The Use of Presupposition in the Creation of Socio- Political Dominance in Kenyan Parliamentary Debates between 1992 and 2010

Christine Atieno Peter[1]*   Prof Mwenda Mukuthuria[2]   Prof Peter Muriungi [3]
1.Chuka University, P.O. Box 109, Chuka, Kenya
2.Masai Mara University, Narok, Kenya
3.Chuka University, Chuka, Kenya

Abstract
Presupposition, a linguistic element can be employed in utterances. When this is done it enhances the comprehension of what is being communicated. This aspect of language that is implicit assumption of an utterance is a strategy that may be used to express a speaker's socio- political dominance. The truth of what is said is taken for granted and can be manipulated by the speaker to have devastating effects on an individual or the society at large. This study examined presupposition as a strategy of language used by Kenyan members of parliament during debates to create socio- political dominance. The objective was: To analyse the usage of presupposition in language used by parliamentarians to create socio- political dominance in Kenyan parliamentary debates. Various sources of literature have been reviewed in the following areas: ideology, discourse strategies, the power in language, parliamentary proceedings and political dominance. The study used descriptive research design. By using purposive sampling, the data was collected from the Hansard dating from 1992 to 2010. Data was analysed using Foucauldian Discourse Analysis (FDA). This theory looks at how the society is moulded by language that shows various power relationships. The study identified language that created dominance, discussed the presupposition as a strategy used in the utterances. The research found out that presupposition was used by speakers to create dominance in the debates.
Keywords: Presupposition, Discourse Strategies, Ideology, Power. Parliamentary Language

1. Introduction

Language is a means by which human beings exchange knowledge, beliefs, ideas, opinions, wishes, commands, thanks, promises, declarations and feelings. It is arranged in a way of thinking which can be in textual form or verbal communication (Lupton, 1992). Language is interactional and can be used to generate social identities (Jorgen & Phillips, 2002). It can also hide meanings or distort facts (Brock- Utne & Garbo, 2009). It is a system of conventional spoken or written symbols by which human beings as members of a social group and participants express themselves. Language is the universal capacity of humans in all societies to communicate and it is integral to the construction of categories that show identity and differences (Fairclough, 1989; Foucault, 1972). Language is a fundamentally social phenomenon (Yallop, 2004; Halliday, 1978; Tuebert, 2010). Arguably in all human endeavours language still remains the principal vehicle for conceptualizing, transmitting and gaining access to world information and knowledge. However, despite the central role language plays in all spheres of life, it still remains a notoriously difficult concept especially because of its complex and versatile character (Topan, 2014).

Language is accorded a very central role in social phenomena (Fairclough, 1992). It contributes to the domination of some people by others therefore language can be used to provide ways of structuring ourselves and the world (Burr, 1995). It may be used for purposes of expressing power and inequality. Language functions as a communicating tool that is used for information dissemination. Language is seen as a marker of identity (Crystal, 1979; Kitishat, 2014). The Members of Parliament (MPs) often develop self-identities and they also categorise the others who do not belong in their class. They interact by negotiating and re-negotiating their positions as they socialise through language. During debates speakers are affected by what is said and they in turn may speak animatedly. Language may become a political tool of social oppression and resistance. The oppressed people resort to forms of resistance. Those in power tend to dominate the other and in retaliation, the governed resort to confrontation. In parliament this plays out through the speeches that are presented by both sides of the divide.

Ideology is the specific fundamental beliefs of groups of people that represent their interests. It is the foundation of social representations shared by the groups. Participants in discourse take positions which are related to their ideological stands. Politics being a social domain has practices that are discursive. Political ideologies are (re)produced by discourse. When the dominated group accepts dominant ideologies then there is ideological dominance. Ideology is not just a domain of the dominant group but it can be associated with the dominated group because they have ideologies such as resistance and opposition.

Dominance is usually resisted. Strategies of resistance include co-operating with the dominant group, seeking change while challenging those in power. This was clear in parliament especially during the question-answer session where the government was put to task to defend its performance in service delivery. Sometimes

people may resist by being confrontational and aggressive (Kitishat, 2014). The study was conducted on the language that parliamentarians use as they debate, which sometimes was combative. The national assembly was a good choice because it is a fertile ground for expression of dominance and resistance through the use of language.

Parliament is a privileged house. The parliamentarians enjoy immunity which protects them from any judicial action against them, especially in the precincts of the National Assembly. In Kenya the Members of Parliament enjoy these privileges. The repeal of Article 2A of the old Kenyan Constitution (1991) and the promulgation of the new Constitution in 2010 enhanced this (Habwe, 2010).

The history of section 2A of the constitution of Kenya dates back to 1963. When Kenya got its independence the constitution provided a multiparty parliament. But in 1982, multipartism was abolished by the government, making Kenya a single party state with KANU as the ruling party. In December 1991 at a KANU delegates meeting, the president repealed section 2A of the constitution. This change took the country back to being a multiparty state. The Constitution of Kenya (Amendment) Act No. 12 of 1991 saw the repeal of section 2A of the Constitution which converted the country to a one party state in 1982. This amendment reintroduced multiparty politics in Kenya and introduced term limits to the presidency. This change led to formation of many political parties. After the amendment of 1991, it was realized that further amendments would be necessary as the president had become very powerful; the judiciary and legislature arms of government were easily manipulated. The president was the one controlling the distribution of national resources. The civil society had no say. With this background, corruption and sycophancy thrived. Tribalism and ethnic animosity were institutionalized. The general elections were manipulated and oppressive laws enforced. There was less human rights protection (Mak'Odingo, 2010).

This study examined the language in the Kenyan Parliamentary debates proceedings as recorded in the Hansard, which is the verbatim record of proceedings in the National Assembly. Hansard is a publication named after Thomas Curson Hansard, an early printer of the Parliamentary proceedings.

2. Literature Review
2.1 Ideology
Ideology is a set of beliefs which individuals or groups base their actions. A certain ethical set of ideals of a social group that explains how society should work. Political ideologies are concerned with many different aspects of society including power allocation. Ideologies are frameworks for organizing the social cognitions that are shared by members of a group. In a discourse, participants engage each other as individual or groups. In such situations, there can be domination by one group and resistance to this by the other (van Dijk, 2005). Players especially in a political discourse will tend to portray themselves as upright and good while placing the others in negative light. Ideology refers to how language accrues socio- political meaning (Kroskrity, 2000). It organizes and enables all cultural beliefs and practices as well as the power relations that emerge. Ideology emerges from social actors' habitual practice. Ideology refers to shared representation of people in a social setting (van Dijk, 2011).

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

Ideology can be either positive or negative (van Dijk, 2005). This usually depends on who is making the observation and what the individual's perspective is. Language in parliament during debate is political and in Kenya after the repeal of section 2A, there was government and opposition side. The members' discusse issues based on which side of the divide they belong. Generally this political discourse almost always places government and opposition on antagonistic fronts. The government would strive to defend its stand on an issue while opposition would strive to criticize and question government in an attempt to play the oversight role and speak for the neglected people.

Ideology affects the structure of language such as speech presentation (van Dijk, 1995). A member of parliament from either side would have his personal view influence the way their team members argue on an issue in the August house. It is through the discussions in parliament that the groups' ideology is brought out.

2.2 Discourse and Parliamentary Language
Discourse is a wide term that refers to whole varieties of meanings (Titscher, Meyer, Wodak & Vetter, 1998). This is not just a meaning in a text or an utterance, but it is finding many meanings that can be decoded from a text. It is a process of social interaction (Fairclough, 1989). Discourse can also be defined as an exercise that characterises the world by demonstrating it, creating and assembling it in meaning (Fairclough, 1992). From this definition, discourse is a way of speaking and writing about information, societal practice that mirrors and produces the

structuring of the area. Language is viewed as a window into people's minds and also as a discursive resource which individuals utilise to perform various discursive functions (Chalebois, 2010). Discourse can also be that system of thought that is systematically constructed in a discussion through which power relations produce speaking subjects (Foucault, 2003).

Politics is concerned with the influence to make resolutions, to control resources and other people's behaviour and their values. This involves the need for politicians to select their words and phrases carefully because they believe in the influence of language on an individual's thoughts. Discourse in a socio- linguistic approach and conversation analysis is an interactional order which emerges in social situations; therefore it is an interactionist concept (Angermüller, 2007). In the national assembly, the Members of Parliament (MPs) interact during debates and in so doing use language to express their views and opinions. There is need for models that feature beliefs which remain implicit, such, make meaning clear and leads to presupposed discourse, (Wodak & van Dijk, 2000). Discourse can be involved in dominance which van Dijk refers to as power abuse in the (re)production of social inequality.

Language is used as an instrument to combine and manipulate ideas and relationships for the purpose of power and control (Fowler, 1985). This is crucial as the MPs use language in debates with an intention to manipulate other people so that they may dominate them in the process. The aim in this study was to examine language as is used by MPs in parliamentary debates. Jakaza (2013) focused his study on the exploration on the nature of appraisal resources that are employed in consolidation and manipulation of relationships in parliamentary debates and speeches. He also examined the nature of manoeuvring strategies that are realised in the discourse of parliamentarians as they struggle for dominance. Similarly, the current research examines the discourse elements and discursive formations that are used by parliamentarians to create identity which brings about socio- political dominance. Discourse knowledge is ideological knowledge related to larger units of discourse (Bekalu, 2007). It has knowledge on content and the genre of the text or the type of text.

Politicians are not known to be consistent. Quite often they present arguments geared toward endearing themselves to either the powers that be or, retrospectively, toward supporting their side of the political divide. The varied linguistic strategies applied in debates and speeches by members of parliament have a great impact on the laws as well as the citizenry of land. Parliaments are institutions in which members debate legislative proposals and scrutinize the operations of government through interrogative questioning which at times appears negative (Jakaza, 2013). Parliamentary proceedings have a strict code of conduct that should be observed during business (Ilie, 2009). This includes parliamentary etiquette, turn taking and other types of language that are rule governed. For example, there is always one speaker at a time and when the speaker is on the floor they [s/he] stand while the others are seated. Further, the Speaker of the National Assembly is at all times in control of who should be speaking. He is charged with the responsibility of chairing all the activities during the debate. The other speakers have to channel their contributions through him.

Culture and history influence the type and nature of discourse used in parliament (Jakaza, 2013). According to Fairclough and Fairclough (2012), debates get their discursive nature from the content and rules of a critical discussion. This is a complex speech act that is dialogically aimed at the persuasion of an interlocutor by giving reasons. Debates take place in a context within a certain setting. This could be in the chambers or the National Assembly. The study was conducted on language used by MPs during debates in parliament. Parliamentary debates may or may not give new information. Therefore it is notable that debates can be categorised according to levels of the differences in the opinion and knowledge of the participants (van Dijk, 2003).

2.3 Discourse Strategies

Discourse is an institutionalized way of speaking that determines not only what we say and how we say it, but also what we do not say (Yasemin, 2010). Discourse signals are used in making interactions, control unbalanced use of politeness strategies, speech procedures, use of proverbs, evaluative accounts and explicit declarations of power and dominant informational structure amongst others (Uchenna, 2012). These should be studies in order to expose the hidden agenda and ideological bias, (Ilie, 2010c). In so doing one can examine different interpersonal positioning, rules and practices in parliamentary discourse. Politicians are sustained by persuasive or manipulative use of language. Specific discourse forms can be resolved into a play of pre- significations as opposed to overgeneralising form of analysis (Hook, 2005). In the present study, investigations focused on how the speakers used such manipulative language that was actualised in discourse elements such as presupposition.

2.3.1 Presupposition

Presupposition, a linguistic element that is found in speech, refers to an implicit assumption about the world. It is the background belief relating to an utterance (Palmer, 2004). The truth of this utterance is taken for granted. For instance, in the following sentences:

a) "Have you seen Mr Gatabaki?"
 The presupposition is that you know Mr Gatabaki.
b)" Pattni stopped exporting gold."

The presupposition is that Pattni used to export gold.

Foucault's analysis of discourse is from the point of view that discourse is an event and in its study, one must identify it as a set of assumptions. Presupposition may be studied in discourse from two approaches: The truth condition (TC) and the socio- cognitive approach. Presupposition involves framing, emphasis and topic (Sperber & Wilson, 1995). It is a useful tool in the analysis of discourse that is linked to ideology and positioning the hearers as powerless (Polyzou, 2014). In a TC approach, there is usually a presupposition.

Discourse used in this way is an indicator of dominance which according to Wodak and van Dijk (2000) is power abuse as political actors produce inequality in the society. This approach can be used as a discursive and cognitive category of analysis. In a TC study, speakers can manipulate the audience by presenting certain beliefs as true, given and unquestionable, even if they were not known by the audience. For example, when the speaker says, "The party members are planning to rig the elections," this is informative presupposition. The speaker intends to give information that may not be known by the listeners.

Presupposition can be used as a discursive and cognitive category of analysis. A cognitive approach of presupposition to Discourse Analysis is more productive than a TC logical approach. In a TC study, speakers can manipulate the audience by presenting certain beliefs as true, given and unquestionable, even if they were not known by the audience, for example when the speaker says: "The party members are planning to rig the elections." This is informative presupposition. The speaker intends to give information that may or may not be known by the listeners.

In a TC approach, presupposition is presented as a problem of formal logic. Accordingly, the meaning of a sentence is its truth condition. Presuppositions are introduced through expressions known as 'presupposition triggers' (Levinson, 1983). In the following sentences,
a) The county governor is left- handed.
å) The county governor is not left- handed.

The presupposition trigger is the definite article 'the'. In both sentences a) and å) it is presupposed that the county has a governor. The county has a governor is a proposition that is true for a) and the negative å). The presupposition triggers make a proposition difficult to refute (Chilton, 2004; Wodak, 2007; Mills, 2008).

The use of frames such as: Noun or noun phrases are labels for a person or group, verb or verb phrase, action, adverb or adverbial phrase labels how, when, where an action is performed and adjective or adjectival phrase, description of place or person, contribute to the constitutive function of discourse. These are obvious ways of ideologically conceptualizing groups or situations (Reisigl & Wodak 2001). In the application of presupposition, a speaker says something that could be challenged in two different ways (Stalnaker 1991). In debates in parliament, this involved situations where the speaker said something that was supported by his side of the divide which could be challenged or opposed by the listeners from the opposite side. An utterance was supported or opposed depending on the side that a member chose to take. Presupposition is used to support stands or positions and it is a powerful tool as it is taken that what is presupposed is the truth that cannot be contested or questioned.

In the following example, the presupposition trigger used in the TC approach is the definite article, 'the'. The utterance confirmed that: There is a government, it has plans that it is undertaking and establishing a lake transport system is not among the plans. Presupposition is further enhanced by the use of frames. In the example given, the frames used included:
NP: *The government*, VP: *does not have plans… operates a limited service*, AdvP: *Currently the Kenya Railways Corporations …in the area…after obtaining…* PP *to establish… from other railway earnings … for hire…*

The frames simplify the process of getting aspects of presupposition. Discourse used in this way is an indicator of dominance which according to Wodak and van Dijk (2000) is power abuse as political actors produce inequality in the society. The speaker here places the listener in a spot where the latter can do nothing to force the speaker to establish the lake transport system. In the example above, there is creation of dominance by the speaker in his employment of presupposition as a discourse element.

In instances where there is power imbalance, like in parliament, there are many cases of the more dominant group not being challenged by the less powerful side. In such cases, the issue appears to be that of power and not linguistic. Power is related to appropriacy and taken-for-granted-ness, which Sbisā (1999) calls 'assumptions' that ought to be shared. This therefore means that the approach of presupposition should be based on the assumptions and propositions that a speaker uses in an attempt to control the dominated group. Such utterances may not have the presupposition triggers. There are other non- explicit factors that mark presupposition, for example, an intuitive link between shared knowledge and knowledge presented as shared or given (Sbisā, 1999). There are several categories in presupposition; shared knowledge where both the speaker and listener know back-grounded beliefs and beliefs presented as given. The back-grounded is knowledge needed to make sense of an utterance which some recipients do not have.

2.4 Political Dominance
Power is not just a negative concept of coercion or repression but it can be a productive and positive force (Gaventa,

2003). A group with more power is considered as the dominant one and it may control others in specific situation or domains. Since action is controlled by the mind, the dominant group strives to influence other people and this gives them power over the dominated group (Essed, 1991). Group based dominance is produced and maintained through discrimination at various levels which is integrated and co-ordinated by legitimizing ideology (Pratto, Sidanius & Levin, 2006).

Nyewusira and Nweke (2012) expose that transactional nature of party politics affect democratic governance at local government level where there arose a system of support of policymaking opposed to rules, ethics and views of democratic governance. Overt statements of power and dominant interpretive frameworks are aspects of discursive signals used by elders to mark interactional power (Uchenna, 2012). This compares with implicit explanation used by speakers in parliament to respond to questions. This aspect of discursive formation is discussed under mode. Dominance can be conveyed by non-verbal cues such as body language (Amos, 2013). People knowingly develop and use this as a technique to exert control over others. MPs use this aspect consciously to achieve their desired goals. Dominance is also created through other discourse elements; streotypes, implicature, hate speech, verbosity and presupposition. There has been a 'linguistic turn' (Stibbe, 2001) where there is a social principle that looks at how language is given a dominant role in social aspects (Fairclough, 1992).

Politics is a game of power and dominance. It is argued that power is a force that circulates in a web of social interactions between individuals who exercise as well as undergo power. Foucault (1980: 98) says:

> Power is employed and exercised through a net-like organisation. And not only do individuals do circulate through its thread; they are always in the position of simultaneously undergoing and exercising this power. They are not only its inert or consenting target; they are always also the elements of articulation. In other words, individuals are the vehicles of power, not its point of application.

It is the argument of this thesis that members of parliament see themselves truly as the elements just aforementioned; elements of power. They always want to be felt not only by the people they serve, but also by their fellow parliamentarians. That is why; therefore, they will use all that it takes for that dominance to be felt. This includes the language they use on the floor of the house. It is this language that this thesis sought to analyse. The Language that parliamentarians use during debates may, at times, be considered 'unparliamentary'. According to West Minister system such language includes, among others, hate speech, profanity, dishonesty and the like (Pilkinton, 1999). Legislators are however protected from persecution and legal actions because they enjoy parliamentary immunity. On legal proceedings against a member of parliament, chapter 8 of the Constitution of Kenya states:

> No civil or criminal proceedings shall be constituted against a member for words spoken before, or written in a report to, the assembly or a committee, or by reason of any other matter, brought by him therein by petition, bill, resolution, motion or otherwise.

By studying parliamentary discourse, it is hoped that the various strategies used by members of parliament would be revealed to the general populace since, in the house, members are not always objective in their contributions. Rather, they tend to incline toward the position taken by their side of the divide; There are always opposing sides even when the members debate legislative propositions (Bayley, 2004). This study focuses on the language used in Kenyan parliamentary debates to create socio- political dominance. While studying parliamentary debates, the role of context in the discourse is undisputable. Though parliaments are bound by strict rules of operation (mentioned earlier), the role of the context of culture and history is indisputable (Bayley, 2004.) The Kenyan Parliamentary discourse has intrigues that stretch into the early history of this country.

Parliamentary language should be courteous, good tempered, and use moderate among other qualities. Language that does not have such qualities is considered un-parliamentary. It uses offensive, provocative or threatening approaches. Personal attack, insults and obscene language or words are not allowed. In Belgium as well as Ireland, a member is allowed to say what he or she wishes because they consider it necessary as a democratic state. They have absolute freedom of speech when in parliament. The Canadian members enjoy freedom of expression but certain words and phrases are prohibited. Members avoid using such words to describe others (MP) because they are un-parliamentary (Flynn, 2007). Un-parliamentary language is prohibited in Hong Kong and India. The Indian parliament discourages the use of certain words and phrases and has gone further by publishing a book of words that are un-parliamentary. Similarly the New Zealand parliament has a list of words and phrases that are seen as unbecoming and insultive. Ugandan parliament members are given an opportunity to explain a speech that could have been misunderstood, to exonerate his or her character and conduct if it has been maligned (Kiwanuka, 2012). In the neighbouring country, Tanzania, Parliament proceeding is conducted in Swahili and members are expected to conduct themselves with dignity and moderation (Wekuja, 2004).

As hinted already, dominance is a term associated with authority, control and command actions and it may be exhibited in an optimistic or harmful way, depending on the intention of the speaker and the purpose for which the dominance is displayed. In politics, dominance is a battle of supremacy by the real or imaginary opposing side. This can be conveyed through prominence, positioning and determination to dominate interactions. The parliamentary procedure of having only one member on the floor at a particular time is not only a show of

superiority but also physical dominance. The MP on the floor, towers over his/ her seated colleagues. Dominance is thus perceived in positioning of the member's physique (Amos, 2013).

2.5 Power and Manipulation
Power can be manipulated within the social and cultural contexts of modern society. When this happens, it is pervasive (Damico, Simmons- Mackie & Hawley, 2005). Power and its marks are recognized from the activities of executive agencies and other establishments and even the way individuals enforce their will on the dependents. Human beings cooperate and this includes the way they build communicative exchanges but also how these structures connect with essential powers (Damico et al, 2005). A typical feature of manipulation is to communicate ideas implicitly (van Dijk, 2010). Power and dominance are aspects that feature in parliamentary discourse (Jakaza, 2013). Since "power is the ability of the people and institutions to control the behavior and material lives of others" (Fowler, 1985), MPs' strive to have the power to control others and struggle for authority and dominance is rightfully observed in the language used in parliament (Jakaza, 2013).

2.6 Foucauldian Discourse Analysis (FDA)
Foucauldian Discourse Analysis (FDA) theory informed the study. FDA is patterned way of thinking which can be identified in textual and verbal communications and be located in wider social structure (Lupton, 1992). Parliaments are different in terms of culture, historical development and power relations and it is these variations that influence the way language is used in the parliament (Jakaza, 2013); so, using different theoretical frameworks on different data gives important insights on parliamentary discourse.

FDA is a method of Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) that is applied to texts. A CDA is usually based on power; which is social power of groups or institutions. There is power if individuals are able to control the actions and thinking of others. The assumption is that those who are powerful have privileged access to scarce resources such as knowledge and information (Lukes, 1986; Wrong, 1979). FDA can be used where the text has been assessed and confirmed to represent the required contents. Widdowson (2004) characterises CDA as: "… type of discourse analytical research that primarily studies the way social power abuse, dominance and inequality are enacted, reproduce and resisted by text and the social and political context." Discourse is language; that is, its structure, functions and patterns in use. This study employed Foucauldian Discourse Analysis, a form of CDA, as espoused by Michel Foucault. It finds its roots from the critical theory of language which views language as a social phenomenon. This theory has not been used to analyse parliamentary debates in Kenya.

FDA is a critical concept often used in politically oriented studies. It is preferred by scholars who are looking for a system that tries to explain the political implications of discourse (Batstone, 1995). During debates in parliament, language is used to create identities and also to manipulate the listeners. FDA is an analytical approach that studies primarily the way social power abuse, dominance, and inequality are enacted, reproduced and resisted by text and talk in the social and political context (van Dijk, 2003). The present study examined how language was used to create dominance through coercion and other strategies.

3. Methodology
The study used a qualitative research design. This was appropriate in the study of human behaviour because it uncovers deeper understanding of such behavior (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). This method allowed the researcher to gather the required information. The methodology helps a researcher to collect data in the form of words (Miles & Huberman, 1994). This was done through the study of extracts from Hansard.

3.1 Population
The target population for the study was the speeches made by the parliamentarians between 1992 and 2010 in the National Assembly. The utterances of members of the Kenyan Parliament during debates as recorded in the Hansard were used. The research investigated the kind of language the MPs used during debates in parliament that created socio – political identities and dominance.

3.2 Sampling Procedure and Sample Size
Purposive sampling method was used to get the sample for the study. This is a selection tool that is sometimes called judgment sampling (Tongco, 2007). There was a deliberate choice of the utterances to include due to the qualities that they had. Categories that were important to the study were identified. Here a person decides while designing the study how many items or participants to include and what to look for in the sample that would be picked. A recruitment strategy, which is a specific plan for identifying and picking the sample that is project specific was necessary (Nkui, Nyamongo & Rjan, 2001).

4. Data Collection Procedure
Data was collected from extracts of parliamentary debates in Kenya from 1992 to 2010. This information was from

the Hansard. Relevant excerpts were identified using the guiding card and the table on the principle criteria of choice. The presupposition as a pragmatic strategy of dominance creation was examined.

5. Data Presentation and Discussion
The following is the analysis of the use of presupposition as a discourse element to create socio-political dominance.
UTT 1

> Prof. Saitoti: I am surprised that the Hon. Member did not take the trouble to read the details which are contained in an article published by 'The Standard' newspaper... There is an extremely detailed position here…this article gives the historical perspective…I want honourable members to know that similar agreements have been signed by Tanzania and Ghana so we are following examples of what is being done elsewhere... I thought Hon. Members would be happier if gold is exported… **(Hansard: 22nd April 1992).**

The presupposition trigger in this utterance is the word 'there' that is used to introduce the presupposition, (Levinson, 1983; Gilles, 1985). By using this trigger, the proposition becomes difficult to refute. This is a TC and it is a logical argument where the meaning of this utterance is its truth condition. There is no doubt that a detailed explanation exists in the newspaper. It is assumed that the information given is complete.

This examination of presupposition was further addressed using the cognitive approach to the element. This was done with the study of frames which are obvious ways of conceptualising groups (Reisigl and Wodak, 2001).

The frames included; N and NP: *I, I am, we, I am surprised that the Hon. Member… the trouble… The Standard newspaper within its business section… There is an extremely detailed position.* VP: *wanted to see… can tap gold potential…looked at it and saw very clearly… accepted the proposal and licensed one person.* AdvP: *When we first put gold under …Now, because our foreign exchange.* PP: *by Tanzania and Ghana*

The phrases in the utterance led to assumptions (Sbisā, 1999). It was assumed that MPs read newspapers especially *The Standard* and that they read the business section. The presupposition was that all the answers were in the paper. When the speaker says: "There is an extremely detailed position here…" it was assumed that if Ghana and Tanzania have signed such an agreement, then there was no problem with Kenya doing the same. The speaker presupposed that all the members support Kenya exporting gold to earn foreign exchange for the country. Being on the government side, it was assumed that whatever the member said was the truth and it was also a way of expressing the dominance that the speaker and those in leadership enjoy. This strategy is used by the speaker as a way to support his views and to try and influence the rest of the members of parliament to support the action of the speaker and government of allowing only one person to import and export gold.

UTT 2

> Mr. A. H. Ahmed: The government does not have plans to establish a Lake Transport System to connect the fifteen Islands in Mbita Constituency with the mainland. Currently the Kenya Railways Corporations operates a limited service in the area with few vessels but the service is unprofitable and has to be heavily subsidised… However, anyone with adequate resources is free to establish a ferry or boat service for hire from any of the 15 Islands.
> **(Hansard: 2nd November 1993).**

In this utterance, the presupposition trigger used in the TC approach is the definite article, 'the'. It is confirmed that:
a) There is a government.
b) It has plans that it is undertaking.
c) Establishing a lake transport system is not among the plans.

When these assumptions are made, the member and the government are seen to be strategic in the way they handle planning. From the utterance, the government appears less concerned about its subjects and their wellbeing. Speaking like this not only creates socio- political dominance but it also portrays the speaker as being discriminative in developing certain areas and this region is not one of them. Presupposition is further enhanced by the use of frames. In UTT 2, the frames used included:

NP: *The Government, VP*: *does not have plans…. operates a limited service*, AdvP: *Currently the Kenya Railways Corporations …in the area…after obtaining…* PP *to establish… from other railway earnings … for hire…*

The frames simplify the process of getting aspects of presupposition. When the speaker says: "The government does not have plans to establish a Lake Transport System to connect the fifteen Islands in Mbita Constituency with the mainland… anyone with adequate resources is free to establish a ferry or boat service for hire from any of the 15 Islands after obtaining the necessary certification and license…"

The presupposition in this utterance is that the government is not interested in developing or improving the transport system in the fifteen islands. Discourse used in this way is an indicator of dominance which according to Wodak and van Dijk (2000) is power abuse as political actors produce inequality in the society.

In this utterance, it is presupposed that the government is involved in many activities but establishing a lake transport system is not one of them. When these assumptions are made, the member and the government are

seen to be strategic in the way they handle planning. From the utterance, the latter appears less concerned about its subjects and their wellbeing. The presupposition in this utterance is that the government is not interested in developing or improving the transport system in the fifteen islands. Discourse used in this way is an indicator of dominance which according to Wodak and van Dijk (2000) is power abuse as political actors produce inequality in the society.

An utterance such as this fulfils the point of view that it is an event which according to Foucault (2003), should be handled as a set of assumptions. This is why one assumes that these regions do not contribute to the national economy and so government will not waste resources on them. One can presuppose that there are people who have resources and would like to venture into the transport system which the speaker has indicated that is unprofitable. Being a leader, the speaker is condemning the region while he assumes that it is not a productive region and so should not be given the necessary support to develop. The assumption made from the utterance is mainly a means for justifying the government's stand on the issue of transport in the region.

UTT 3

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

In this utterance, using the TC approach, the presupposition trigger is the definite article, 'the'. From the utterance, it is confirmed that:
a) There are officers.
b) The officers are policemen.
c) These officers were assigned duties in Yugoslavia.
d) There was imprest given to the officers.

These are propositions with truth conditions. A deeper examination using the cognitive approach reveals that framing was done. In the utterance, the frames used were:

NP: *The police officers…. The imprest ... the officers… the United Nations Mission… winter clothes… their mission fields… the flight route was changed,* PP: *of kshs 180,000…. surrendered by… return from... in London ... enroute to….,*VP: *were assigned duties….were given… was to be surrendered… were that… were to purchase… flight route was changed… in Yugoslavia…,*AdvP: *on return… Earlier...*

Using the above settings it was noted that there was presupposition when the speaker states: "Earlier arrangements were that the officers were to purchase their winter clothes in London enroute to their mission fields, but the flight route was changed. The clothes were bought immediately on their arrival in Yugoslavia and issued to them..."

In UTT 3, the assumption is that there were police officers sent to Yugoslavia and that they all got the money whose imprest they were to sign on arrival from the mission. The arrangement was to buy for them winter clothes in London but this was later changed. They got the clothes on arrival in Yugoslavia. It is therefore assumed that all officers had adequate cover from the harsh winter weather before they got new ones in Yugoslavia. It is assumed that the officers were comfortable with the arrangements and that they were not able to buy for themselves the winter clothes. The fact that those in charge did not entrust the officers with the responsibility of buying their own winter clothes is a show of dominance by the government.

UTT 4

> Mr Awori: KANU will soon forward a cheque worth kshs. 23,410,912 the party borrowed from the government to carry out elections between 1985/86 and 1986/87 and not kshs 27 million as alleged…as soon as possible… At the time, the party and the government were one…first of all I want to refute all the allegations made by the honourable member…The kshs.23, 410,912 includes all those monies borrowed from the district treasuries.
> **(Hansard: 22nd June 1995).**

The presupposition trigger used in the TC approach is the preposition, 'at'. This is a temporal clause headed by 'at' and is a widely agreed presupposition trigger (Beaver and Condoravdi, 2003). It is confirmed that:
a) There was a party.
b) A government was in office
c) There was collaboration between party and government
d) There was a time that these events took place.

These are presuppositions made on TC basis. However in discourse analysis, it is prudent to not only study the sentences, but to also go beyond it. More investigation carried out using the cognitive approach revealed the frames in the utterance: these were:

NP: *The Kenya African National Union (KANU)… a cheque ... the party… the government… Sir…. the time, the party... the government …,*VP: *will… forward ... borrowed ... carry out… alleged... were…,*AdvP: *soon… as soon as possible . . . At the time...*
PP: *from… to… out… as...*

Using the frames, the speaker says:

"… the Kenya African National Union (KANU) will soon forward a cheque worth kshs. 23,410,912 the party borrowed from the government to carry out elections between 1985/86 and 1986/87 and not kshs 27 million as alleged."

It was presupposed that the members were aware of the issue of the money that the party borrowed for elections. And that the money owed by KANU would be paid. The truth of this utterance was taken for granted. It was also assumed that KANU is honest and would keep its promise of paying back the loan. The presupposition showed that there were several assumptions that were made by the listeners. The presupposition created socio-political dominance as the party members used government money to conduct party affairs with the assumption that no one could query this action. This act is abuse of power as is observed in the actions reported in the utterance (van Dijk, 2000; Sbisā, 1999) which express dominance by those in government.

UTT 5

Mr. Sunkuli: The police force is capable of dealing with all types of violence…the police are not partisan in dealing with political violence…There was no political violence in KANU zones…his area where polling stations were overran… members of the opposition were very notorious in overrunning the polling stations… I do not answer pompous questions. If somebody out of his own character calls me childish then I am not obliged to such pompous questions…If the honourable members of the opposition want a good answer then they must be courteous enough... He must withdraw the word "childish" or else I do not answer the question.   **(Hansard: 30th October 1996).**

In the utterance, the presupposition trigger used in the TC approach to examine it was the pronoun, 'there' and the definite article 'the'. These confirmed that:

a) A police force exists.
b) Police deal with violence.
c) Violence was experienced in the country.
d) KANU zones were peaceful.
e) There were elections.
f) The violence occurred during the elections.

The presupposition triggers in a TC approach assist to expose the discourse presupposition. This was done through the framing process that helped to point out the obvious ways to view groups or situations (Reisigl and Wodak, 2001). The frames used were:

NP: *The police force … violence …politics…. political violence… There… KANU zones… other areas… his… polling stations… the situations… they … the members … opposition,* VP: *is capable… dealing… related… are not … was … were... overran … deal with… were partisan… overrunning ....,* AdvP: *in… where… very notorious...,* PP: *of… with… in… with …*

The utterance confirmes that there was political violence in the country. It is assumed that the police have been partisan in dealing with the violence by participating in the punishment of innocent Kenyans. There was belief that in the past, some members had asked pompous questions. Palmer (2004) reiterates that presupposition is background belief relating to an utterance. The opposition members are impolite in the way they ask questions. By refusing to answer the question, the speaker confirms that he dominates and is not controlled by the opposition. He may or may not give a response and the opposition members will not force him to do it. Evasion is a common way of creating socio- political dominance (Dixon, 1994). The presupposition is not contestable and the speaker uses it to delegitimize the opposition for the chaos they caused in the polling stations.

UTT 6

Mr. Wako: The independence of the judiciary is ensured in the constitution of Kenya which gives judges the security to tenure and which therefore enables them to decide all cases before them impartially on the basis of facts and in occurrences with the laws…The members of the judiciary are under duty to decide cases without improper influences, inducement, pressure or threats or interferences…before the courts because such matters are *subjudice.*   **(Hansard: 10th April 1997).**

The presupposition trigger used in the TC approach is the definite article, 'the'. It is confirmed that:

a) There is a judiciary.
b) The judiciary is independent.
c) The constitution upholds this independence.
d) There is a constitution.
e) The government does not interfere with this independence.

The following frames are used in the analysis of presupposition in the utterance:

NP: *The government… Kenya… the independence… the judiciary… The constitution ... the laws ... their functions… judges… the security of tenure… them… cases ... basis ... facts…,* VP: *cherishes and upholds... protect…discharge… ensured… gives… enables …decide...,* PP: *of… to… before… on… with...,* AdvP: *... impartially…*

The frames were used in the speech: "When they come before the courts and the judiciary knows that and they actually discharge their function accordingly…Any person in this country should not comment on matters which are specifically before the courts because such matters are *subjudice."* The speaker assumes that everyone is aware that the matter is before a court of law. The speaker creates dominance by withholding information from the people. Having spoken the way he does, he cuts off any further debate by the other members and in so doing assists in the creation of socio- political dominance. In his position he has the power to prevent the debate from developing.

UTT 7

> Mr. Maore: So when the language is used that we all share the responsibility of bringing down the economy, I say no!... for the last several years is that very many people are getting rich from the DOD after supplying air.
> Mr. Angwenyi:Is the honourable member from some part of Meru in order to say that in the Department of Defence, they now pay one for supplying air? Have they ever paid him for air? **(Hansard: 15th April 1998).**

In this utterance, the presupposition trigger used in the TC approach is the first person plural pronoun, 'we'. The following truths about the proposition cannot be refuted:
 a) There is no activity.
b) The action demanded should be from the government side.
c) The government has been docile.
 d) Something is wrong.
 e) The wrong thing should be corrected.

The presupposition frames that assisted in the analysis of this utterance were:

NP: *We … them… the language… all…responsibility… economy… I… action… years … many people… the Department of Defence (DOD) … air,* PP: *from… of… down … for…,* VP: *want…from…is used … share … bringing… say… has been happening… is… …are getting … supplying...,* AdvP: *Today … for the last several years...,* AdvP: *very many people…rich…*

From these frames, it is presupposed that there is corruption in the government departments and that there has been change from original DOD that was upright. The current one is riddled with malpractice. This is also captured in the speech made by the speaker in government to counter the accusations made by the first speaker. Put in that way, there is intimidation of the first speaker especially when his home area is mentioned. This is followed by a battery of rhetorical questions in such a way that personalises the debate. This is intended to stop any further action from the opposing side. Intimidation here is a tool used to show dominance.

UTT 8

> Mr.Arap Kirui: I would like to indicate that I had in fact substantially answered this question the last time it came up. But for the benefit of those members who may not have been here, I will go over it again…the financial resources budgeted for the vast general elections held on December 29th and 30th 1997 was KE 158,210,695. Financial resources actually spent were however in this amount by an additional KE 10 million which is yet to be paid… **(Hansard: 22nd July 1999).**

From the statement in the utterance above: "I would … again…" the presupposition trigger used in the TC approach is the first person singular pronoun, 'I'. It is confirmed that:
a) The information is being repeated.
b) The same information had been said earlier.
 c) There are people who were not present when it was first mentioned.
 d) The information is very important and the speaker needs to say it again.
The frames were used in the following ways:
NP: *I... this question… the last time… benefit… those members… it ,* VP: *would like… indicate... answered …came up... may not have been… will go over…,* PP: *to... in... up... for... over…* AdvP: *substantially… here… again,* AdjP: *those members who may not have been here…*

Using the frames, when the speaker says:
"… I had in fact substantially answered this question the last time it came up. But for the benefit of those members who may not have been here, I will go over it again…" it is assumed that in this utterance, the information had been given to the members earlier. And that it was adequate. It is presupposed that some people were absent during the delivery of the same information earlier. The speaker states this with finality. He repeats his earlier statement and the amount used which is yet to be paid. Dominance is detected here as there would be no room to continue discussing the issue.

UTT 9

> Mr. Samoei:I am not aware that people in Turkana cannot meet the necessary conditions for the issuance of national identification card…While I admit that identification cards are a necessity to all Kenyans and that every effort should be made to make them as accessible as possible, areas like Lokichogio do present a problem to the government. This is a border district and we have to take extra care in the issuance of identification cards…We have a committee of elders who help in vetting to determine true Kenyans. **(Hansard: 18ᵗʰ October 2000).**

In this utterance, the presupposition trigger used is the conjunction of contrast 'while'. The speaker uses it at the beginning of the clause to introduce information which contrasts with 'that' in the main clause. It is confirmed that the problem is brought about by the issue of identity cards.

It is presupposed that the people of Turkana are being discriminated against. They are getting different treatment from the ones received by other Kenyans. It is presupposed that those areas are proving to be a security challenge for the government. The assumption is that the insecurity in the neighbouring countries is the one causing the Turkana people to be handled differently. The government's action of vetting the people to determine true Kenyans leads to the assumption that there are people who may not be Kenyans but want to be given Kenyan identification cards. The practice of treating others unfairly is an avenue for those in government to express their power and control over certain groups of people. After the complaint, it is presupposed that because of the speaker's assurance, the discrimination will not happen again.

From the following presupposition frames;

NP: *I… identification cards… a necessity … all Kenyans… every effort… them… areas... Lokichogio… a problem… the government… a border district … we… care … the issuance…,* PP: *While… to… like… in…,* VP: *admit… should be made... make… do present… is … have to take...,* AdvP: *as accessible as possible…,* AdjP: *every effort... border district… extra care… identification…,* the speaker creates dominance.

Using the frames above, it is presupposed that the Turkanas are being discriminated against when trying to get identity cards. They are getting different treatment from the ones received by other Kenyans. This brings about inequality among the citizens, which is an indication of one group dominating another. It is presupposed that those areas are proving to be a security challenge for the government since they are in the border between Kenya and other countries as indicated in the speech: "This is a border district and we have to take extra care in the issuance of identification cards." The assumption is that the insecurity in the neighbouring countries is the one causing the Turkana people to be handled differently. The government's action is captured in the statement: "…We have a committee of elders who help in vetting to determine true Kenyans…" one can also assume that there are people who may not be Kenyans but want to be given Kenyan identification cards. The practice of treating other people less fairly is an avenue for those in government to express their political dominance over certain groups of people. After the complaint, it is presupposed that because of the speaker's assurance, the discrimination will not happen again.

UTT 10

> Dr. Wamukoya: I did not hear the honourable member because there was an echo. Could the honourable Mr.Gatabaki kindly repeat his question for me to understand? I look older than the honourable member; I must have gone through better schools than him. **. . .** If the question had been put to me in the way Mr. Muriungi is putting it, I would have prepared a relevant answer… **(Hansard: 18ᵗʰ April 2001).**

In the speaker's last statement, the presupposition trigger used in the TC approach is the first person singular pronoun 'I'. It is confirmed that:

a) There was an echo in the room.

 b) This prevented the speaker from hearing the question well.

c) What was asked was incorrect.

d) The speaker and the questioner went to different schools.

When the following frames are used;

NP: *I … the member… an echo… Mr.Gatabaki… his question… me... schools …him.,* VP: *did not hear …was… Could… repeat… understand… deny…look … must have gone…,* PP: *for me to…through…,* AdvP*: kindly… Secondly… since…,* AdjP: *honourable… older… better …*

The presupposition is that the person who asked the question the first time was arrogant and did not do so in the right way.

By using the triggers and the frames, the speaker's dominance is expressed when he evades the question on account of the echo in the room, the framing of the question and the differences in the schools that they attended is a means of bringing out the socio- political status of the two groups, where the speaker's group dominates. The other questioner should be cowed because he apparently went through poor schools as opposed to the Assistant Minister.

UTT 11

> Mr. Nassir: I have never been a cashier in my life… Everybody in Kenya whether it is President Moi's daughter or son, a chief's son, a minister's son or even a member of parliament's son is free to operate a business in Kenya…I know that the rent has been paid…We have correctly and properly audited accounts... we do not run this government by relying on speculation because people usually say whatever they want. If the honourable member has any proof of these allegations, then they should table it. The issue is not to whom this building belongs. Even the head of this country has a right to own property. **(Hansard: 19th March 2002).**

The trigger used is the first person singular pronoun 'I'. It is confirmed that the speaker is not a cashier and that there are people who can engage in business activities. In this utterance, the assumption is that there are Kenyans who are given better treatment than others; they are exempted from paying rent just because they are related to prominent members in the society. This assumption points to corruption in some government institutions. When the speaker states: "Even the head of this country has a right to own property", the presupposition is that there are people who are contesting the fact that the president owns property. The meaning of the utterance is implicit in nature and the listeners presuppose this. Dominance is in the speaker's words which ensure that all the records are set and complete. His concluding remark leaves no room for more questions and the rest have to accept his explanations. The assumptions are used to state the issues as they are and that they should not be challenged. It is confirmed that:

a) The speaker is not a cashier.

b) He knows how a cheque looks like.

c) He can bring a cheque to the house.

d) Everyone is free to transact business in Kenya.

The presupposition triggers are further complimented by the following frames:

NP: *I… a cashier… my life… you… the cheques… we … them…. Everybody… Kenya… it… President … daughter… son….a chief's son…. a minister's son… a member of parliament's son… a business… Kenya,* VP: *have … been… want to see… can bring… is... free… operate…* PP: *to… in...,* AdvP: *never… next time…,* AdjP: *Moi's… chief's… minister's …. member of parliament's …*

In this utterance, the assumption is that there are Kenyans who are given better treatment than others that is; they are exempted from paying rent just because they are related to prominent members in the society. Some people do not pay rent on government institutions. When the speaker states: "Even the head of this country has a right to own property", the presupposition is that the president owns property. The meaning of the utterance is implicit in nature and the listeners presuppose this implication. Dominance is in the speaker's words which ensure that all the records are set and complete. His concluding remark leaves no room for more questions and the rest have to accept his explanations.

UTT 12

> Mr. Mwiraria: The Government's position is that the currency notes and coins bearing the portrait of former President Moi will continue to circulate as legal tender. Since we have two Presidents, I have assumed that the questioner has in mind the immediate past President… when we took over Government, we found that bank notes printed in 1978 bearing the portrait of the first President of the Republic of Kenya were still kept… we released them into circulation…we are completely at liberty to continue printing the late President Kenyatta's notes, if we so wish. **(Hansard: 23rd July 2003).**

In the statement the presupposition trigger used in the TC approach is the definite article, 'the'. It is confirmed that:

a) The government has taken a position on the issue of currency to be used.

 b) The currency is in the form of notes and coins.

c) There are two former presidents.

d) The currency with president Moi's portrait will continue to circulate.

e) New currency is being circulated with the portrait of the late President Kenyatta.

Since presupposition is identified as a set of assumptions (Foucault, 2002; Sbisā, 1999), it is assumed that the questioner is talking about the immediate past president. The following frames were used:

NP: *The Government's position… the currency notes and coins… the portrait … President Moi… tender. … we… notes… Republic of Kenya… the vaults … the Central Bank of Kenya… them… circulation…,* VP: *is … bearing… will continue…circulate… took… found… printed... bearing … were… kept… released…,* AdvP: *when… in 1978 …,* PP: *of … to… into…over…in…,* AdjP: *former…legal tender… first… bank notes…*

These frames were useful in analysing presupposition in the utterance. It is also assumed that people will understand why the new government preferred to use the late president Kenyatta's currency. It presupposes that the government's decision is the best for the country and that a lot of money would be saved in so doing. The idea of changing from one type of currency presentation to another because there has been change of guard is an indication that those in power at the moment enjoy that priviledge of deciding which currency type to circulate. This is confirmed when the speaker says that they will print the type that they want and the rest cannot do anything

about it. Socio-political dominance is created especially when there has been change in government and they decide to discard the currency with the portrait of the immediate former president and replaced it with that of the founding president. When the speaker says: "we are completely at liberty to continue printing the late President Kenyatta's notes, if we so wish." the speaker says that they can do whatever they want since they are the ones in power. Dominance is portrayed as the speaker is gloating, that is showing pleasure at his successes in an arrogant way.

UTT 13

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

In this utterance, the presupposition trigger used in the TC approach is the definite article, 'the'. It is confirmed that:

a) There is a government.
b) The government is involved in military exercises.
c) The government does not want to terminate the exercises.
 d) The exercises have negative impact on the local people.

UTT 13 assumes that the speaker has been kept in the dark on certain issues that is why he says that he is not aware. He further wanted to know if the Minister was aware that fifteen head of cattle were also killed during the incident. Mr. Ngoyoni wanted to know if the Government was going to compensate the victims and pay hospital bills. He also wanted further military exercises halted until the area is cleared of unexploded ordinance. Denial of the knowledge is in itself portrayal of dominance by a speaker. This is the speaker's way of peddling falsehoods, because from his response, it is clear that he is aware of the incident.

The frame in presupposition from the utterance include:

NP: *The Government… military exercises… Samburu range… land… military training…,* VP: *will not… halt… is… availed…,* AdvP: *pre- independent times,* AdjP: *government trust land ...* PP: *in… for… to…*

These frames were used in the analysis of presupposition. This speech creates the presupposition that the activities in the Samburu Range are military trainings and do not necessarily contribute to endangering the lives of the citizens. It is also presupposed that the government has had military training taking place in the region. The speaker implies that the military activities are more important than the safety of the local people. The arrogance of the speaker when he makes the statement: "The Government will not halt military exercises in Samburu range as it is government trust land availed for military training back to pre- independent times." is a confirmation of the socio – political dominance.

UTT 14

> Mr. Speaker: Order! Order, Dr. Godana! I think there are some Honourable Members who do not realise that it is a serious issue to be a Member of Parliament and let us take it seriously. So do not heckle one another!
> Dr. Godana: I am not surprised that those are NARC Backbenchers! They seem to be as indisciplined as the frontbenchers! **(Hansard: 22nd March 2005).**

In this utterance, the presupposition trigger used in the TC approach is first person singular pronoun 'I'. It is confirmed that:

a) There are members of who are not conducting themselves well.
b) They are honourable members of parliament.
c) Some of them do not take their roles seriously.
d) Some people are heckling others in parliament.

The frames used in this utterance are:

NP: *I … those…Backbenchers… They… frontbenchers!,* PP: *to…,* VP: *am… not surprised… are… seem… be… indisciplined...,* AdjP: *NARC Backbenchers…*

Through the frames above, it is presupposed that earlier on, NARC members must have also been involved in heckling just like their back benchers are doing. The utterance is an expression of the attitude of a person in a position of authority. In his castigation of the action of the opposition members, the speaker displays his political dominance over others.

UTT 15

> Mr. Kingi: I am not aware that the government's spokesman was escorted by a convoy of eight vehicles and motorcycle outriders during his visit to Kisumu on 4th April 2006. What is referred to as a convoy was, in fact transport for twenty four local and international journalist who had accompanied the public communications secretary or the government spokesman to a tour of projects in Kisumu. There was no extra expenditure in respect to the visit other than the normal routine expense by the District Security Intelligence Committee (DSIC)…
> **(Hansard: 13th June 2006).**

The assumption in UTT 15 is that a lot of money was used to transport the people involved. This was in

connection to Mr. Sungu's contribution on the Motion: Police Motorcycle Outriders for Government Spokesman during the Kisumu Visit. He wanted the Minister of State for Administration and National Security to explain why the spokesman was escorted by a convoy of eight vehicles and police motorcycle outriders and why it was necessary. The member also wanted to know how much money the Government spent during the Kisumu visit. In this utterance, the presupposition trigger used in the TC approach is the definite article, 'the'. It is confirmed that:

a) There is a spokesman.

b) The spokesman works for the government.

c) He is usually given escort during his state functions.

d) He recently toured Kisumu town.

 Several frames are used in the utterance. They include: NP: *the government spokesman…a convoy… eight vehicles and motorcycle outriders his visit… Kisumu…,*PP: *by… to…* VP: *was escorted…* AdvP: *during …* AdjP: *a convoy… motorcycle…*

It is presupposed that the spokesman was treated like the president: a charted plane and convoy of 8 vehicles escorted by 2 motorcycle outriders. From the response one can conclude that the money spent on this tour could have been used for other important issues but since the speaker wants to show dominance, he reacts as if there was nothing wrong in spending a lot of money in that way. Extravagance by the government is creating socio- political dominance.

UTT 16

> Mr. Ojode: You will remember that when I was moving it last week, I said that I wanted to appeal to the Government to take strategic steps, without victimising anybody, in order to address this very important issue…A casual glance at the Government records shows the disparities. Look at the office of the President's staffing. People from one particular region took charge of very good Ministries, very powerful Ministries, parastatals and departments. Ministries which are heavily funded are given to people from one particular region.
> **(Hansard: 12th September 2007)**

In this utterance, the presupposition trigger is the determiner, 'this' which is used to confirmed that this is a unique motion. The assumption is to draw the attention of the listeners to the importance of what he wants to say. It is presupposed that those who got the employment must have come from the president's region. It assumes that the government is in the tendency of punishing the people who are critical of its actions. The speaker gives the impression that other contributions were not as important as his. There is disparity in the government employment as it appears that some regions are favoured more than others.

When the speaker states: "very good Ministries, very powerful Ministries, parastatals and departments. Ministries which are heavily funded are given to people from one particular region…" it is presupposed that the 'good ministries' are the ones that are heavily funded and these are manned by people from one community. The utterance also assumes that every member knows the one particular community that he is talking about. The assumptions are made by the speaker to delegitimize the government.

In this utterance, the presupposition trigger used in the TC approach is the determiner, 'this'. It is confirmed that:

a) There are motions to be debated.

 b) This is a unique one.

c) It is a continuation of a similar one.

 d) It had been introduced earlier.

e) It is a lengthy one.

The presupposition frames used in the utterance include: NP: *important Motion... the office…the President's staffing…one particular region... charge… Ministries…parastatals… departments.* PP: *at… of… from …,* VP: *is… Look… took… are… funded… are given,* AdvP*: heavily funded… very,* AdjP: *good… powerful ...*

It is presupposed that those who got the employment must have come from President Kibaki's region. UTT 16 also assumes that the government is in the tendency of punishing the people who are critical of its actions. The speaker gives the impression that other contributions were not as important as his. There is disparity in the government employment. It appears that it favours some regions more than others.

When the speaker states: "very good Ministries, very powerful Ministries, parastatals and departments. Ministries which are heavily funded are given to people from one particular region…" This utterance assumes that the 'good ministries' are the ones that are heavily funded and these are manned by people from one community. The speaker's issue is nepotism. The utterance also assumes that every member knows the one particular community that he is talking about. This action by the government is a mark of dominance and having authority over the other people to do as it pleases.

UTT 17

> Mr. Ojode: What I was saying is that heavily funded Ministries are given to people from a particular region…
> If you look at the eight provinces, the Provincial Police Officers (PPOs), six are from one particular region…
> Mr. Maore: I think it is only fair when the mover is citing his examples, to be balanced. He should cite the examples of Kenya Commercial Bank (KCB), the Managing Director and the Chairman. He should also cite the Ministry of Planning and National Development when Prof. Anyang'- Nyong'o was the Minister. **(Hansard: 12ᵗʰ September 2007).**

In this utterance, the presupposition trigger used in the TC approach is the first person singular pronoun, 'I'. It is confirmed that:
a) The speaker is talking about something that is known.
b) There are ministries.
c) They receive funds.
d) The fund distribution is not the same.
e) Some receive more funds.
In UTT 17, frames used include: NP: *I … people…a particular region… disparity … we …. Some… the Ministries…* PP: *to… from…* VP: *was saying is… funded... are given … is… want... rationalise…* AdvP: *heavily funded…* AdjP: *a particular region…*

In the utterance it is presupposed that everyone knows where 'that particular region' is. When another speaker counters the first one by saying: "I think it is only fair when the mover is citing his examples, to be balanced…" he wants the former contributor to be sensible in his statements, it is presupposed that the latter is supportive of that region that has been mentioned or that he is a fair person and wants everyone to be treated impartially. From the accusation, it is evident that the government is using favouritism to control the people and the resources at its disposal.

UTT 18

> Mr. Musyoka: … I am aware that the prices of farm inputs and more so fertilizer, have shot up and that this poses a challenge to farmers in the current planting season… the Government has set aside Kshs 294 million from the 2KR Japanese Grant Counterpart Fund to assist farmers; who were adversely affected, with fertilizer and seed maize. The Government has given the National Cereals and Produce Board (NCPB) a credit line of Kshs 850 million to purchase fertilizer in order to stabilise the prices… His Excellency the President together with the Prime Minister- designate, will meet the people of the Rift Valley Province… assure the IDPs that they can now go back to their farms. These are the number one farmers. **(Hansard: 25ᵗʰ March 2008)**

In this utterance, the presupposition trigger is the first person singular pronoun 'I' and it confirms that the speaker is well informed about what is happening. In the utterance, the government is buying fertilizer as stated and it is assumed that buying this commodity from NCPB, is economical since the price of fertiliser will go down. It is assumed that giving the small scale farmers fertilizer and seeds will alleviate famine. Another assumption is that the fertilizer and seeds will be given to the farmers before the long rains so that they will have adequate time to plant. The statement makes one to presuppose that the IDPs are very good farmers as compared to others. And that they are living in deplorable camps with very poor infrastructure; they are being rained on in their temporary shelters. It is assumed that the price of fertilizer has gone up because of some occurrences in the country. The government has put into place several measures to assist the farmers. This gives the former an opportunity to have access to the resources needed to run the country. Such a chance may be manipulated to present the government as being concerned about the people.

In this utterance, the presupposition trigger used in the TC approach is the first person singular pronoun 'I'. It is confirmed that:
a) The speaker knows what is happening.
b) Farm input prices have gone up.
c) The farmers are bound to suffer because of this.
d) The farmers need help.
The frames used in this utterance aid in the examination of presupposition:
NP: *The Government… the National Cereals and Produce Board (NCPB)… a credit line… Kshs 850 million … fertilizer… the prices… the farmers… farmine and food shortage… Fund… affected… seed maize…*, VP: *has given…purchase... stabilise... assist … avoid… has set ... assist...were… affected…*, PP: *to ... in... aside ...from… with …,* AdvP: *adversely…,* AdjP: *imminent… the 2KR Japanese Grant Counterpart…*

In the utterance, the government is buying fertilizer as stated. There is presupposition as it is assumed that buying this commodity from NCPB, is economical since the price of fertiliser will go down. It is assumed that giving the small scale farmers fertilizer and seeds will alleviate famine. Another assumption is that the fertilizer and seeds will be given to the farmers before the long rains so that they will have adequate time to plant. The statement makes one to presuppose that the IDPs are very good farmers as compared to others. And that they are living in deplorable camps with very poor infrastructure; they are being rained on in their temporary shelters. It is

assumed that the price of fertilizer has gone up because of some occurrences in the country. The government has put into place several measures to assist the farmers. This gives the former an opportunity to have access to the resources needed to run the country. Such a chance may be manipulated to present the government as being concerned about the people. The government can use this chance to provide to those people that they choose.

UTT 19

> Mr. Kabando Wa Kabando: The disbursement of the fund has been and continues to be, done in accordance with the laid down procedures. The constituency component of the fund is disbursed by the community committees of which the area honourable member of parliament or his representative is a member…The fund releases money to the PCK, together with the details of the approved groups. The PCK branches then write cheques to groups…
>
> **(Hansard: 3ʳᵈ February, 2009).**

In UTT 19, the speaker also wanted to know the steps that the Minister would take to hasten the process of disbursement of the funds. The presupposition in the utterance: "The disbursement of the fund has been and continues to be, done in accordance with the laid down procedures…" In this utterance, the presupposition trigger used in the TC approach is the definite article, 'the'. It is confirmed that:

a) There are funds that were disbursed.
 b) The process is a continuous one.
c) There is a set procedure to be followed.

The following frames were used to enhance presupposition:

NP: *The constituency component… the fund… the community committees… the area honourable member of parliament... representative… a member…. an agreement … the Postal Corporation of Kenya (PCK)… Posta-Pay Product… process…. money … the details … groups…,* PP: *of... by… through… to ...,* VP: *is disbursed… is… has entered… quicken... releases…,* AdjP: *approved groups…*

These frames are used to analyse presupposition. This utterance was on the process the government used to disburse the funds. The procedure used was the correct one. The statement: "I think there was a question that needs to be addressed locally in that particular constituency. That is because every honourable member is a member of the constituency YEDF committee through his or her nominee." assumes that the MPs are familiar with the procedures. And that they are aware of their role in the YEDF committee. This explanation gives the speaker an upper edge therefore showing his political dominance over the others.

UTT 20

> Mr. Mbiuki:... this year we are planning to give seeds of all the legumes including maize and beans as we had done during the 2007/2008 … But it is not the responsibility of the ministry to mop up cotton in the industry…As I stand in this house my minister is camping at the treasury to ensure that the ministry of finance is able to provide us with more than kshs 2.1 billion so that we can start buying maize for this season…to rescue farmers whose adequate stocks of maize are rotting in their farms. **(Hansard: 3ʳᵈ March 2010).**

The debate was on: Non- Provision of free seeds/ Fertilizers to Nyatike District was captured as UTT 20. Mr. Anyanga asked the Minister for Agriculture whether he was aware that Nyatike was categorised as one of the hardship areas in Kenya and that the farmers in the district had not received free seeds or fertilizers. He wanted to know the measures that the minister was taking to provide these commodities.

In this utterance, the presupposition trigger used in the TC approach is the definite article, 'the'. It is confirmed that:

a) Seeds were given to farmers during the last season.
b) More seeds will be given during the current planting season.
c) Farmers benefit from these donations of the food crop seeds.
d) The donation will be enough for all the farmers in the region.
e) The cotton industry is not included.

The following frames reinforce the cognitive discourse approach to the study of presupposition in this utterance:

NP: *the crop seeds… I… the ones… the last planting season… we… legumes … maize and beans… (NAAIAP)… whereby… a package… the farmers… 253 farmers... the area … a wide range … drought resistant crops…,* VP: *have mentioned are … gave… are planning to give… including... had done were … give… benefitted…* PP: *to ... under… in… from…* AdjP: *able... drought resistant crops….*

The frames in UTT 20, contribute to presupposition where it is assumed that the government will keep its promise of providing the seeds for planting. It is also assumes that the area has more than 253 farmers. And if these farmers have the seeds to plant, then all the inhabitants will be catered for.

It is presupposed that the government is not giving its full support to the cotton farmers. It can only do part of the job and leave the rest to the millers. The assumption got from this speech: "my minister is camping at the treasury…" is that if the treasury gives the 2.1Billion to the ministry of agriculture, then enough seeds would be bought. The presupposition is that it is treasury that is responsible for the suffering of the farmers in this region, since it has not released any funds. It is also assumed that the former can be a saviour of the suffering farmers.

Such an utterance from the speaker creates an impression of dominance by those in leadership in the country.

6. Summary
This paper presents the backdrop of the study which is premised on the following research objectives; to discuss presupposition as a strategy used to create socio- political dominance in Kenyan parliamentary debates.

7. Findings
The research problem was that politically elected leaders use the immunity that they enjoy to manipulate language to create dominance. Members of parliament used explicit and implicit forms in order to coerce others to support, embrace or reject some people. Using language in this way created socio- political dominance. The study examined the language used by parliamentarians to see how this was used for dominance creation. The study had the following questions that were solved as indicated. The findings of this study are presented alongside the three research questions:

How is presupposition presented in language used by parliamentarians to create socio- political dominance?

It was found out that in their endeavour to create social political dominance the members of parliament in Kenya used the following presupposition.

Presupposition: the MPs presented their arguments as the truth that should not be subjected to question.

8. Conclusion
This study set to examine the language used by parliamentarians during debates to create socio- political dominance. The research revealed that between 1992 and 2010, the Kenyan Parliament turned very vibrant as members freely enjoyed the freedom of expression especially after the repeal of the section 2A of the then Kenyan Constitution. It was evident that the ideology that the members ascribed to had a great impact on the kind of language they used during debates. In the process they sometimes went overboard to create socio- political dominance. The strive for dominance brought about rigidity and members would try anything to influence the others to accept their opinions. Evidently, the government and the opposition were always on an antagonistic stance in their response to the questions. The members' contributions were mainly geared towards power control over the weaker side

References
Amos, J.A. (2013). *Body language and hierarchy or dominance*.

Angermüller, J. (2007). Research report: Major research centers in discourse analysis in France. *Forum Qualitative Social Research* 8 (2) pp 4.

Batstone, R. (1995). Grammar in discourse: Attitude and deniability. In G. Cook & B. Seidlhofer (eds). *Principle and practice in applied linguistics*. pp 197-213. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Bayley, P. (2004). The whys and wherefores of analysing parliamentary discourse. In Bayley, P. (Ed). *Cross-Cultural Perspectives on Parliamentary Discourse.*PP 1- 44. Amsterdam. John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Bekalu, (2007). Presupposition in news discourse. *Discourse and society. 17(12), PP 147 – 172*.

Brock-Utne, B., & Garbo, G. (2009). *Language and power: Implications of language for peace and development*. Dar es Salaam, Tanzania: Mkuki na Nyota Publishers Ltd.

Burr, V. (1995). *An Introduction to social constructionism*. London: Sage.

Charlebois, J. (2010). The discursive construction of feminities in the account of Japanese women. In *Discourse studies*. Vol. 12, PP 699. UK: Sage.

Chilton, P. (2004). *Analysing political discourse: Theory and practice*. London: Routledge.

Crystal, D. (1979). *A dictionary of linguistic phonetics*. (4th ed). Oxford: Blackwell.

Damico, J. S. Simmons- Mackie, N. & Hawley, H. (2005). Language and power. In Ball, M. J. (ed), *Clinical Sociolinguistics. PP 63- 73*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing Ltd.

Essed, P.J.M. (1991). *Understanding everyday racism: An interdisciplinary theory*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Fairclough, N. (1989). *Language and power*. London: Longman.

Fairclough, N. (1992). *Discourse and social change*. Cambridge: Polity Press.*Discourse as Social Interaction*. (pp. 258 – 284). London: Sage Publications.

Fairclough, L. & Fairclough, N. (2012). *Political, discourse analysis: A method for advanced students*. London and New York: Routledge.

Flynn, C. (2007). *Debating tutorial*. Ireland: Ardfinnan CO. Tipperray.

Foucault, M. (1980). *Power/ knowledge: Selected interviews and other writings (1972- 1977)*. Colin Gordon (ed) New York (NY): Pantheon Books.

Foucault, M. (2003). *Society must be defended*. New York (NY): Picador.

Fowler, R. (1985). Power. In van Dijk, T. A. (ed). *Handbook of discourse analysis. PP 61 – 82*. London: Academic

Press.

Gaventa, J. (2003). *Power after Lukes: A review of the literature*. Brighton: Institute of Development Studies.

Habwe, J. H. (2010). 'Dialogue drama in kenyan political speeches and pragmatic Implications.' In *Nordic journal of African studies* 19(3): 165 – 180.

Halliday, M. (1978). *Language as social semiotic*. London: Edward Arnold.

Hook, D. (2005). Genealogy, discourse effective history: Foucault and the work of critique. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*. 2(1) PP 3-31.

IIie, C. (2009). Argumentative functions of parentheticals in parliamentary debates. In Alvarez – Benito, G. Fernandez- Diaz, G. and Inigo - Moira, I. (Eds). *Discourse and Politics. New Castle: Cambridge Scholars Publishing PP 61 –79.*

IIie, C. (2010 c). Introduction: European parliaments under scrutiny: Discourse strategies and interaction practices. *In IIie, C. (ed) PP 1-28.*

Jakaza, E. (2013). *Appraisal and evaluation in zimbabwean parliamentary discourse and its representation in newspaper articles*. Unpblished Ph.D: Stellenbosch University.

Jorgen M. & Phillips L. (2002). *Discourse analysis as theory and method.* London: Sage.

Kitishat, A. R. (2014). Language and resistance. In Brian Friel's translations, *International journal of Linguistics and literature (IJLL)* vol. 3 issue 1 pp 1-8.

Kiwanuka, W.K. (2012). *Parliamentary debate in Uganda*. Uganda: Office of the clerk
to Ugandan Parliament.

Levinson, S.C. (1983). *Pragmatics.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Lincoln, S.Y. & Guba, E. G. (1985). *Naturalistic inquiry*. Newbury Park, London:
Sage Publications.

Lukes, S. (1986). *Power.* Oxford: Blackwell.

Lupton, D. (1992). 'Discourse analysis: A new methodology for understanding the ideologies of health and illness'. *Australian journal of public health* 16: 145-150.

Miles, M.B. & Huberman, M. A. (1994). *Qualitative data analysis*. London: Sage Publication.

Mill, J. S. (2008). *Language and sexism*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Nkui, P., Nyamongo, I. & Rjan, G. (2001). *Field research into social issues: Methodological guideline*. Washington, DC: UNESCO.

Nyewusira, V. & Nweke, K. (2012). *Party politics and democratic governance in Nigerian local government administration: The case of Rivers State (1999-2010).* Nigeria: River State University of Education.

Palmer, F.R. (2004). *Semantics* (2nd Ed), U.K. Cambridge University Press.

Pilkington, C. (1999). *The politics today companion to the British Constitution*. London:

Polyzou, A. (2014). *Presupposition (Ideological) knowledge management and gender: A socio- cognitive discourse analytical approach*. Unpublished PhD Thesis. Lancaster University.

Pratto, F., Sidanius, J. & Levin, S. (2006). Social dominance theory and the dynamics of intergroup relations: Taking stock and looking forward. *European review of social psychology, vol. 17, pp 271-320.*

Reisigl, M. & Wodak, R. (2001). *Discourse and discrimination*. London: Routledge.

Sbisā, M. (1999). Ideology and the persuasive use of presupposition. In Verschuenen (Ed). *Language and Ideology. Selected Papers From the 6th International Pragmatics Association Conference*. Vol. 1 PP 492-509. Antwerp: International Pragmatics Association.

Sperber, D. & Wilson, D. (1995). *Relevance: Communication and cognition*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Stalnaker, R. (1991). Propositions. In Jay L Garfield & Murray Kiteley (eds). *Meaning and truth: essential reading in modern semantics.* New York: Paragon House.

Stibbe, A. (2001). Language, power and the social construction of animals. *Society and Animals. 9:2 PP 145-161.*

Titscher, S.; Meyer, M.; Wodak, R. & Vetter, E. (1998). *Methods of text and discourse analysis*. London: Sage.

Tongco, D. C. (2007). Purposive sampling as a tool for informant selection , In *Journal of Plants, People and Applied Research: Ethno- botany Research and Applications* Vol. 5 pp 147-158.

Topan, M. (2014). *Word meanings and discourse: Religious. Ideological assumptions in same-sex marriage parliamentary debates*. PhD thesis summary.

Tuebert, W. (2010). *Meaning, discourse and society*. New York: Cambridge university press.

Uchenna, C. A. (2012). Power manifestation and manipulations in interactive discourses: Evidence from Ezikeoba elders' council. In *Research on Humanities and Social Sciences. Vol 2 No. 10*. Nigeria: University of Nigeria, Nsukka.

van Dijk, T.A. (1995). Esoteric discourse analysis. In *Discourse and society*. Vol. 6 pp 5-6.

van Dijk, T.A. (2003) "Critical discourse analysis". Chapter 18 In Deborah Schiffin, Deborah Tennen and Heidi E. Hamilton (eds). *The Handbook of Discourse Analysis, Wiley- Blackwell*: pp 352 - 371.

van Dijk, T.A. (2003). Knowledge in parliamentary debates. *In Journal of Language and Politics 2:1, PP 93 – 129.*

van Dijk, T.A. (2003). The discourse knowledge interface. In Weiss, G. and Wodak, R. (Eds). *Critical Discourse Analysis: Theory and Interdisciplinarity (PP 85 –109).* Houndmills: Palgrave Macmillan.

van Dijk, T.A. (2005). Contextual knowledge management in discourse production: A CDA perspective. In Wodak, R. and Chilton, P. (Eds). *A New Agenda in (Critical) Discourse Analysis: Theory Methodology and Interdisciplinarity. PP 71- 100.* Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

van Dijk, T.A. (2010). Political identities in parliamentary debates. In Llie, C. (Ed), *European Parliaments Under Scrutiny: Discourse Strategies and Interaction Practices. PP 29 – 56.* Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Wekiya, I. & Greenhill, R. (2004). *Turning off the taps: Donor conditionality and water privatisation in Dar es Salaam, Tanzania.* London: Action Aid International.

Widdowson, H. G. (2004). *Text, context, pretext: Critical issues in discourse analysis.* Malden: Blackwell Publishing Company.

Wodak, R. (2007). Pragmatics and critical discourse analysis: A cross- disciplinary inquiry. *Pragmatics and Cognition.* Vol 15 PP 203- 225.

Wodak, R. & van Dijk, T.A. (2000). *Racism at the top.* Klagenfurt: Drava Verlag.

Wrong, D. H. (1979). *Power. Its form, bases and use.* Oxford: Blackwell.

Yasemin, I. (2010). *The concept of hate crimes, hate speech and combating hate crimes.* Second Conference Paper Ankara- Turkey.