’ processes of cognition (e.g. I think, I agree) is a metaphor of modality. The reason this is recognized as a metaphor is that it functions as “a proposition in its own right” making the writer personally responsible for what is written/said. This kind of modality is likely to appear in the study of exchanges in form of press statements because press releases are intended to be typically subjective in nature.

Ndambuki and Janks (2010) in their study established that both the women, politicians and community leaders constructed women's condition as one of possibility in their use of modality. Further, they ascertained that modality featured in the construction of false promises made by politicians during elections which was identified as a key issue especially by the women leaders. A study was carried out by Nartey and Yankson (2014) to explore the semantic underpinnings of modal auxiliary verbs in the 2012 Manifesto of a popular Ghanaian political party, the New Patriotic Party (NPP). Adopting a qualitative content analysis, the study findings revealed that modal auxiliary verbs are used extensively in the manifesto to give the message a sense of intention, promise, obligation and necessity in a strategic attempt to influence the voters. Bista (2009) cited in Nartey and Yankson (2014) analysed the semantic and syntactic properties of "Yes, We Can" as used by president, Barack Obama. The study findings indicated that the phrase supposedly highlighted his political will, temerity and boldness in addressing an alleged despondent American citizenry in a bid to inspire and motivate them along the tangents of progress and prosperity. The phrase also gives the message a serious tone given the sense of promise, possibility and ability that are likely to be elicited by the modal auxiliary verb.

Consequently, Shayegh (2012) cited in Nartey and Yankson (2014) investigated the use of modality in the political discourses of Barack Obama and Martin Luther King. Grounded in a combination of Halliday's Systemic Functional Grammar and Fairclough's Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) theory, the study findings indicated that both Obama and Luther King use the modal "will" as a means of insisting on the validity of information in terms of probability and usuality. The study also established that Obama uses modality among other linguistic resources, to create positive or negative power in his interviews. Besides, the potentiality of modal verbs to reflect power and ideology relations is accentuated in Wang's (2010) critical discourse analysis of Barack Obama's speeches.

A study done by Ehineni (2014) analysed the ideological uses of modals by Nigerian politicians especially in their electioneering campaign manifestos. The data was collected from political manifestos of Dr. Olusegun Mimiko of the Labour Party (LP) and Barr Rotimi Akeredolu of the Action Congress of Nigeria (ACN) used during their campaigns for the 2012 gubernatorial election in Ondo State. The study was grounded in CDA. The study findings identify the ideological underpinnings of the modals used by the politicians. The study revealed that the modals such as "will", "must", "can" are used by the politicians in both manifestos for persuasion, obligation, to make promises, demonstrate political will/commitment, and solicit public support and manipulation. Therefore, modals are not only linguistic elements but also ideological tools (Ehineni, 2014).

While this study may relate to the aforementioned studies in terms of political discourse analysis, it is uniquely different. The foregoing studies focus on, inter alia, representation of women's issues in electioneering periods, election manifestos, American and Nigerian Presidential speeches and Ghanaian political speeches. This therefore reveals a gap that this study aims to fill by investigating, very critically, how the examination of modality reveals ideological underpinnings in the discourses of Mwai Kibaki and Raila Odinga in Kenya's coalition government in 2008.

Methods and Materials

The study adopted an exploratory approach using a descriptive research design to investigate the language and discourse patterns of former President Mwai Kibaki and Prime Minister Raila Odinga during post-consultation discourse in the Kenyan Grand Coalition Government. The aforementioned design presents a qualitative analysis, description, interpretation and explanation of study findings to understand and find a solution to the significant problem of the 2007/2008 political crisis in Kenya.

The study was carried out in Kenya from the initial political period of the Coalition Government beginning of 2008. This is because this is the period that there was collaborative leadership in Kenya where the two principals the former President Mwai Kibaki and Former Prime Minister Raila had to share power. It is important to mention that the two leaders were on opposing sides though collaborating.

There were four major incidents when the two principals had to negotiate on issues of national concern. Briefly, these were; the formation of the coalition government, the suspension of Honourable Ruto and Prof Samuel Onger, the Judicial Appointments by former President Kibaki, and the mandated election date. This study targeted the instance on the formation of the Grand Coalition Government because it was the first contentious issue immediately after the signing of the National Accord.

The four written texts were downloaded from electronic data searches mainly: the official website of the former President specifically, at (2010 State House Nairobi, Kenya) and the former Prime Minister's texts were downloaded from the *African News*, Kenyan Election Crisis: Negotiations. In addition, back-ups for authentications of the same texts were accessed from the Public Communications Office of the Government Spokesman. This was done with permission from the National Council for Science and Technology, now referred to as the National Commission for Science Technology and Innovation (NACOSTI).

The texts were drawn from the political written discourse of the two principals during the post-election consultation negotiation discourse for Portfolio Balance as transmitted through the internet and the official websites. The four texts were the best to analyse because they were the major texts that were transmitted on how the negotiations on the Portfolio Balance were unfolding. The texts were in form of official letters and press releases. They were written in the official websites of the two principals and posted also by the Office of the Government spokesperson. The exchanges were considered confidential since the negotiations were ongoing and at the time, the country was witnessing street conflict and violence in various parts of the country. This was the main reason why their distribution was limited and only transmitted through the official websites and the Office of the Government Spokesperson. However, it is important to mention that since they were transmitted by the internet, mainly half of the Kenyans own internet-enabled phones most of them could easily access the texts since the two principals had been restricted from disclosing the progress of the negotiations chaired by Dr. Kofi Annan and other eminent persons. Additionally, the four texts were important because during the negotiation period, there were no speeches over the Portfolio Balance to be analysed.

In addition, since the print media (especially newspapers) have ideological leanings which could prejudice some Kenyans against the others, it was appropriate to use a more neutral channel to disseminate the negotiation between the two principals on Portfolio Balance. This explanation therefore justifies the use of the official website of the two principals and the office of the Public Communications of the government spokesman as sources of data for this study. It has been observed that such channels are associated with accountability, and transparency unlike the newspapers. There was also need to practise cautiousness and privacy during the negotiations notwithstanding the volatile and fragile situation then.

It should be pointed out that all the four texts collected and analysed in this study did not appear anywhere in the newspapers in their form but in the aforementioned official channels of the government. This was also done to shield the public from the negative reportage from the media which could result in violence. This statement is made in the view of the fact that the public's dependence on media messages for guidance increases when the social environment is ambiguous, threatening or is rapidly changing as was the case in post-election violence Kenya (Ojwang, 2009:29). Similarly, Shinar (2003) also observes that in situations of uncertainty, people turn to the media for guidance. The media thus becomes the most effective channel for acquiring information, particularly, on decisions about political goals.

Sampling Procedures

Purposive sampling was used to sample texts from electronic data searches. The researchers purposively selected four written texts from the two principals which emanated from the political crisis arising from the context of the Formation of the Grand Coalition Government in February, 2008. The texts belonged to different genres specifically, the Letter, and the Press Statement. In addition, the National Accord (2008) was also considered as a related text to the four aforementioned.

This is because it was the main legal document that guided the conduct of the two principals therefore relevant in the analysis of the four texts. Consequently, all the four texts including the National Accord were referred to as the post-election consultation negotiation texts.

In this study, the term “text” is conceptualized as a discursive event involving an instance of discursive practice and an instance of social practice. Genre is characterized as a socially ratified way of using language in connection with a particular type of activity (Fairclough 1995:14). One main characteristic of negotiation discourse is the Initiator-Response structure. The four texts under analysis were structured along this structure since the discourse topic was on negotiations/consultations. The texts were given a code to refer to the texts in this study such as 1 PB 4.1: 1, 2, 3...n: PB refers to Portfolio Balance; 4.1 refers to the serial number of the main text under study; then 1 refers to the number of the text in a sequence. Further, 1...n refers to the quoted line/sentence in the text, (where “n” refers to numerals up to infinity), The first Text PB 4.1 which was in form of an official letter served as an initiator of the areas of divergence in the National Accord as revealed in the negotiation for the Portfolio Balance. The response to this initiative was a Press statement in the second text. At this point, it should be pointed out that the subsequent exchanges were in form of Press releases/statements. The four texts were chosen to reveal continuity in the negotiation process instead of treating each text as a completely discrete event. The texts were considered to be part of the same intertextual content.

Data Analysis and Interpretation

This study used descriptive method of analysis within the framework of CDA to analyse the post-election consultation texts from the two principals. The texts were derived from the instance of the Formation of the Grand Coalition Government in 2008. Fairclough’s model of analysis was employed.

In realizing the objectives of this study, Fairclough’s (1989) linguistic analysis was employed in identifying and explaining the linguistic strategies employed by the two principals in the post-consultation discourses. CDA was used on key linguistic features of the data after identifying the genre. This level deals with the representation of content, “how it is said”, that is, the language used and how it represents the relationship between the two principals. The descriptive stage focuses on anaphora and deictics (pronouns inclusive we/exclusive of we/you, Us and Them: othering pronouns, the choice of first/second/third person and deixis such as demonstratives, time and spatial adverbs); nominalisation (a process is turned into a thing or an event without participants) devices and larger-scale structures of discursive strategies. The interpretation This stage in a CDA “makes explicit what for” participants is generally implicit: interpreting the situational context aims at illuminating power relations between the sender and receiver; and what membership resources both participants draw upon in the production and reception of a text. The Explanation Stage is concerned with analysing how the features of the groups and the situation investigated are reproduced in the production of discourse and how they either maintain or change existing power relations and ideologies in society (Fairclough, 1989).

Results and Discussion

Modality is what the leaders commit themselves to in their texts and is expressed through a number of modal verbs. According to Freeborn (1995), modality enables us to refer not to facts, but to possibility of something happening, its necessity, certainty and whether the action is permitted. This study sought to analyse modality and in view of the ideological positions suggested in the discourse of Mwai Kibaki and Raila Odinga. In this analysis, each modal was classified first as either representing epistemic or deontic modality. Epistemic modality refers to the speaker's certainty in the truth value of the proposition made. The use of deontic modality expresses the speaker's level of interpersonal power in relation to other participants. Furthermore, deontic category may convey desirability, obligation or permission. A frequency count of the modals is done for each speaker in each text for comparison (see Table 1 below).

Table 1: Frequency Count of Modals in the Texts

Modal	PB 4.1: (R) Frequency count	PB 4.2: (K) Frequency count	PB 4.3: (R) Frequency Count	PB (4.4: K) Frequency Count
MUST	4	1	0	0
WOULD	2	1	3	0
SHOULD	2	0	1	2
COULD	0	2	0	0
CAN	0	1	0	0
HAVE	0	3	0	3
HAS	0	0	0	7

Source: Authors' Analysis (2014)

KEY: R (Raila); K (Kibaki), PB (Portfolio Balance)

Table 1 shows that the modal “must” is frequently used more by Raila Odinga than Mwai Kibaki (5 frequency count & 0 respectively). Similarly, the modal “would” has 5 frequency count by Raila Odinga and 1 frequency count by Mwai Kibaki. The modal “should” is also more frequently used by Raila Odinga (3 counts) than Mwai Kibaki (2 counts). The modals “can” and “could” are only used by Mwai Kibaki same to the use of “has” and “have”. At this point, it is important to classify these modals into the various categories for ease of analysis. This is indicated in Table 2 below:

Table 2: Deontic Modals by Sub-category in the Texts

Modal	Raila	Kibaki
Desirability	8	3
Obligation	4	14
Permission	0	3
Total	12	20

Source: Authors' Analysis (2014)

Deontic modal are those modal which express the speaker's desire, permission or obligation to carry out a certain activity. In the analysis of these four texts (i.e. Text PB 4.1, PB 4.2, PB 4.3 & PB 4.4), it is observed that Raila Odinga and Mwai Kibaki employ deontic modalities of desirability, obligation and permission differently. If we aggregate the results for the three deontic categories in table 4.5 above, we get a total of 12 deontic modals used by Raila Odinga versus 6 used by Mwai Kibaki (including 6 occurrences of 'have' and 7 occurrences of "has" which function as modals in this context. Table 3 displays the same. The data analysis of Modality in Text PB 4.3 was very minimal with slight use of the deontic modals "would" and "should". These categories are briefly explained below.

Desirability

The particular modal most associated with the category of desirability is "should" but on some occasions other modal verbs such as "would" can be interpreted as signalling desirability (see Table 3 for the frequency counts).

Table 3: Frequency Count of Modals of Desirability

Modals of Desirability	Raila	Kibaki
Should	3	2
Would	5	1
Total	8	3

Source: Authors' Analysis (2014)

Table 3 shows that Raila Odinga uses more modals of desirability (8 counts) than Mwai Kibaki (3 counts). This could be attributed to show more agency in resolving the contentious issues in the Portfolio Balance.

The attitude of desirability/inclination is expressed in the following examples:

We have always acted in good faith and conveyed to your Excellency that the Grand Coalition *would* be one government. The current cabinet *should* be dissolved to allow for the formation of a fresh cabinet in accordance with the act... Our party now maintains that the Grand Coalition cabinet *should* not exceed 34, Ministries (6, 10, and 12: PB4.1)

In these examples, Raila Odinga expresses his moral and practical judgments towards the formation of the Grand Coalition government. The use of the modal “would” in (6, 10 and 12 PB 4.1), affirms the desirability of having the Grand Coalition Government in existence. Consequently, the use of the modal “*should*” expresses Raila Odinga’s inclination which also expresses his authority and power over the decision on the size of the cabinet. According to Ravelli (2000, Ndambuki & Janks, 2010), the use of “*should*” evidences high modality and therefore it is equated with authority and consequently power.

On the other hand, Mwai Kibaki uses the modal auxiliary ‘would’ to express desirability/inclination. This is illustrated below:

Yesterday, I and Hon. Raila Odinga promised in a joint statement that we *would* convene today to have the matter concluded (5: PB 4.2)

In this sentence, it can be observed that Mwai Kibaki uses low modality to express his feelings about the then stipulated meeting between him and Raila Odinga. The use of low modality shows that Kibaki is lessening his authority and power in the matter under concern. This is a legitimation strategy which makes him appear accommodative and approachable. However, this strategy does not reduce his power as the former President. It can be approached from the perspective of good negotiation attributes. The use of the deontic modal ‘*should*’ indicates obligation from the ODM side. The Government Coalition points out the ODM is obliged to accept that the former President has Executive and exclusive powers as demonstrated by the law. The speaker emphasizes this point by using the sentence adverb “*clearly*” to show that such “powers” are not debatable as the constitution is clear on the same.

The use of the deontic modal “should” in line [2 b] “... it is unfortunate that this program has been put on hold on the insistence of the ODM that an expanded cabinet should be in place first”, demonstrate obligation from the Government Coalition over the ODM. This is illustrated below:

ODM *should* now move from confrontational and activist politics of the opposition into responsible politics of governance (4 PB 4.4).

Further, the use of the modal 'should' in 4 PB 4.4 context served as a warning to the ODM side to cease from "Activist politics." Mwai Kibaki problematizes Raila Odinga of being involved in activist politics of the opposition, yet he was in the government vide: 4 PB 4.4. It can be mentioned that such a warning could not be enacted without authority which in my view indicates that the Government Coalition appears to be exercising power over the ODM by demanding "responsible politics of governance" from the latter. Authority was also legitimated in the use of event modality signified by the verb "will" viz:

Greater progress *will* be made through working together as Coalition partners and not through confrontational public shows (4 PB 4.4).

The use of "will" indicates predictability in this case, which is dependent on the warning issued earlier. That is if the ODM side does not heed to the warning and continues with "Activist politics", then the implication is that there would be no coalition government and thus no progress in the formation of such a government. "Greater Progress" is also juxtaposed with "...activist politics of the opposition" to point out the characteristics of the opposition politics in the activities of the ODM. This contrast further point to the coalition partners as foes and not collaborators in the coalition (Sullivan, 2005). The end result of this opposition has been the suspension of talks on the Portfolio Balance and thus retarding the progress on the negotiations for Portfolio Balance.

The use of "*should*" in line [4 PB 4.4] cannot be viewed as a modal of desirability as is expected. Under the context of situation, the modal serves as a warning since it is an obligation modal, which from my point of view has a manipulative effect thus the power undertones. Bliss (2005:185) contents that "if something is 'a must' that presupposes a moral or belief system that supports it and therefore, suggests strongly that 'the must' has to be accepted", then the effect is manipulative. In this case the deontic use of 'should' is manipulative because it presupposes a moral system, that is, the ODM has to stop inciting the public. This comes after protests in Kibra where several people were injured due to the suspension of talks by Raila Odinga. If the protests continue, then the country would slip back to a situation of anarchy and this why the PNU demands that the ODM should end such "confrontational public shows."

Obligation

The prototypical modal of obligation in the data is “*must*” and both speakers, Raila and Kibaki, use it. Mwai Kibaki also uses variations of ‘have’. The following Table 4 summarizes the modals of obligation used by the two speakers.

Table 4: Frequency Count of Modals of Obligation in the Texts

Modal	Raila	Kibaki
Must	4	1
Has	0	7
Have	0	6

Source: Authors’ Analysis (2014)

The use of strong modality conveys a force of authority and toughness by the speaker. Both Raila and Kibaki speak categorically in bare statements which express modality of obligation. However, it can be observed that Raila Odinga employs heavy use of ‘must’ more than his counterpart, Mwai Kibaki. Part of the toughness of each leader is to construct themselves as being personally committed. Raila Odinga uses the modal ‘must’ to express both a deontic and epistemic meaning. For example:

... It must be understood that ODM and PNU are equal partners in the Grand Coalition (4: PB4.1).

The use of ‘must’ in this sentence has a commentary interpretation tone on the epistemic value of the proposition. The speaker is confident on the validity of the statement and authoritatively asserts that PNU is fully aware that they are equal partners with ODM only that they (PNU) want to breach the Accord intentionally. [9] I therefore wish to let you know that the following issues must be resolved in the course of our further consultations on the formation of the Government (9:PB4.1) In (9 PB4.1), the speaker uses the modal “must” to indicate that Kibaki is obligated to resolve the stalemate. These findings are in agreement with those of (Nartey & Yankson, 2014, Bista, 2009 and Shayegh, 2012). In addition, the use of the word “wish” as a lexical verb indicates the desire of the speaker that the addressee should act.

Allocations of Portfolios *must* be based on the agreement of 3rd April, 2008 in which we agreed that the PNU side nominates appointments in the Finance and Security Portfolios and in return, ODM, *would* nominate ministers to the following Portfolios: Local government.... Cabinet affairs (12: PB 4.1).

The use of the modal ‘must’ in [12] signals authority from the speaker obligating the addressee to perform the action. It implies that Kibaki may have no option but to allocate the portfolio in accordance with the National Accord and Reconciliation Act, 2008. (iii) Structure and organization of Government. The following must also be agreed upon in advance: An acceptable classification of ministries... and constitutional offices (Line 15 PB4.1). The use of ‘must’ in the line above also has a sense of obligation conveyed with respect to the addressee and not the speaker. The researcher observes that Mwai Kibaki uses the modal of obligation “must” in only one proposition, viz:

This matter *must* come to a close without further delay in order for us to move forward and focus on urgent matters facing our people, the priority being the resettlement of internally displaced Kenyans (12:PB4.2).

The sense of obligation in [12 PB 4.2] lies with both the speaker and Raila Odinga. This means that both of them are under obligation to ensure that they bring to an end this stalemate on the formation of the coalition government. In Text 12 PB 4.2, Mwai Kibaki uses emotive language to persuade the readers to side with him on the issue of giving priority resettlement of the Internally Displaced Persons. Croft (1992) states that people can be easily persuaded if they become involved in emotion. Kibaki uses this technique to front his attitude of being considerate, empathetic, and practical and of moral values.

The strong use of the modal “*must*” also emphasizes this attitude (Fowler, 1981, Wang, 2010). Majority of the leaders would be able to sympathize with the IDPs living in make-shift tents, braving the cold nights, having sick children, and lacking food and essential services among others. It may be observed that this is a legitimation strategy employed by Mwai Kibaki to persuade the readers to believe him and view him as being progressive and mindful of the Kenyans. Legitimation in this case is achieved through rationalisation. In addition, Mwai Kibaki employs the quasi-modal ‘have’ to signal obligation.

In Text PB 4.4, Mwai Kibaki has expressed modality in various ways, for example, through semi-modals such as has to/has been, deontic *modality* such as “should” event modality expressed in the use of the verb “*will*” and word/sentence adverbs such as “clearly”, “in this regard”, and “bearing all these activities...”. The epistemic semi-modals “has to/have been” are used to construct the representation of completed actions which also emphasise the progressiveness of the Government Coalition. Such use of epistemic semi-modals rationalise the PNU’s dismissal of ODM’s allegations that the Government Coalition has done nothing since the signing of the Accord. It also disputes the suspension of talks by Raila Odinga.

Permission

The prototypical modals of permission are “can”, “could”, “may”, “might” etcetera which signal that the person is allowed to carry out a specific function. Table 5 below provides the frequency counts of the modals signalling permission in the texts.

Table 5: Frequency Count of Modals of Permission

Modals of Permission	Raila	Kibaki
Can	0	1
Could	0	2
Total	0	3

Source: Authors' Analysis (2014)

From Table 5, it can be observed that it is only Mwai Kibaki who employs the modals of permission. This perhaps indicates his willingness to resolve the stalemate, which is one apparently not shared by Raila Odinga. In the use of the modals of permission, the speaker allows the addressee to perform some action (Fowler, 1985).

In this case, Mwai Kibaki allows Raila Odinga to fully and constructively participate in the decisions concerning the formation of the Coalition Government. This portrays Mwai Kibaki as a person who is ready to share power and authority. This permissibility also acknowledges the possibility of Raila's voice and opinion on the matter of concern. Permission is often signalled by “can”, “could”, “may”, “might” inter alia. Examples [6], [8] and [13] illustrate Kibaki's use of modals of permission ‘can’ and ‘could’ viz:

This is because we were of the view that the remaining few matters relating to the formation of the cabinet *could* have been resolved today. Despite this, I was hoping that we could clear these concerns during our scheduled afternoon meeting today....I invite Hon. Raila Odinga to engage constructively so that we *can* conclude the formation of the government (6, 8, 13: PB 4.2).

The use of the modals ‘could’ and ‘can’ in [6], [8] and [13] signal permission and the ability to renegotiate and resolve the stalemate. However, it can be mentioned that the fact that Raila Odinga does not perform the activities he had been “allowed” to do so by Mwai Kibaki may be interpreted as a silence in the text.

Furthermore, the use of the lexical verb 'hoping' in [8 PB 4.2] epistemically indicates the desire of the speaker to resolve the issue of the formation of the coalition government. Underlying is an attitude that indicates the ideology of unification through symbolization of unity (Thompson, 1990).

In summary, the research findings of the use of modality show that Raila Odinga and Mwai Kibaki use deontic modals frequently in their discourse to signal authority and power. This finding is in tandem with Ehineni (2014) study which established that politicians use modals to front their individual and party ideologies. However, it can be observed that Raila's comparatively heavy/high/strong use of deontic modals in his discourse makes him appear manipulative or propagandistic (Jowett & O'Donnell, 2006; van Dijk 2006), while Kibaki's moderate/low use of the same renders him merely persuasive. However, this does not imply that Mwai Kibaki is not propagandistic in his discourse. It is worth noting that in his (Kibaki's) use of collectivisation through *symbolization of unity* in sentence [13 PB 4.2], and as explained earlier, he uses power to persuade the readers to believe in what he says. This is a unification strategy which largely escapes the awareness of the readers hence manipulative or propagandistic (Rigotti, 2005). Since Raila Odinga makes several use of the deontic Modal "must" in his discourse, the presupposed modal system can be manipulative/propagandistic. However, the researcher observes that Raila's heavy use of deontic modality may be interpreted as a system of duty since it is concerned with his attitude to the degree of obligation, which in this case, is "restoration of democracy" in the country.

Conclusion

Modals are deployed in Kenya's post-consultation discourse to indicate political will and commitment, promises, pledging, persuasion, political obligation and manipulation, personal conviction, possibility and appeal. Politicians often use modals to reinforce their individual political ideologies, communicate their political ideas and elicit public support. Additionally, the preponderant use of the modals 'will', is established in the fact that this modal is more easily used to introduce pledges and promises to the public with the ultimate view of persuasion. Furthermore, the modals 'must' and 'should' were used by the leaders to consolidate their obligations and when necessary, distance themselves from established deontic values. A conclusion is also made that modals are not only just linguistic elements, but political strategies and ideological tools in political discourses. Furthermore, the modals were used strategically to highlight specific objectives and themes in the Kenya's 2008 post-consultation discourse of the principals. Finally, it can also be concluded that in a post-conflict situation and where the aspect of power-sharing exists, the coalition leaders have to front their ideologies reasonably and carefully for purposes of sustaining the coalition. Therefore, the findings of this study suggest that since coalition governments have become common in Africa, in future, despite political competition, leaders have to use language that enhances coalition building.

References

- Bliss, R. (2005). Manipulation in the Speeches and Writings of Hitler and NSDAP from a Relevance Theoretic Point of view. In L.de Saussure and P. Schultz (Eds), *Manipulation and Ideologies in the Twentieth Century: Discourse, Language, Mind*. Amsterdam: John
- Ehineni, T.O (2014). A Critical Discourse Analysis of Modals in Nigerian Political Manifestos *International Journal of Linguistics*. Vol 6(3): 109-117
- Fairclough, N. (1989). *Language and Power*. New York: Longman
- Fairclough, N. (1995). *Critical Discourse Analysis*. London: Longman
- Fowler, R. (1985). Power. In T.A. Van Dijk (Ed), *Handbook of Discourse Analysis*,_Vol 4. London: Academic Press. Inc pp 61-82.
- Halliday, M.A.K. (1994). *An Introduction to Functional Grammar* 2nd Ed. Great Britain: Edward Arnold.
- Jowett, G.S. and O'Donnell, V. (2006). *Propaganda and Persuasion* (4th edn) London: Sage.
- Nartey M. And Yankson F.E (2014). A Semantic Investigation into the use of Modal Auxiliary Verbs in the Manifesto of a Ghanaian Political Party. *International Journal of Humanities And Social Sciences* Vol 4 (3): 21-30
- Ndambuki, J. and Janks, H. (2010). Political Discourses, Women's Voices: Mismatches in Representation. *Critical Approaches to Discourse Analysis across Disciplines* <http://caadad.ne/ejournal> vol 4(1) 73-92
- Ojwang, B, O (2009). "The Semantics of Peace and the Role of Print Media in the 2007-2008 Post-election Violence in Kenya." *Africa Media Review*. Vol 17 (1) (2): 23-50
- Palmer, F. (2001). *Mood and Modality* (2nd edn). Cambridge. Cambridge University Press.
- Ravelli, L. (2000). "Getting Started with Functional Analysis of Texts". In Unsworth, L. (Ed.).

- Republic of Kenya: Public Communications Office of Government Spokesperson, Nairobi. 2008.
- Rigotti, E. (2005). Towards a Typology of Manipulative Processes. In L.de Saussure and P. Schultz (Eds) *Manipulation and Ideologies in the Twentieth Century: Discourse, Language, Mind*. Amsterdam: John Benjamin's pp. 61-83.
- Shinar, D. (2003). "The Peace Process in Cultural Conflict. The Role of Media", *Conflict and Communication Online*, 2(1) retrieved on April 10, 2009 from <http://www.cco.regener Online.de>
- Sullivan, D. (2005). 'The Missing Pillars': A Look at the Failure of Peace in Burundi through the Lens of ArendLijphart's Theory of Consociational Democracy. *The Journal of Modern African Studies* 43 (1): 75-95
- Swales, J. M. (1990). *Genre Analysis: English in Academic and Research Settings*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Thompson, J.B. (1990). *Ideology and Modern Culture*. UK. Polity Press.
- van Dijk, T. (1998). *Ideology: A Multidisciplinary Approach*. London: Sage
- van Dijk, T.A. (2006). Discourse and Manipulation. *Discourse & Society* 17(3): 359-383.
- Wang, J (2010). A Critical Discourse Analysis of Barrack Obama's Speeches. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*. Vol 1(3): 254-261.