

# THE INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF HUMANITIES & SOCIAL STUDIES

## A Rhetorical Analysis of the Presidential Election Campaign Discourse in Zambia

Clare Mwiinga

Lecturer Department of Literature and Languages, Chalimbana University, Zambia

Dr. John Simwinga

Lecturer, Department of Literature and Languages, University of Zambia, Zambia

### **Abstract:**

*This study explores the political discourse of the presidential elections in Zambia with a view to establishing the rhetorical strategies of this discourse. The study is informed by the Systemic Functional Grammar (SFG) analytical framework. The main research objective that the study addresses relates to how rhetorical strategies are achieved in political discourse by employing certain rhetorical devices and how they are exploited by politicians to achieve their intentions and ambitions.*

*Given the type of data that were collected, a qualitative content analysis approach was employed for analysis. The recordings of the discourse by the candidate under investigation that were held between 11<sup>th</sup> May and 10<sup>th</sup> August 2016, were collected from the different media houses in video form and were then transcribed verbatim. Thereafter, excerpts were selected from the discourse at random and analysed by applying content analysis using the inductive model.*

*The results of the study indicate that politicians make use of personal pronouns and other syntactic elements which include nominalization, parallelism, passivation, modality, cohesivation and unification as rhetorical devices to highlight their political will, nerve and confidence through their campaign message thereby achieving persuasion in their campaigns.*

*The study concludes that the political candidate under study made use of personal pronouns together with modal verbs and other syntactic features as rhetorical devices in campaign messages to achieve persuasion. Furthermore, politicians lean on the extremely polarised view of us versus them, by presenting themselves positively and their opponents negatively.*

**Keywords:** *Discursive, election, othering, polarisation, political rhetoric, rhetorical devices, Systemic Functional Grammar, Us versus Them*

### **1. Introduction**

Language is considered as a purely human and non-instinctive method of expressing feelings and yearnings by way of a system of freely produced symbols (Sapir, 1939). The noticeable role of language in the life of every human being and the society as a whole cannot be under-estimated or over emphasised. This is because language is used as a medium of serenity, persuasion and advancement on one hand and a medium of uproar, disorder and retrogression on another hand. The present study focuses on a significant form of political discourse, the election campaigns. The term politics is from Greek: πολιτικός politikos, which denotes "of, for, or relating to citizens," in the course of making decisions pertaining to all members of each group (James, 2014). In a narrow way, the concept designates to accomplishing and exercising positions of governance, that is, organised control over a human community, especially a state. Furthermore, politics is the practice of the dispersion of power and resources within a given community as well as the interrelationship(s) between communities (James, 2014).

Essentially, the study analyses political discourse. Johnson and Johnson (2000) explain political discourse analysis as the arena of discourse analysis which centres on discourse in political forums such as debates, speeches, and hearings as the phenomenon of interest.

The main objective of the present study is to analyse rhetorical strategies in presidential campaign discourse in Zambia, and the study makes use of SFG as the framework guiding the study.

Since the introduction of multi-party politics in Zambia in 1991, several political parties have been competing for political power. In Zambia, general elections are held every five years. These elections are preceded by rigorous political campaigns by different political parties characterised by all sorts of language as politicians solicit for votes. What matters in order to be understood during these campaigns, is not what politicians say, but rather how they present what they say. During the run up to the August 11, 2016 elections, there were nine presidential candidates who were vying for presidency. However, the race was between two leading contenders - Hakainde Hichilema for the United Party for National Development (UPND) and Edgar Lungu for the Patriotic Front (PF). The study focuses on one of the two main contenders –

Mr Hakainde Hichilema. In order to woo support of the Zambian people, these the candidate under study employed certain strategies during his campaigns to win support of the electorate.

The present study examines the campaign discourse of one of the leading presidential candidates by critically analysing the rhetorical devices he employed in his campaign messages. This investigation is with a view to establishing the rhetorical strategies engaged by the presidential candidate under examination in an effort to woo support of the electorate.

## 2. The Problem

Politicians' discourse is replete with many constructions at different stages just like other discourse genres. Political campaigns are therefore associated with certain rhetorical devices that carry with them particular images that are invoked by the politicians' diction during campaigns. However, there has not been any known exhaustive and representative study on the Zambian political campaign discourse, particularly with a focus on the naturally occurring verbal discourse in political rhetoric. Therefore, the rhetorical devices employed by politicians to achieve persuasion in political discourse in Zambia are not known.

It is against this background that the study investigated rhetorical devices employed in the discourse of the presidential campaigns in order to evoke unconscious images and emotions in the audience with a view to achieving persuasion.

## 3. Purpose of the Study

The main objective of the study was to analyse rhetorical devices in order to establish the rhetorical strategies in the presidential campaign discourse. Specifically, the objectives of the study were to:

- analyse the rhetorical devices used in the political campaign discourse of the political candidate under investigation.
- examine the rhetorical function of certain linguistic units in the political campaign discourse of the political candidate under examination.
- establish the rhetorical significance of certain syntactic features in the political campaign discourse of the political candidate under investigation.

### 3.1. Research Questions

- What rhetorical devices are used in the political campaign discourse of the political candidate under investigation?
- What is the rhetorical function of certain linguistic units in the campaign discourse of the political candidate under examination?
- What is the rhetorical significance of certain syntactic features in the campaign discourse of the political candidate under investigation?

## 4. Analytical Framework

In order to adequately analyse the discourse of the presidential candidate under examination, the study made use of the Systemic Functional Grammar (SFG) analytical framework as its guide. SFG is a functionally based theory, which examines the function that language has evolved to serve in society (Halliday & Matthiessen, 2004).

SFG framework is a form of grammatical description originated by Michael Halliday. SFG is a functionally based theory which scrutinises the functions that language has evolved to serve in society. Chapell (2013) submits that SFG is a grammar based on the view that language is a system for making meaning. He further posits that *systemic* refers to the fact that when we use language, we make choices from sets of available options. *Functional* assumes that every time we make a choice from the available options, we are doing so in order to fulfil a communicative purpose. Chapell further posits that *grammar* simply refers to the fact that there is an overall organisation to all of these possible options.

SFG put forward by Halliday (Halliday 1994; Halliday & Matthiessen 2004), pays huge consideration to how the speakers create utterances and texts to carry out their intended meanings.

This view involves the analysis of real language events to understand purposes language serves in a variety of contexts, and to understand the way language itself functions. Systemic Functional Linguists, then, study how meanings are made in different contexts.

The SFG framework was used to analyse the campaign speeches of the candidate under study on the basis of his skilful political rhetoric and oratory thereby establishing the rhetorical strategies in his campaign message. The analysis was done by identifying the rhetorical devices exploited by the presidential candidate under examination and bringing out the rhetorical functions of the discursive practices the candidate employed. Rhetorical devices are aspects of SFG.

## 5. Literature Review

Studies on political discourse include the use of euphemisms and metaphors in political campaigns (Mihas, 2005), the syntactic and semantic properties of "Yes we can" (Bista, 2009), the use of hedging in political discourse (Fraser, 2010) as well as on the rhetoric of presidential election campaigns (Kangira, 2005). Van Dijk (2006) brings out some of the crucial socio-cognitive practices fundamental to the creation and understanding of ideological discourse. In his later study, he surveyed some general properties of ideologies as forms of social perception and their associations to political text and

talk (van Dijk, 2008). Macclay (2017) reveals the ways in which reality is constructed through representations of social actors; while Korhonen (2017) performed an analysis of how language is used to advance political goals.

Machira (2014) applied descriptive methods of CDA to critically analyse the rhetorical devices and strategies in the presidential campaign discourse of April 4, 2013 elections in Kenya. He demonstrates that language is a formidable tool that politicians employ to communicate policies and ideological positions as well as to create certain insights in order to influence and manipulate the votes with a view to gaining an advantage over their opponents. Like Machira's, the present study also critically analysed the rhetorical devices and strategies in the 2016 political discourse.

In a study in America, Kazemian and Hashemi (2014) analysed Barack Obama's 2012 Speeches in the light of Halliday's Ideational Grammatical Metaphor, Rhetoric and Critical Discourse Analysis. The results indicate that there are certain rhetorical devices that dominated Obama's speeches. There is some antithesis, expletive devices as well as passive voices in these texts. The present study also examined rhetorical devices in the political campaign discourse.

With regards to polarisation, Wirth-Koliba (2016) demonstrates that the 'us' and 'them' relationship is constantly present in politics, therefore different means of constructing such relations are needed. The study dealt with 'us' and 'them' constructions from a pragma-cognitive perspective. The results of the study revealed that the means by which these relations are structured depend on the speaker's intentions in the discourse, which in turn determine the way the 'us' and 'them' are presented. The present study identified instances of *us / them* expressions of positive in-group representations and negative out-group representations respectively in the discourse of the two candidates and analysed how they were used as rhetorical devices.

On the other hand, Korhonen (2017) performed an analysis of how Donald Trump used language to advance his political goals and called it the rhetoric of blame and bluster. The results reveal that Trump's rhetoric was highly effective. The study concludes that from his rhetoric, Trump thrives when he had someone to blame: An adversary or opponent of some kind that he could use to contrast his ideology to, as well as accuse of foul play and divert attention to whenever he himself is being criticised. Korhonen's study is related to the present one in that the present study endeavoured to reveal how the political candidates managed to woo support for themselves and of the electorates by employing polarised views.

Furthermore, Kondowe (2014) performed a transitivity analysis of Bingu wa Mutharika's inaugural address by focusing on how he manipulated language in his second inaugural address to enhance his political ideologies, by using Halliday's transitivity system as a theoretical framework. The speech foregrounds Bingu as a leader with autocratic and dictatorship leadership ideologies and concludes that such leadership characteristics could be possible reasons that led to his political downfall in his second term. Like Kondowe's, the present study applies a transitivity analysis to the discourse of the two presidential candidates under study with a view to showing how they manipulated language in their campaigns to enhance their political ambitions.

In a study on the use of language and political rhetoric, Rozina and Karapetjana (2009) submitted that the linguistic manipulation can be considered as an influential instrument of political rhetoric. The study was devoted to exploring allusion, metonymy and metaphor - the linguistic devices used in rhetoric. However, the study took a narrow focus of linguistic manipulation which is just a part of political rhetoric and therefore the justification of the present study.

Further, in a study of Polish and American political discourse, Kuzio (2013) investigated frames of self-presentation in constructing persuasive messages. The study concluded that political speech presents persuasive techniques used by Jarosław Kaczyński and Newton Gingrich to create a positive image and convince people to their points of view. Like Kuzio's, the present study analysed how the political candidate under study manipulated language to create a positive image of himself in order to convince the electorate of his point of view.

## 6. Methodology

The study employed a non-experimental descriptive analytical approach in which discourses from several presidential campaign rallies were examined and it informed by the qualitative research method. The corpus of the study consisted of the discourse from one of the leading presidential contenders of 2016 general elections in Zambia, who was selected purposefully. The data that were considered are the campaign messages that were presented to the electorate during campaign rallies, selected at random. These data were collected from the Zambia National Broadcasting Corporation and Muvi TV.

The study is essentially a qualitative content analysis and the instrument of research was the researcher herself. The discourse was obtained by getting the recordings of the different campaign rallies conducted across the country between 11<sup>th</sup> May and 10<sup>th</sup> August 2016. Then excerpts were selected at random, transcribed verbatim and then analysed. In applying the content analysis, the steps of analysis by Creswell (2009) were followed. The data was read through and a detailed analysis was conducted. Then a description of the themes was generated making interpretations or meaning of the data.

In addition, the study employed the SFG analytical framework at the level of diction or word choice, grammar, semantics and pragmatics in the analysis.

## 7. Results and Analysis

The study analyses the rhetorical devices that were employed by the presidential candidate under investigation in his election campaign discourse. The rhetorical devices that were analysed include nominalization, parallelism, antithesis and expletive, unification and cohesivation, and modality and passivation.

### 7.1. Nominalisation in Political Discourse

The section below presents one of the rhetorical devices, nominalization, by showing how it was expressed in the 2016 presidential campaign discourse by candidate the candidate under investigation. Nominalization is a key lexicogrammatical characteristic of most languages.

#### 7.1.1. Excerpt 1

..... *We will increase farmer support in both input provision and reduce the unit cost of production. .... What farmers need is a robust extension service system so that they can produce more by improving their management of fields. .... We will also help farmers diversify their crop to produce other foods and grow produce for neighbouring countries.*

The speaker employed Ideational Grammatical Metaphor (IGM) in the above excerpt. In giving a promise to reduce the price of mealie meal he employs nominalization as follows: The processes *to support*, *to provide* and *to produce* are rendered in entities. As Simon-Vandenberg et al. (2003) avow, nominalization is a special technique which can be employed to symbolise the processes as things rather than actual happenings. The speaker makes use of long sentences with noun phrases to compact more information in a clause. Another consequence of this IGM is the fact that some fundamental aspects of the process and some information is left unspecified through the use of the passive voice. In the excerpt, the speaker uses the first-person plural pronoun *we*, which could be understood as him and his administration and uses it to promise good agricultural policies to the farmers for better yields. The expression acts as a rhetorical strategy because in the process the message appeals positively to the audience which makes them to be easily persuaded. The speaker goes on to elaborating how farm produce could improve per hectare using the same inputs by indicating that farmers need a *robust extension service..... management of their fields*. The speaker makes use of the first-person plural pronoun *we* that farmers will be helped to diversify crops and *grow produce* for neighbouring countries. As presented here, through nominalization, a fundamental proposition consisting of a subject, verb and an object can be turned into a much simpler entity or a noun phrase (Simon-Vandenberg et al. 2003). Halliday and Webster (2009) draw our attention to the fact that IGMs habitually take place in circumstances, where every constituent has undergone a metaphoric shift.

The speaker ends with a further promise to the farmers to produce surplus foodstuffs using the same combination of the first-person plural pronoun *we* and the modal auxiliary verb *will*. The utterance, *we will also help farmers diversify their crop to produce other foods and grow produce for neighbouring countries*, gives the position and commitment of the speaker and his party to bringing to pass his promises to the people in the sentence. Ultimately, the two rhetorical devices; nominalization and modality give hope to the audience since agriculture is one of the backbones of the nation's economy. The speaker most likely won the hearts of the electorate and gained popularity.

These arguments are supported by Michira (2014) who demonstrates that language is a formidable tool that politicians employ to communicate policies and ideological positions as well as to create certain insights in order to influence and manipulate the votes with a view to gaining an advantage over their opponents. These views are also supported by Bista (2009), that in political discourse, personal pronouns together with modal verbs, supposedly, highlights the political will, nerve and confidence in addressing an audience in an endeavour to inspire and motivate them along the tangents of advancement and prosperity.

These views are further supported by SFG in that it is concerned with the propositional meanings and functions of syntactic elements and that it can attest representations which are said to signal bias, manipulation and ideology in discourse (Fowler, 1991). In the excerpt, the speaker chooses how to present his message from the available options by making use of transitivity. He achieves this view by changing processes into entities by employing nominalization in which processes such as *to produce* and *to manage* are changed into entities *production* and *field management* respectively. The choice made by the speaker here helps to create mental images in the minds of the audience giving the real meaning of what the speaker wanted to convey to the audience.

The analysis is also supported by Systemic Functional Grammar (SFG) the analytical framework guiding this study regarding the ideology and power relations in political discourse. SFG is a grammar based on the view that language is a system for making meaning and that when people use language, they make choices from sets of available options. Every time people make choices from the available options, they do so in order to fulfil a communicative purpose and that there is an overall organisation to all of these possible options (Chapell, 2013). The speaker in this case selected the language carefully from the many options by employing rhetorical devices to bring out the meaning of what he wanted to deliver to the audience, in this case taking development to the area. In this way the speaker applies transitivity in that he makes choice of the available options to talking about *developmental programmes* and *living standards* using entities as opposed to presenting them as processes. This presentation helps the speaker convey the meaning in a clause to the audience in a clear manner.

### 7.2. Parallelism in Political Discourse

This section analyses how the presidential candidate under examination exploited parallel structure in his discourse during political campaigns. The Candidate exploits parallelism as a rhetorical device by making use of the first-person pronoun *I* and the modal verb *will* as shown in the excerpt below.

#### 7.2.1. Excerpt 2

*I lived in a grass thatched house. I went to school first three years without shoes, I understand what your children are going through, I understand what you are going through. I went to university on the government bursary and the government is you. When you elect me into presidency, I will make sure that the children of Zambia will receive the best investment and it*

*is no other than education. Whether a child is an orphan or vulnerable I will take them to school to their best intellectual abilities free of charge in the bursary.*

The candidate employs parallelism in the first four sentences by making use of a series of pronouns, verbs and nouns as he empathises with the audience, *I lived in a grass thatched house..... I went to school first three years without shoes... I understand what you are going through....* The speaker's position was reflected in the pronoun *I*, which brought him to the level of the people he was addressing. As expressed in the text, parallelism is re-occurrence of syntactical and lexical resemblance and is employed across or inside sentences or even inside clauses and phrases (Cuddon, 2012).

In the last two sentences the speaker links the earlier expressions to the focus of the campaign message by presenting cause and effect thereby attempting to take paramount importance of issues in the audience's account. The employment of these pronouns, verbs and nouns, in addition to the above properties, is highly persuasive. In this case, they symbolise a sense of emotional, intellectual or sensory pressure on the part of the audience.

Furthermore, the meaning of these expressions, which is contained in the first-person pronoun *I*, in *I lived...* and *I went...* presented the candidate as a human being as well, with feelings, giving an assurance that he would take care of the needs of the people once elected president. It also gives the message authenticity. The speaker then made an assurance that, *I understand what your children are going through....* basing on the experience he has had early in his life. The pronoun *I* and the genitive *your* makes the message authentic and combines very well with the speaker's discourse, as he addresses the audience directly by *your*, showing empathy to them. In turn, these linguistic units appeal to the electorate as persuasive devices presenting him as a better candidate than his opponents.

The speaker then turns around to delivering his promises after empathising with the people regarding their situation. He expressed his intentions through the pronoun *I* and the modal verb *will*. He promises, *when you elect me into presidency, I will make sure that the children of Zambia will receive the best investment and it is no other than education.* This self-glorification is intended to let people have confidence and trust in him and elect him president. The syntactic elements used here give the message authenticity and the audience receive it with the seriousness it deserves thereby believing in what the candidate was saying. This gives the speaker more power and support from the electorate. The power of the pronoun expressed through parallel structure, turns out to be persuasive to convincing the audience thereby achieving the objective of winning votes on the part of the candidate.

These findings are supported by Kuzio (2013) that political speech presents persuasive techniques used by politicians to create a positive image about themselves and convince people to their points of view. The conclusions also tend to agree with Rozina and Karapetjana (2009) on the use of language and political rhetoric, that the linguistic manipulation can be considered as an influential instrument of political rhetoric.

### *7.3. Unification and Cohesivation Strategy in Political Discourse*

This section analyses how the unification and cohesivation strategy was employed by the political candidate under study. It endeavours to analyse the context of the power in the pronoun by showing how it is a unifying and cohesive device as presented in political discourse.

In the excerpt below, the candidate under examination makes use of the unification and cohesivation rhetorical device by employing the first-person plural pronoun *we* and the modal verb *will* to speak on the security of the citizens.

#### 7.3.1. Excerpt 3

*.... We are taking over Government to ensure that Zambians can enjoy their rights.... We need to fight corruption to the bitter end, it has made us poor and I am telling you now, anyone who is corrupt will face the law. Corruption is a cancer that needs to be aggressively tackled.*

The speaker was talking about good governance indicating how he would make sure he protects the citizens in order for them to enjoy freedom during his reign. He began by employing positive *us* presentation by presenting himself as better than his opponents. He posits, *we are taking over Government to ensure that Zambians can enjoy their rights*, his commitment being expressed by the first-person plural pronoun *we* and the auxiliary verb *are* to ensure citizens enjoy their freedom. The *we* in this utterance is exclusive referring to the speaker and his administration, while the *their* is inclusive referring to all the audience. The continues with the use of the same first-person plural pronoun *we* and the auxiliary verb *are* to promising a better Zambia which would be free of corruption and drug abuse. As Fairclough (1989) avows, there are generally two types of *we* pronouns, namely, inclusive *we*, which includes the audience as well as the speaker, and exclusive *we*, which refers to the speaker or writer plus one or more others, but does not incorporate the addressee(s). The candidate here exploits these two types of pronouns to his advantage through unification and cohesivation strategy.

The speaker reiterates the fight against corruption as a do or die action by making use of the first-person pronoun *I* and the modal verb *will* to reveal this determination. He assures, *I am telling you now, anyone who is corrupt will face the law.* These elements give power to the message to the conviction of the audience. The speaker ends by making use of the figurative expression that *Corruption is a cancer that needs to be aggressively tackled.* The metaphor *corruption is a cancer* implies that corruption is a bad vice which if not forcefully controlled would end up deteriorating the economy of the nation. Hence the need to *aggressively tackle* it for the good of the citizens and the nation at large. The campaign message and objective of the speaker are achieved through the first-person pronoun *I* and the modal auxiliary verb *will* and through these linguistic units the electorate could be persuaded into believing in the candidate.

All these promises are articulated clearly and persuasively by careful and skilful combination of the suitable linguistic units to drive home meaning and to denote solidarity with the speaker's party and the audience (Fairclough, 1989). These promises are realised through the use of unification and cohesivation device and are so influential that the candidate may have convinced the electorate into voting for him.

The findings are also supported by Kazemiam and Hashemi (2014) who submitted that politicians employ certain rhetorical devices in their political speeches. These rhetorical devices include antithesis, expletive devices employed with the aim of persuading the audience.

#### 7.4. Modality and Passivation in Political Discourse

The candidate under investigation made use of modality and passivation in his campaign discourse as rhetorical devices. He exploited modal verbs and the passive voice to achieve persuasion in his discourse. This perspective is presented in the excerpt below.

##### 7.4.1. Excerpt 4

... *We will fix it. Tukalungisha. Tukakontrolola..... We plan to start with job creation and employment. From the first day in office, our Government will help Zambian companies to create jobs, by ensuring we start manufacturing most of the things we import. Isn't it an embarrassment that we are importing toothpicks? Are you telling me we can fail to make toothpicks? We will promote investment, trade and economic growth, diversifying the economy and investing in under-developed sectors with huge potential for job and wealth creation such as tourism.*

The speaker begins by referring to the ten-point plan and quickly recites the slogan, *we will fix it. Tukalungisha 'we will fix'. Tukakontrolola 'we will control'...*

The modal verb *will* is employed several times in the discourse and *can* is applied in few instances in the above excerpt. These modal verbs are expressing strong conviction based on deduction or inference from evidence. They display obligation, that is, authority's attitude obliges them to do so. Obligation can be thought of as an inevitable duty or requirement, realised by *will* and can have the force of a direct command. This force grows out of the fact that in definite cultural contexts, the speaker has authority over the audience, and the speaker takes the responsibility for the action being conducted. Fairclough (1989) avows that modality is concerned with speaker or writer authority as well. There are two aspects to modality, depending on what direction authority is focused on. Primarily, the status of the authority of one person pertinent to others, relational modality is engaged. Secondly, when a matter of the speaker or writer's authority in regard to the truth or possibility of a depiction of reality is presented, expressive modality is employed (Fairclough, 1989; Downing & Locke, 2006).

The speaker further ridicules his opponents through negative *other* presentation and passivation, *isn't it an embarrassment that we are importing toothpicks?* The speaker turns the process *to embarrass* into an entity *embarrassment*. He further reiterates this point by employing the modal *can* though in a negative way, *are you telling me we can fail to make toothpicks?* This expression in a way implies that as Zambians we can make toothpicks and it presents the party that was in government negatively that they were not even able to make toothpicks. The electorate can easily lose confidence in such a candidate. The use of the modal *can* therefore, is a powerful strategy for winning the hearts of the electorate.

The speaker further expresses power of discourse through self-glorification employing passivation. He itemises the *promotion of investment, trade and economic growth, diversifying the economy and investing in under-developed sectors* as part of their ten-point plan turning the processes of *promoting* and *investing* into entities. To ensure their philosophy is understood and appreciated by the electorate, the speaker makes use of the modal *will* to show his commitment to uplifting the condition of women and the youths. The combination of modality and passivation by use of *will* and investment shows the concern the speaker has for the audience. This power through discourse which brings out the party's philosophy in turn wins the hearts of the electorate and the candidate could be assured of getting votes from the citizens.

In this excerpt, the speaker employs a number of modal verbs. The high percentage of the application of modal verbs is appropriate to the communication since the discourses are delivered in spoken form. As Renkema (2009) submits, modality is the semantic category principally related to the expression of alternative opinions and attitudes and is the means by which a speaker's stance towards what they are speaking is expressed. In contrast to other verbs, modal auxiliaries are more readily identified and then acknowledged, due to the fact that, at the time of listening to the discourse, the audience has no time to think over certain issues.

This analysis confirms Muqit's argument that ideology and power relation can be expressed through some linguistic units. Such linguistic units in the discourse include *tuka kontrolola 'we will control', tukalungisha 'we will fix', attack, strong, embarrassment* and others, which the speaker expresses through lexicalisation. These linguistic units are presented by making use of modality and passivation. These two linguistic devices, modality and passivation help the candidate to achieve his objective. SFG put forward by Halliday (Halliday 1994; Halliday & Matthiessen 2004), pays huge consideration to how the speakers create utterances and texts to carry out their intended meanings. SFG studies how meanings are made in different contexts as demonstrated in the above excerpt through the use of modality and passivation.

These conclusions are also in line with Kazemiam and Hashemi (2014) who posit that in political discourse, multiple linguistic and rhetorical strategies are exploited for the efficiency of the speeches. The tendency and priority to

apply more nominalization, passivation and modal verbs by the political orator in political speeches are the vital reasons for making his language powerful, impressive, persuasive and ambiguous as well.

## 8. Conclusion

The analysis reveals that the rhetorical devices that were presented in the political campaign discourse of the presidential candidate under study include nominalization, passivation, parallelism, modality and cohesivation. These devices were expressed through use of the pronouns *I*, *we*, and *they* together with the modal verb *will* and to some extent the form of the verb *be*.

The study concludes that when campaigning, politicians make use of rhetorical devices as persuasiveness properties to improve the effectiveness, clarity, and beauty of the speeches. They also find modal auxiliary verbs and pronouns very useful persuasive strategies to employ in an attempt to passionately conduct the campaign message of their party to the electorate. The analysis also shows that politicians employ polarisation by use of the pronouns expressing positive *us* presentation and negative *them* presentation.

## 9. Recommendations

The study recommends that a further study be conducted in which the general public, that is, senior government officials, the ordinary Zambians and the media to be included in the study to see how they collectively or individually contribute to rhetorical analysis in politics.

## 10. References

- i. Bista, K. (2009). "On 'Yes, We Can': Linguistic power and possibility." *Journal of English for Specific Purpose* 3.24: pgs. 34- 50.
- ii. Chappell, S. (2013). *An Introduction to Systemic Functional Grammar*. London and New York: Routledge.
- iii. Cuddon, J. A. (2012). *A Dictionary of literary terms and literary theory*, (5th ed.) London: Penguin Books.
- iv. Fairclough, N. (1995). *Critical Discourse Analysis: The critical study of language*. New York: Longman.
- v. Fairclough, N. (2006). *Language and Globalization*. London and New York: Routledge.
- vi. Fairclough, N. and R. Wodak, (1997). *Critical Discourse Analysis*. London: Sage.
- vii. Fowler, R. (1991). *Language in the News: Discourse and Ideology in the Press*. London: Routledge.
- viii. Fraser, B. (2010). Hedging in political discourse: The Bush 2007 press conferences. In U. Okulska & P. Cap (Eds.), *Perspectives in politics and discourse* (pp. 201- 213). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- ix. Halliday, M., and C. Matthiessen. (2004). *An Introduction to Functional Grammar* (3<sup>rd</sup> Edition), London: Arnold.
- x. Halliday, M. A. K., & Webster, J. J. (2009). *Continuum Companion to Systemic Functional Linguistics*. London: Continuum.
- xi. James, P. (2014). Globalization and Politics, Vol. 4: *Political Philosophies of the Global*. London: Sage Publications. pp. x. Retrieved 2016-02-19.
- xii. Johnson, D.W. & Johnson, R.T. (2000). Civil political discourse in democracy. The contribution of psychology. Retrieved on 20th May, 2013 from [www.cooperation.org/pages/contro-pol.html](http://www.cooperation.org/pages/contro-pol.html).
- xiii. Kangira, J. (2005). *A Study of the Rhetoric of the 2002 Presidential Election Campaign in Zimbabwe*. PhD Thesis. Cape Town: University of Cape Town.
- xiv. Kazemiam, B. and Hashemi, S. (2014). Critical Discourse Analysis of Barack Obama's 2012 Speeches: Views from Systemic Functional Linguistics and Rhetoric. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, Vol. 4, No. 6, pp. 1178-1187, June 2014 doi:10.4304/tpls.4.6.1178-1187
- xv. Kondowe, W. (2014). Presidents and Ideologies: A Transitivity Analysis of Bingu wa Mutharika's Inaugural Address. *International Journal of Language and Linguistics*. Vol. 2, No. 3, pp. 174-180. doi: 10.11648/j.ijll.20140203.16
- xvi. Korhonen, S (2017). *The Rhetoric of Blame and Bluster: An Analysis of How Donald Trump Uses Language to Advance His Political Goals*. University of Oulu
- xvii. Kuzio, A. (2013). Frames of Self-presentation in Constructing Persuasive Messages: A study of Polish and American political discourse. *Rocznik Kognitywistyczny* 6/2013, s. 23-36 doi:10.4467/20843895RK.13.003.1350
- xviii. McClay, R. (2017). *Us and Them: A Descriptive Analysis of Donald Trump's Campaign Speeches*. University of Birmingham
- xix. Mihas, E. (2005). 'Non-Literal language in political discourse'. *LSO working papers in Linguistics* 5: pp. 124- 139. Retrieved on 20th April, 2013 from <http://ling.wisc.edu/lso/wpl/5.1/LSOWP5.1-10-Mihas.pdf>.
- xx. Muqit, A. (2012). Ideology and Power Relation Reflected in the Use of Pronoun in Osama Bin Laden's speech Text. *International Journal of Social Science and Humanity*, Vol. 2, No. 6.
- xxi. Renkema, J. (2009). *Discourse, of course. An overview of Research in discourse studies*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: Benjamins Publishing
- xxii. Richardson, Alan and Bowden, John (1983), *A new dictionary of Christian theology* pp.552-3
- xxiii. Rozina, G. and karapetjana, I. (2009). The Use of Language in Political Rhetoric: Linguistic Manipulation. *SDÜ Fen Edebiyat Fakültesi*. Mayıs 2009, Sayı:19, ss.111-122.
- xxiv. Sapir, E. (1939). *Language: An introduction to the study of speech*. New York: Harcourt, Brace and Company.

- xxv. Simon-Vandenberg, A.M., Taverniers, M. & Ravelli, L. (2003). *Grammatical metaphor: Views from Systemic Functional Linguistics*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- xxvi. Van Dijk, T. A. (1993). Principles of critical discourse analysis. *Discourse and Society*. 4(2), 249–283.
- xxvii. Van Dijk, T. A. (2006). Politics, ideology and discourse. In Brown K. (Ed.), *The Encyclopedia of Language and Linguistics* (Vol. 9, pp. 728-740). Oxford: Pergamon Press.
- xxviii. Wirth-Koliba, V. (2016). The Diverse and Dynamic World of 'Us' and 'Them' in Political Discourse. *Critical Approaches to Discourse Analysis across Disciplines*. Vol 8 (1): 23 – 37