



## Discursive strategies of manipulation in the late President Magufuli's campaign inaugural speech of the 2020 Tanzanian presidential election

Judicate Selenya<sup>1</sup>

Eastern Africa Statistical Training Centre

### Abstract

*This paper explores the use of language as a tool of manipulation in election campaigns in Tanzania by analysing a speech delivered by late President Magufuli during his second-term campaign for the ruling party, Chama cha Mapinduzi (here forth CCM). The study employed Critical discourse analysis (hereafter CDA) as a framework of analysis, specifically Fairclough's (1989, 2013) three dimensions model for analysing text and talks. The study explores rhetoric as a pivotal element in analysing how language constructs social reality and influences power dynamics. Within CDA, rhetoric plays a crucial role in understanding how language is employed to manipulate minds, construct and shape social realities, and challenge or uphold power relations. In this context, rhetoric serves to inform, persuade, and motivate audiences through various linguistic and communicative means. The findings of the study reveal that the language used in the speech was aimed at manipulating the minds of the voters through various strategies such as appealing to audiences' religious beliefs, attributing government achievements to the collective efforts of the people, and using personal pronouns 'we', 'our' and 'us' to create a sense of unity. The study also reveals that the speech employed repetition to emphasize the success of the government, and presupposition to negatively portray the opposition contenders while using statistics to positively represent himself and his party before voters. The study concludes that politicians often use language as a powerful tool to manipulate the audience to achieve personal agendas.*

**Keywords:** *critical discourse analysis; discourse; language; manipulation strategies; politics*

### Introduction

This study explores the discursive strategies of manipulation by analysing a campaign inaugural speech by late President John Pombe Magufuli of the ruling party CCM during the 2020 Tanzania general election. The goal is to uncover how language is employed by politicians to influence voters and secure political power. The study employed Critical discourse analysis (CDA) as an analytical tool.

The 2020 election was a controversial election in the history of Tanzania. It was marked by allegations of malpractice whereby the pre-election environment was characterized by banning political parties' rallies; the arrest and harassment of opposition party leaders and members of civil

---

<sup>1</sup> **Judicate J. Selenya** is an Assistant Lecturer in the Department of Official Statistics at the Eastern Africa Statistical Training Centre in Dar es Salaam, Tanzania. He specialises in teaching Communication Studies and Language, with primary research interests in Applied Linguistics, Communication Studies, and Discourse Analysis. His specific areas of focus include English as a Foreign Language teaching and learning, Critical Discourse Analysis of political texts, Crisis Communication, and the social aspects of language. He holds a Master of Arts in Linguistics from the University of Dodoma, a Bachelor's degree in Education (Languages) from Tumaini University Makumira, and a Diploma in Education in Tanzania. He is currently pursuing a PhD at The Open University of Tanzania. ORCID: 0009-0007-1288-4092



society; suppression of press freedom and so forth. Apart from the cohesive power that was used to ensure the re-election of the incumbent President, language was also used as a soft power to complement the cohesive power. Paget (2021) maintains that the re-election of President Magufuli was the result of several factors which include electoral manipulation and the authoritarian nature of Magufuli's regime.

The incumbent President Magufuli was re-elected with an 84% formally announced vote, the highest share recorded in a presidential election since multipartism was reintroduced in 1992. According to Paget (2021), this landslide victory can be attributed to the authoritarian nature of the Magufuli regime. The late President Magufuli used language alongside cohesive power to legitimize his actions of restoration in the government and within his political party CCM. Consequently, he wanted to assure his opponent within the ruling party and outside the party that his style of leadership pleased the majority of Tanzanian citizens. So, the 2020 election was to be used to silence the criticism from within the country and outside.

Language and politics have long been related. Throughout the history of man, language has been used to access power and control over others. According to Chilton (2004), language is a powerful tool used by those in power to influence, compel, persuade, manipulate and control those they govern. Fischer, F., & Gottweis (2012) observed that politics largely depends on language and language significantly influences politics, while Opeibi (2009) referred to this relationship as a symbiotic one. Chilton (2004) noted that all activities of politics are constituted in language, including government deliberations, political party campaigns, parliamentary debates, and speeches by politicians. Through political discourse, politicians use words to transmit their messages and pursue their interests while influencing people's knowledge and understanding of both political and social reality (Bourdieu, 1991; Van Dijk, 2006a; Van Dijk, 2015).

Political power is manifested in political discourse by means of carefully chosen language, enabling politicians to manipulate political information (Oparinde, Rapeane-Mathonsi, & Mheta, 2021). Political discourse is filled with manipulative language, with the primary aim of attracting as many voters as possible. According to Kakisina et al. (2022), through their use of language, politicians influence people's comprehension and awareness of both social and political realities. Politicians creatively employ various linguistic techniques and strategies to sway diverse voters to their advantage.

Van Dijk (2006b) states that politicians who possess power over society manipulate others by presenting subjective perspectives to persuade them to believe and act against their own will and interests. Therefore, politicians' objective during campaigns is not to persuade people by presenting truthful information, but rather to use manipulative speeches to exploit and control voters. Van Dijk (2006b) defines the term 'manipulation' in political discourse as an illegitimate control used by the manipulator over others to make them believe that things are in their best interests when, in reality, they only favour the manipulator. He states that manipulation implies power, and more specifically, the abuse of power and domination. Van Dijk (2006b) also maintain that manipulation is intentional and covert, benefits the speaker's interests, and implies an asymmetrical relation between the involved parties. Despite this, the relationship between them is based on trust, which is gained by the manipulator through argumentation. This is in stark contrast to legitimate forms of manipulation such as education and persuasion, wherein the interlocutors are free to believe or act as per their own beliefs and understanding of the arguments (Van Dijk, 2006b).



In contrast, manipulation assigns the recipient a passive role, making them victims of manipulation. This can occur when the recipients lack the knowledge to resist manipulation. Barnhill (2014) asserts that manipulation involves directly altering someone's beliefs, desires, or emotions in a manner that deviates from their self-interest or is likely to be detrimental to their self-interest in the given context. On the other hand, Gasparyan and Harutyunyan (2021) define manipulation as a common persuasion technique aimed at transmitting a particular message to influence the audience and convince them to endorse the manipulator's perspectives or actions. Van Dijk (2006a) further states that the difference between manipulation and persuasion lies less in the linguistic features of discourse and more in the social and interactional structures in and by which the discourse acts. He suggests that social conditions of manipulative control should be formulated in terms of group membership, institutional position, profession, material and symbolic resources, and other factors that define the power of groups and their members.

Politicians influence people's knowledge and understanding by forming biased mental models and social representations (Van Dijk, 2006b). According to Van Dijk (2006b), this interference with the process of understanding is the function of manipulation which involves mind control. Politicians use their power in society to control group knowledge by controlling the access of public and non-public discourse, and by determining the kind of information which will be given to the public through the mass media (van Dijk, 2012). Politicians also can manoeuvre information in such a way that the audience will believe, internalize them and act according to the wishes of the manipulator.

The aim of all these strategies is to exercise power over the public to make them believe or do things that are in the interest of the manipulator, and against the best interest of the manipulated (Van Dijk, 2006a). Fairclough (1989) asserts that the choices made in discourse are never impartial but instead driven by underlying ideologies. He posits the existence of a "hidden agenda." Against the background of all that has been said, it can be inferred that manipulation serves not only as a tactic to deceive others and persuade them to believe in false information for the purpose of achieving personal goals but is also utilized to establish trust by deliberately concealing certain facts or misrepresenting the truth about reality.

### ***Previous Research in the Field***

Studies have established that political speeches often employ manipulation and discursive strategies in order to influence the opinions and actions of the audience. Politicians often use various tactics in order to maintain their power, often at the expense of those they dominate. Hancock et al. (2007) mapped out the linguistic behaviours employed by manipulators and found out that they use manipulative devices such as producing more words, using more third-person pronouns, and employing more terms related to senses. Van Dijk (2017) found that local manipulation strategies also involve lexical derogation, selective accusations, presuppositions, disclaimers, positive self-presentation, suspicions and accusations as facts, generalizations, numbers game rhetoric, and delegitimizing and legitimating accusations. Furthermore, Blass (2005) found out that one common manipulative strategy in political speeches is the use of emotional appeals.

Closely related to the current study is the study by Abuelwafa (2021) which investigated the legitimization strategies utilized by Trump before his supporters stormed the Capitol, discovering that he employed rationalization, moral legitimization, authorization, and mythopoesis. The study differs

from the current study in the sense that it studies the legitimisation strategy which is a different group of discursive strategies while the current study investigates the manipulation strategies in election campaigns. Khajavi and Rasti (2020) studied the ways in which Obama and Romney marketed themselves during the 2012 election campaign, finding that they used positive self-representation, others' negative representation, legitimisation, delegitimation, and persuasion. Addy and Ofori (2020) investigated a Ghanaian opposition leader's campaign speech, identifying the use of pronouns and repetition to establish a connection with voters and persuade them to support him. In a study conducted by Oparinde et al. (2021), the focus was on the rhetorical strategies used by politicians in Nigeria during their speeches. The study utilized CDA as a framework of analysis, revealing that Nigerian politicians make use of various linguistic devices such as pronouns, modalities, hyperbole, repetition, and metaphors in their political communication. Ultimately, the study concluded that Nigerian politicians deliberately employ manipulative rhetoric in political discourse. In addition, Michira (2014) analysed the Kenyan presidential candidates' speeches and manifestos leading up to the 2013 elections, finding that, rhetorical and semiotic techniques were used to communicate concealed messages to the voters.

While these studies have employed Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) as a framework of analysis, they differ from the current study in that they did not specifically investigate manipulation as a strategy to complement cohesive power. In contrast to the present study, there is limited previous research that has utilized a CDA approach to examine manipulation strategies as a means of social power in Tanzania's political discourse. CDA has been used in a variety of contexts to study how language is used to create meaning and power relations. In the context of this study, CDA revealed the way in which language was used to shape public opinion and influence voters through manipulation in Tanzanian political discourse. The study tried to shed light on the role of language and discourse in shaping political outcomes this helps to highlight the potential danger of manipulation in democratic societies. The study also provided an understanding of the discursive strategies which Tanzanian political leader used to gain and maintain power, and their potential consequences for democracy and civic discourse.

The objective of this study was to analyse the linguistic and discursive strategies used to manipulate voters in the 2020 Tanzanian presidential election campaign inaugural speech by the late President John Pombe Magufuli. The aim was to gain a deeper understanding of the ways in which language was used to influence and persuade voters during the election. The main research of this study was: "What linguistics and discursive strategies of manipulation did President Magufuli use in his campaign inaugural speech during the 2020 Tanzanian presidential election?"

## **Methods**

This qualitative study used a critical discourse analysis (CDA) approach to investigate manipulation in the campaign inaugural speeches of the late President Magufuli in the 2020 Tanzanian general election. The speech was delivered in a campaign inaugural rally which was held in Dodoma Jamuhuri stadium on August 29 2020. The speech was downloaded from the East African Radio YouTube channel at <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=M8A7X-QS8ik> which is available online for the public. The Kiswahili audio-visual speech was transcribed into texts and translated into English language. The analysis was conducted by analysing sentences and labelling them corresponding to the manipulation strategies identified. The interpretation was done based on the Fairclough (1989, 2013) analytical framework.



### ***Theoretical Framework***

CDA is an interdisciplinary research program focused on addressing problems, incorporating a variety of approaches that feature distinct theoretical models, research methods, and agendas (Wodak, 2014). The field of CDA employs several frameworks, as noted by Rahimi & Riasati (2011), including the most prominent frameworks of Fairclough (1989, 2003), van Dijk (1997), Wodak (2001) Hodge & Kress (1993) and Van Leeuwen (1995, 1996). The current study employed the framework by Fairclough (1989; 2013).

### ***Fairclough's Three-dimensional Framework of Critical Discourse Analysis***

Fairclough (1989; 2013) developed a framework for analysing text and discourse; the framework consists of three dimensions: the first one, is a linguistic description of text's formal properties. This is concerned with an examination of the linguistic features and structures of discourse, such as lexical choices, syntax, and discourse markers. The second dimension is the interpretation of the link between discursive processes/interaction and the text (which is both a result of text production and a resource for interpretation), and the third one is an explanation of discourse's connection to social and cultural reality. This component analyses the wider social, cultural, political, and economic contexts that influence the construction of text and discourse and how these contexts are represented and reproduced in the text. Rahimi and Riasati (2011) contend that Fairclough's analysis expands beyond just describing the "what" of a text to exploring the "how" and "why" of its interpretation and explanation. According to Fairclough (1989), discourse selections are never neutral, but rather influenced by underlying ideologies. Therefore, he contends that by analysing language forms, we can uncover social processes and embedded ideologies, leading to an examination of power relations in society.

### ***Who is President Magufuli?***

According to Fairclough and Fairclough (2012), critically understanding a discourse requires first to know the one who created it. It is common for presidents to have speechwriters, who assist them in crafting their speeches; however, it is challenging to determine who may have been behind Magufuli's speeches. Therefore, I assume that he was the sole author of his speeches and so, I will offer a brief overview of President Magufuli as the enunciator of the speech.

John Pombe Magufuli (1959-2021) was the fifth president of the United Republic of Tanzania who served from 2015 until his death in 2021. He started his political career as a member of parliament, who was first elected in 1995, and held several cabinet positions; he served as Deputy Minister of Works from 1995 to 2000, Minister of Works from 2000 to 2005, Minister of Lands and Human Settlement from 2006 to 2008, Minister of Livestock and Fisheries from 2008 to 2010, and again held the position of Minister of Works from 2010 to 2015 when he was elected the President of Tanzania. Magufuli came into power as president in 2015 after winning an election with 58.5% of the votes, the smallest margin of all presidential polls since the reintroduction of multiparty democracy in 1992. The 2015 election was highly contested. Magufuli viewed the drawback of CCM votes as a result of previous government failure. According to Paget (2021), Magufuli associated the failure with the CCM party leaving its founding mission by permitting too much economic privatisation and political liberalisation. This made Tanzania vulnerable to exploitation by both domestic and foreign imperialists. Magufuli presented himself as a rescuer of the deteriorating condition of Tanzania. He started a war against corruption and held public workers accountable. According to Paget (2021), Magufuli wanted to restore the agenda of Julius Nyerere (1922-99), Tanzania's first president.





During his first term in office, a lot of public servants were fired and others were put in prison for alleged corruption scandals. Businessmen were also held for tax evasion. The opposition political leaders were also imprisoned and tortured for alleged cooperation with foreign imperialists and lack of nationalism. Members of the press who were critical of his regime were also targeted. Some newspapers were burned and huge fines were imposed on media houses who criticised his government. Magufuli won the 2020 election with a landslide victory of 84.4%. According to Paget (2021), the landslide victory by Magufuli was achieved through electoral manipulation. He maintains that it was accompanied by high levels of violent oppression. Having seen in brief the contextual situation of the 2020 election and Magufuli's brief description, I will turn to the results of the analysis.

## **Results and Discussion**

This study analysed one speech which was delivered during the CCM campaign inaugural by the late President Magufuli. The speech was analysed using CDA to reveal the discursive strategies of manipulation which were employed in the speech to influence the voters' minds.

### ***Discursive Manipulation Strategies Employed in Magufuli's Campaign Inaugural Speech***

Magufuli engaged in manipulation through his CCM party presidential campaign inaugural speech. According to the analysis the president employed six main discursive strategies to manipulate the audience to support him in the election. The strategies are appeal to the audience's religious belief, presupposition, the use of the pronoun, emotional appeals, positive self-presentation and repetition.

#### **Appeal to the Audience's Religious Belief**

Politicians have been known to use appeals to religious beliefs as a rhetorical device to win over people and portray themselves as wise, virtuous, and trustworthy individuals to gain audience support (Hassan, 2018). This can include referencing religious texts or figures, appealing to moral or ethical principles that align with the voters' religious views, or highlighting their own religious beliefs. In my analysis, I found that Magufuli extensively employed this strategy in his party's opening campaign speech.

In his campaign speech, Magufuli made use of religious appeals in order to connect with and manipulate voters. He presented himself as a God-fearing person, creating a sense of divine approval for his political campaign which might suggest that supporting it is synonymous with supporting God's will and blessings. The technique was expected to help him get support as most Tanzanians are religious believers, thus, creating a sense of obligation and loyalty among voters and aimed to increase voter turnout and support. In his words: (1) *Ndugu zangu nianze kwa kumshukuru mwenyezi Mungu kwa kutufikisha siku hii muhimu ya leo ya uzinduzi wa kampeni ya CCM kwa ajili ya uchaguzi mkuu wa mwaka huu* "My brothers and sisters, I start by thanking God for bringing us to this important day of the CCM campaign launch for this year's general election" (the author's own translations will be used throughout).

Furthermore, Magufuli used language to link the success and safety of the country to belief in God and his own religious piety, citing the country's supposed success in fighting the coronavirus crisis as evidence of the success of prayer and God's love for Tanzania. In his words:

(2) *Tunamshukuru pia mwanzoni kabisa mwenyezi Mungu. Tulivyomuomba katika kipindi cha nyuma kuhusu tatizo la Corona Mungu alitusikiliza na ndio maana kama tulivyo hapa*



*kwenye uwanja huu simuoni hata mmoja aliyevaa barakoa. Hii ni kwasababu Mungu ametenda, hii ni kwasababu Mungu anatupenda watanzania* “We also thank the Almighty God at the very beginning. As we prayed to him in the past about the Corona problem, God listened to us and that’s why as we are here in this stadium, I don’t see a single one wearing a mask. This is because God has acted, this is because God loves us Tanzanians.”

Thus, Magufuli suggests that because the people have prayed and God has answered their prayers, they are now safe and able to continue with their normal activities. This implies that those who do not believe in God or who do not pray may not be as safe or successful. This can be substantiated by his statement:

(3) *Mungu wetu anatupenda na ndio maana mnaona mataifa mengine hata mnapoangalia kwenye TV gonjwa hili bado lipo lakini sisi Mungu ameliondoa; tunamshukuru sana, tunawashukuru sana watanzania, ninawashukuru sana viongozi wa dini zote walivyokaa kumuomba Mungu na kumlilia na tulivyomlilia Mungu amejibu.* “Our God loves us and that’s why you see in other nations when you watch on TV, this disease is still there but God has removed it from us; we thank him very much. We are very grateful to Tanzanians. I am very grateful to the leaders of all religions who prayed to God and cried to him and when we cried to him, God has answered.”

Magufuli suggested that the success in fighting the coronavirus crisis in Tanzania was a result of prayer and a sign of God’s love for the country. He also implied that other countries were still struggling with the virus due to a lack of prayer. This reveals the ideology of us versus them; the Tanzanians who believe in God and the other nations who do not believe in God. However, it’s important to note that the Tanzanian government’s success in combating the virus was likely political propaganda, as the government burned the release of data early in April 2020 (Kangwerema et al., 2021). This suggests that the supposed success in fighting the virus was not a result of prayer, but rather manipulation of information.

The statement might also imply that the government, represented by the CCM campaign, is closely tied to God’s favour and blessings on the country. By suggesting that the government is blessed by God, Magufuli was trying to make voters believe that by supporting the CCM party, they are supporting God’s will.

Magufuli also employed certain phrases and statements, such as:

(4) *...watu kanisani na misikitini...* “...people in churches and in mosques...”

(5) *...viongozi wa dini zote...* “...leaders of all religions...”

(6) *Tulimuomba kwa pamoja madhehebu yote na tukamshukuru kwa pamoja kazi ya Mungu haishindwi, naomba tumshangilie Mungu kwa nguvu zote tuliopo hapa* “We prayed together, all denominations, and we thank God together for His work that cannot be defeated. I ask that we all look to God with all the strength, those who we are here.”

According to Westfall and Russell (2019), politicians understand the significance of religion and intentionally use it for political gain. Thus, Magufuli (in data 4, 5, and 6) used religious appeal as a



tactic to connect with the audience's religious and social identities, and to present himself as someone who shares and aligns with their values. Magufuli used this strategy with the knowledge that the majority of Tanzanians are religious believers, either Muslim or Christian. The implication of this to voters is that Magufuli is trying to create a sense of shared identity and values by referencing religious groups and their leaders. The voters who were either Christian or Muslim might have felt that by supporting Magufuli, they were supporting someone who aligned with their beliefs and values. This can be a persuasive and manipulative tactic, as sometimes people have a greater sense of trust and loyalty towards those whom they perceive as being similar to themselves. Emeka-Nwobia (2016) noted that this technique is a strong manipulative strategy, especially given the religious vulnerability of Africans.

### **Presupposition**

Presuppositions are implicit assumptions or beliefs that are taken for granted in a text or speech (Tantucci, 2016). They are not stated directly but are implied by the language used. This is the discursive strategy used to manipulate the voters. In the speech, the president used presuppositions to address the audience. For example:

(7) *Ndugu wananchi tumeanza kipindi cha kampeni watakuja wengi na mtaelezwa mengi wito wangu kwenu waskilizeni kwa makini ili siku ya kupiga kura mfanye maamuzi sahihi* “Dear citizens, we have started the campaign period, many will come and you will be told a lot. My call to you is to listen carefully so that on the day of voting you can make the right decisions.”

(8) *Uchaguzi huu utaamua pia tukwepe viongozi wa aina gani, viongozi wenye dhamira ya dhati ya kutetea maslahi ya taifa letu au kuiletea maendeleo nchi yetu ama tupate viongozi wenye ajenda zao binafsi ama waliobeba ajenda za watu wengine* “This election will also decide what kind of leaders we should avoid, leaders with a sincere mission to defend the interests of our nation or to bring development to our country or we should find leaders with their own agendas or those who carry other people's agendas.”

(9) *Lakini pia uchaguzi huu utaamua kama tupate viongozi wataokua nasi wakati wa shida na kutupa moyo ama viongozi wakati wa shida watatukimbia au kusubiria maelekezo kutoka kwa wale wanaowatuma uamuzi ni wenu* “But this election will also decide if we get leaders who will be with us in times of trouble and give us courage, or leaders who in times of trouble will run away from us or wait for instructions from those who send them, the decision is yours.”

The speech implies the existence of leaders who prioritize their own agendas as well as the agendas of others. It raises the question of who these "other people" are and what their agendas are, which the leaders must fulfil alongside their personal interests. Additionally, the speech suggests that there are leaders who will stand by the citizens during times of trouble, as opposed to those who will flee or wait the instructions from those who sent them. The statement implies that there may be external countries sending instructions to the leaders during troubles, which the leaders must wait for before taking action. The question to ask is who are the external parties and who are these leaders who wait for external instructions?

Furthermore, it can be argued that the speech implies that the main opposition presidential contender, Tundulisu, may be receiving instructions from external powers, but the president does



not clearly identify who these leaders or foreign powers may be. The audience is left to wonder about the leaders' personal ambitions and the objectives of the external powers in Tanzania. This presupposition may have been used as a manipulative technique to negatively portray opposition leaders.

### Use of the Pronoun

The use of personal pronouns is closely linked to the dynamics of power and solidarity within relationships. As a result, Magufuli's selection of pronouns is indicative of this relationship. According to Fairclough (1989, p. 81), pronouns carry specific values that are conveyed through various aspects of language structure. In Magufuli's campaign inaugural speech, deliberate choices were made by the speaker regarding the personal pronouns used to represent individuals.

During the analysis of the speech, the utilisation of out-group personal pronouns such as "I", "My", and "Me" was deemed insignificant in regard to power and manipulation. These pronouns were primarily utilised to express gratitude and extend congratulations. On the other hand, the pronouns "We," "our," and "us" were found to have greater significance in terms of influencing the minds of the audience. They were employed in a manipulative manner.

Magufuli's speech employed the in-group pronouns *tu...* "we", *sisi/tu...* "us" or *yetu* "our". The personal pronouns 'we' and 'us' are represented as subject prefix *tu...* or objective prefix *tu...* and the personal pronoun *sisi* in Kiswili language. What differentiates the two is the context of use. The pronouns **we**, **our** and **us** serve to construct a sense of collective agency or inclusiveness or exclusiveness. The pronoun 'we' used in a speech can be analysed in terms of inclusive and exclusive contexts. The distinction can be made between the inclusive pronoun 'we' and the exclusive 'we'. The distinction between the two is that exclusive 'we' does not refer to the addressee or audience; in contrast, inclusive "we" refers to both the speaker and the listener, and it creates a sense of shared experience and mutual responsibility.

According to Wales (1996), 'we' is generally used to refer to the speaker and third parties who may or may not be present in the immediate situation. The use of the exclusive 'we' can be a strategic tool for sharing responsibility and avoiding self-blames. In the speech, Magufuli used both exclusive and inclusive 'we'. Through inclusive 'we', Magufuli aimed to align himself to the audience who are either Tanzanian or CCM party members and supporters. Consider the following extracts from his speech:

(10) *Tunamshukuru pia mwanzoni kabisa Mwenyezi Mungu tulivyomuomba katika kipindi cha nyuma kuhusu tatizo la Corona* "We also thank God at the very beginning as we prayed to him in the past about the Corona problem". *Mungu alitusikiliza, na ndio maana kama tulivyo hapa kwenye uwanja huu, simuoni hata mmoja aliyevaa barakoa* "God listened to us, and that's why as we are here in this field, I don't see a single one wearing a mask." *Tulimuomba kwa pamoja, madhehebu yote, na tukamshukuru kwa pamoja, kazi ya Mungu haishindwi* "We prayed to him together, all denominations, and we thanked him together, God's work does not fail."

(11) *Ndugu wananchi, bila shaka, mtakubaliana nami kua katika kipindi cha miaka mitano iliyopita, serikali ya awamu ya tano imejitahidi kutimiza ama kukata kiu hiyo ya watanzania ya kuleta mabadiliko nchini* "My fellow citizens, I am sure that we can all agree that over the



past five years, the fifth phase government has made great efforts to meet the demands of Tanzanians and bring about change.”

This language strategy serves to align Magufuli with the masses and reinforce the idea that the Tanzanian people are working together towards a common goal. Magufuli presumed to speak on the Tanzanian behalf. This language strategy may also suggest that the audience should extend loyalty to the CCM party as it is aligned with the majority. According to Fairclough (1989), the use of this strategy, in this context, suggests that the audience is expected to hold the same beliefs as the government, with the implication that these beliefs are the only ones that are considered to be correct.

Magufuli also used exclusive ‘**we**’ to refer to himself, his government or his CCM party excluding the audience. Hasan (2013) asserts that politicians may use the pronoun “**we**” because they are uncertain about whether the decisions they make will be perceived positively or not. Thus, using this pronoun spreads responsibility. In the speech, Magufuli makes use of this strategy as well to spread responsibility to his fellow government leaders and the CCM party. Consider the following datum:

(12) *Kwanza kabisa, tumejitahidi sana kuimarisha nidhamu kwenye utumishi wa umma* “Firstly, **we** have made great efforts to improve the efficiency of public service.”

(13) *Ndugu zangu, tumeimarisha rasirmali za nchi yetu na kuhakikisha zinatumiwa kwa manufaa ya watanzania wote* “My brothers and sisters, we have strengthened our country's financial resources and ensured they are used for the benefit of all Tanzanians.”

(14) *Ndugu zangu, mliyotutuma miaka mitano iliyopita, tumeyafanya kwa nguvu kubwa tupeni tena miaka mitano mengine* “My brothers, what you sent us to do five years ago, **we** have done with great strength, give us another five years.”

The exclusive pronoun ‘**we**’ was used to refer to Magufuli and his government or party excluding the audience when outlining his government's success and plans for the five years. It can also be argued that the pronoun has been used to create a sense of group unity and exclude the out-group. Oparinde et al. (2021) observed similar results where President Buhari employed plural pronouns in an attempt to make his campaign a collective responsibility of his political party.

Another possessive pronoun that was highly used in Magufuli's speech is the possessive pronoun *yetu* ‘**our**’. The use of the possessive pronoun ‘**our**’ can be indicative of either inclusiveness or exclusiveness, depending on the context in which it is used. When ‘**our**’ is employed in a broad sense, it suggests inclusiveness and emphasizes a shared identity or experience. On the other hand, when ‘**our**’ is used in a narrow sense, it indicates exclusiveness and highlights a distinction between those who are included and those who are excluded.

The analysis of Magufuli's speech indicates that he used this pronoun both in the inclusive and exclusive senses. The pronoun was used in an inclusive sense to create a sense of unity and oneness. It was also used to engage the audience in the ownership of the government's achievements or the country's resources. Consider the following extractions:



(15) *Hususani, kwa kuchapa kazi kwa bidii, kulipa kodi, na pia kudumisha amani ya nchi yetu* “Specifically, by working hard, paying taxes, and also maintaining the peace of **our** country”.

(16) *Nchi yetu imeendelea kua miongoni mwa nchi zinazoongoza kwa amani barani Africa* “**Our** country has continued to be among the leading countries in peace in Africa. Peace is the basis of all this development”.

(17) *Mtakumbuka tulizuia utoroshwaji wa rasirimali zetu, ikiwemo mchanga wa madini* “Let us remember, we prevented the squandering of **our** resources including mineral sand.”

The inclusive possessive pronouns ‘**our**’, despite been used to create a sense of unity and oneness, was also used in a very manipulative way. Consider the following extraction:

(18) *Mungu wetu anatupenda, na ndio maana mnaona mataifa mengine hata mnapoangalia kwenye TV gonjwa hili bado lipo lakini sisi Mungu ameliondoa.* “**Our** God loves us, and that is why you see other nations even when you watch on TV” the disease is still there but God has removed it from **us**.”

In datum 18, the speech employs a manipulative technique by using the possessive pronoun ‘**our**’ to suggest that there is a single God who loves all Tanzanians. This technique attempts to unify the people under a common belief in a higher power that has aided the nation during the COVID-19 pandemic. However, this is a flawed notion as Tanzanians hold diverse religious beliefs, including Islam, Christianity, Buddhism, Hinduism, and various traditional faiths as well as atheists. Thus, the concept of a singular God for all Tanzanians is inaccurate. It raises the question of which specific deity helped Tanzanians combat the pandemic, given the multiplicity of divine figures worshipped in the country. The use of the pronoun in this sense can be a strategy to manipulate voters since this use of pronouns creates ambiguity. Nadeem et al. (2014) observed that using plural pronouns in this context constitutes a form of manipulation of the mind.

Furthermore, the speech utilises the possessive pronoun ‘**our**’ in a limited sense, implying exclusivity and emphasising a distinction between those who are included and those who are excluded. The following extract illustrates the point:

(19) *Amani tutailinda kwa nguvu zetu zote* “We will protect peace with all our strength.”

Datum 19 employs the possessive pronoun ‘**our**’ in a manner that excludes the audience. The strength mentioned refers to the cohesive power of Magufuli’s government, which will be utilised to maintain peace rather than the power of the audience or citizens. The possessor of this power is not the citizens but Magufuli’s government, known for its autocratic nature after coming to power. Prior to the election, the environment was characterised by the burning of political rallies, violent oppression, and harassment of opposition political party leaders and human rights activists, as well as the burning of free media, all in the name of ensuring peace and harmony among Tanzanians. Thus, it can be argued that the possessive pronoun “...**our strength**” referred to a narrow sense that excluded others, such as the common citizens, those who opposed Mugufuli’s policy within his CCM party and opposition political parties.



In a different scenario, the analysis shows that the use of the possessive pronoun ‘**our**’ in the speech could potentially imply that Magufuli intends to encompass both himself and his audience, but in reality, this is not the case. The following excerpt is an example of this usage:

(20) *Tutaendelea pia kulinda muungano wetu pamoja na mapinduzi matukufu ya Zanzibar*  
“We will also continue to protect **our** union and the glorious revolution of Zanzibar.”

However, the inclusivity of the terms "**our union**" and "**our glorious revolution of Zanzibar**" is questionable here, as there is a section of Tanzanian citizens who do not support either the union or the revolution of Zanzibar. Burgess et al. (2009) observed that Zanzibaris are still in disagreement regarding their revolutionary legacy and are split on matters of identity, memory, and whether to maintain their association with Tanzania. This section of Tanzanians does not belong to the group (the ruling party) that possesses the "union" or "the Zanzibar revolution." As a result, 'our' in this context could be argued to refer solely to the government and the CCM party to which Magufuli belonged, which must use force to safeguard the 'union' and 'the glorious Zanzibar revolution.'

Magufuli employed a technique of attributing the accomplishments of his government to the collaborative endeavours of the people by using the pronoun "**us**". The said pronoun encompassed the speaker (Magufuli), his government, his political party, and the Tanzanian general public. Thus, the achievement was acknowledged to be a collective effort of himself, his government, his political party, and the people of Tanzania. The following excerpt is an example of this usage:

(21) *Ndugu wananchi nawashukuru na kuwapongeza wataanzania wote wa dini zote, makabila yote vyama vyote vya siasa kwa kutuwezesha kupatikana kwa mafanikio haya hususani kwa kuchapa kazi kwa bidii, kulipa kodi na pia kudumisha amani ya nchi yetu*  
“Dear citizens, I thank and congratulate all Tanzanians of all religions, all tribes and all political parties for enabling **us** to achieve this particular success by working hard, paying taxes and also maintaining the peace of our country.”

The use of the phrase...*kutuwezesha kupatikana kwa mafanikio haya* “allowing **us** to achieve these successes” implies that Magufuli is crediting the achievement to the collective effort of the people, and not only his own efforts. The use of ...*hususani kwa kuchapa kazi kwa bidii, kulipa kodi na pia kudumisha amani ya nchi yetu* “especially through hard work, paying taxes, and maintaining peace in our country” further reinforces the idea that President Magufuli recognised the contributions of the people in achieving the successes.

### **Emotional appeals**

According to van Dijk (2006), specially chosen words can evoke and appeal to people's emotions. Politicians usually select carefully words that evoke strong emotions in order to appeal to people's emotions. Magufuli employed these techniques in a variety of statements in his speech, for example:

(22) *Mtakumbuka kua tulipoanza kuchukua hatua hizi baadhi ya watu wakiwemo wataanzania wenzetu ambao walitubeza na kututisha kwamba tutashtakiwa na kufikishwa mahakamani. Lakini sisi tukasema rasirmali hizi ni zetu tumepewa na mwenyezi Mungu ili tunufaike nazo hivyo hatuwezi kumwogopa mtu yeyote naamini wale waliotubeza sasa watakua wameaibika.* “You will remember that when we started taking these steps, some



people, including our fellow Tanzanians, threatened us that we would be charged and brought to court. But we said that these resources are ours, they have been given to us by the almighty God so that we can benefit from them, so we cannot fear anyone, I believe that those who scorned us will now be ashamed.”

(23) *Wamekuja hapa kuja kushuhudia ufunguzi wa kampeni wa chama kikubwa kinachoitwa CCM* “They have come here to witness the opening of the campaign of a big party called CCM.”

In data 22 and 23 the President’s speech also used emotive language like *chama kikubwa kinachoitwa CCM* “big party called CCM”, *upendo mkubwa wa Mungu* “the great love of God”, *waliotubeza sasa wameaibika* “Those who scorned us are now ashamed”, *hatuwezi kumwogopa mtu yeyote* “We cannot be afraid of anyone” and *taifa kubwa la Tanzania* “great nation of Tanzania” and *uwekezaji mkubwa tulioufanya kuboresha elimu* “We have made a significant investment in improving education”. Also, the use of positive words like *nashukuru* “I thank” and *kuwapongeza* “congratulate” implies that the President wanted to create a positive emotional association with his audience or supporters.

The emotive language was used to create a positive emotional association with the voters. The use of emotive language is a tactic to manipulate the voters by creating a positive emotional association with the speaker and his party or policies. Magufuli’s use of positive emotional language aimed to make the audience align with him and his party, which might have influenced the voter’s decision.

### **Positive Self-presentation**

Positive self-presentation is when an individual or group presents themselves in a favourable or positive way, highlighting their strengths and accomplishments, while downplaying their weaknesses.

President Magufuli presented his government and CCM party positively in his speech by emphasizing its strengths and accomplishments, while not mentioning its weaknesses. He suggested that his government had fulfilled the citizens’ desires for change. The speech focused on the achievements in various sectors, including education, health, and infrastructure. The speech did not mention any shortcomings or challenges faced during the five-year period. He provides a wealth of statistics to support his arguments and expresses his pride in the progress made. The speech is framed as a showcase of the success of his leadership through numerical evidence. An example is presented in the following statement:

(24) *Ndugu wananchi bila shaka mtakubaliana nami kua katika kipindi cha miaka mitano iliyopita serikali ya awamu ya tano imejitahidi kutimiza ama kukata kiu hiyo ya watanzania ya kuleta mabadiliko nchini* “Dear citizens, you will undoubtedly agree with me that in the last five years, the fifth phase, government has tried to fulfil or quench the thirst of Tanzanians to bring about change in the country.”

The speech suggested that the government had fulfilled all the citizens’ desired changes. However, it is important to note that he did not mention any shortcomings or challenges faced by his government during the whole period of five years. In reality, many promises for change were not fulfilled, including issues of freedom of media and democracy. The government’s undemocratic



practices, lack of freedom of speech, and suppression of opposition parties and media were widely known.

(25) ...*inadhihirisha kua CCM ni Baba lao na ni Mama Lao* “being on top of everything or ahead of everything.”

The use of slang phrases such as " being on top of everything or ahead of everything " by Magufuli aimed to present his group, the CCM party, in a favourable manner while implying negative connotations towards other parties, particularly those in opposition to CCM. This strategy is employed by politicians to manipulate their audience so as to gain the vote.

### Repetition

Repetition is a rhetorical device which refers to the repeated use of a specific word or phrase to reinforce a message and make it memorable. Oparinde et al., (2021) maintain that repetition is employed for emphatic reasons in political discourse. By repeating the same message, the speaker can create a lasting impact on the audience and make their message seem more credible and authoritative. President Magufuli utilized this strategy in his speech as can be seen in the following example:

(26) *Ndugu zangu watanzania kama itakavyokumbukwa mwaka 2015 watanzania walitaka mabadiliko. Walitaka mabadiliko ya kuona vitendo vya rushwa, wizi na ubadhilifu wa mali za umma vinakomeshwa. Walitaka mabadiliko ya kutaka wakienda kwenye ofisi za umma wawe wanahudumiwa vizuri. Walitaka mabadiliko ya kutaka kuona rasilimali za nchi zinalindwa na kuwanufaisha wananchi wote. Watanzania walitaka mabadiliko ya kutaka huduma za jamii zikiwemo elimu, afya, maji na umeme vinaboreshwa. Watanzania walitaka mabadiliko ya kutaka miundombinu wezeshi ya uchumi iimarishwe. Watanzania walitaka mabadiliko ya kutaka uchumi wa nchi ukue kwa kasi na matatizo ya umaskini na ukosefu wa ajira vipungue. Watanzania walitaka mabadiliko ya kuona kero zao mbalimbali zinashughulikiwa na mengine mengi.* “My fellow Tanzanians, in 2015, Tanzanians wanted change. They wanted change, to see an end to corruption, theft, and misuse of public funds. They wanted change; thus, when they go to public offices to be well served. They wanted a change to see the country's resources protected and benefiting all citizens. Tanzanians wanted change, to seek improved social services, including education, health, water and electricity. Tanzanians wanted a change to see the enabling infrastructure of the economy to be strengthened. Tanzanians wanted a change to see the country's economy grows rapidly and the problems of poverty and unemployment to decrease. Tanzanians wanted a change to see their various concerns addressed and many others.”

In datum 26, the President repeatedly used the phrase ...*watanzania walitaka mabadiliko...* “Tanzanians wanted changes” eight times. This is a technique to manipulate voters by emphasising the changes he made since he was elected in the previous election and connecting them to the citizens' demands. Through repetition, he emphasised the significance of "change" and tried to present it as the citizens' choice rather than his own political agenda. He aimed to portray his five-year policies as being motivated by the citizens' desires, rather than his own beliefs and opinions. This repetition was a tactic to influence voters to support him and his CCM party. The rhetorical device of repetition has also been utilized to emphasize President Magufuli's ideology of restoration, which he established since his first term.



## Conclusion

This study has demonstrated that politicians employ various strategies to manipulate voters in order to achieve the desired outcome. Specifically, the study has revealed that President Magufuli used the strategies of appeal to his citizens' religious beliefs to present himself as a God-fearing person. He also used this strategy to downplay the seriousness of the COVID-19 crisis. He indicated that coronavirus was no longer existing in Tanzania due to prayer. This might be a strategy to cover up his government's weaknesses in regard to combating the crisis. Moreover, the study revealed that the President utilised various strategies to align with the masses. Such strategies included crediting the achievement of his government to the collective effort of the people, using the pronouns 'we', 'our', and 'us' to create a sense of unity but at the same time excluding the opponent for the purpose of manipulating voters. The president also used repetition to emphasise the success of his government and that the implementation of the new policies was not his own agenda but the desire of the people. The speech also employed presupposition to negatively portray opposition contenders by showing them as people who work for outside forces and not for the benefit of Tanzanians. Lastly, the president used statistics to favourably or positively highlight his strengths and accomplishments, while downplaying the known weaknesses of his government. The use of all these strategies reveals that language is a very powerful tool which can be used by politicians to manipulate the voters for their own personal agendas. This study was limited to one speech by the late President Magufuli who was the ruling party contender. Other studies might be conducted to include more speeches and/or compare the speech by opposition contenders' speeches to reveal how language was used by both sides to manipulate the minds of the voters.

## References

- Abuelwafa, M. A. (2021). Legitimation and manipulation in political speeches: A corpus based study. *Procedia Computer Science*, 189(2021), 11–18.  
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.procs.2021.05.066>
- Addy, J., & Ofori, E. A. (2020). A critical discourse analysis of the campaign speech of a Ghanaian opposition leader. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 10(10), 1279–1287.  
<https://doi.org/10.17507/tpls.1010.14>
- Barnhill, A. (2014). What is manipulation? In C. Cooks & M. Weber (Eds.), *Manipulation: Theory and practice* (pp. 51–72). Oxford University Press.
- Blass, R. (2005). Manipulation in the speeches and writings of Hitler and the NSDAP from a relevance-theoretic point of view. In L. de Saussure & P. Schulz (Eds.), *Manipulation and ideologies in the twentieth century: Discourse, language, mind* (pp. 171–254). John Benjamins Publishing Co.
- Bourdieu, P. (1991). *Language and symbolic power*. Polity Press.
- Burgess, G. T., Issa, A. S., & Hamad, S. S. (2009). *Race, revolution, and the struggle for human rights in Zanzibar: The memoirs of Ali Sultan Issa and Seif Sharif Hamad*. Ohio University Press.
- Chilton, P. (2004). *Analysing political discourse: Theory and practice*. Routledge.  
<https://doi.org/10.1353/lan.2006.0117>
- Emeka-Nwobia, N. U. (2016). Political manipulation in nigerian presidential discourses. *British Journal of English Linguistics*, 4(4), 2055–6071.
- Fairclough, I., & Fairclough, N. (2012). *Political discourse analysis: A method for advanced students*. Routledge.
- Fairclough, N. (1989). *Language and power*. Longman.
- Fairclough, N. (2003). *Analysing discourse: Textual analysis for social research*. Routledge.



- Fairclough, N. (2013). *Critical discourse analysis: The critical study of language* (2nd ed.). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315834368>
- Fischer, F., & Gottweis, H. (Ed.). (2012). *The argumentative turn revisited: Public policy as communicative practice*. Duke University Press.
- Gasparyan, S., & Harutyunyan, R. (2021). Manipulative speech: A theoretical overview. *Armenian Folia Anglistika*, 17(2), 11–26. <https://doi.org/10.46991/AFA/2021.17.2.011>
- Gee, J. P. (2011). An introduction to discourse analysis: Theory and method. *Journal of Social History*, 44, <https://doi.org/10.1353/jsh.2010.0055>
- Hancock, J. T., Curry, L. E., Goorha, S., & Woodworth, M. (2007). On lying and being lied to: A Linguistic analysis of deception in computer-mediated communication. *Discourse Processes*, 45(1), 1–23. <https://doi.org/http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/01638530701739181>
- Hasan, J. M. (2013). A linguistic analysis of in-group and out-group pronouns in Hosni Mubarak's speech. *Journal of Basrah Researches (Humanities Series)*, 38(2), 5–24.
- Hassan, F. F. I. (2018). Persuasive personae: The appeal to religion and the construction of ethos in political discourse. *CDELTA Occasional Papers in the Development of English Education*, 64(1), 389–406. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2942273>
- Hodge, R., & Kress, G. (1993). *Language as ideology*. Routledge.
- Kakisina, P. A., Indhiarti, T. R., & Al Fajri, M. S. (2022). Discursive strategies of manipulation in COVID-19 political discourse: The case of Donald Trump and Jair Bolsonaro. *SAGE Open*, 12(1). <https://doi.org/10.1177/21582440221079884>
- Kangwerema, A., Thomas, H., Knovicks, S., Safari, J., Diluxe, M., Madadi, S., Elhadi, Y. A. M., Ahmadi, A., Adebisi, Y. A., & Lucero-Prisno, D. E. (2021). The challenge of the dearth of information in Tanzania's COVID-19 response. *Journal of Global Health Science*, 3(2), 2–5. <https://doi.org/10.35500/jghs.2021.3.e20>
- Khajavi, Y., & Rasti, A. (2020). A discourse analytic investigation into politicians' use of rhetorical and persuasive strategies: The case of US election speeches. *Cogent Arts and Humanities*, 7(1), 1740051. <https://doi.org/10.1080/23311983.2020.1740051>
- Michira, N. (2014). The language of politics: A CDA of the 2013 Kenyan presidential campaign discourse. *International Journal of Education and Research*, 2(1), 1–18.
- Moto, F. (2009). *Language, power and society*. University of South Africa Press.
- Nadeem, U., Mahmood, M. A., & Mahmood, R. (2014). A critical discourse analysis of election manifestos of Pakistani political parties. *Public Policy and Administration Research*, 4(11), 1–11. <https://www.iiste.org/Journals/index.php/PPAR/article/view/17259/17563>
- Oparinde, K., Rapeane-Mathonsi, M., & Mheta, G. (2021). Exploring manipulative rhetorical choices in Nigerian political speeches. *Cogent Arts and Humanities*, 8(1). <https://doi.org/10.1080/23311983.2020.1864913>
- Opeibi, T. O. (2009). *Discourse, politics and the 1993 presidential election campaigns in Nigeria*. Straight Gate Publishing.
- Rahimi, F., & Riasati, M. (2011). Critical discourse analysis: Scrutinizing ideologically-driven discourses. *International Journal of Humanities and Social ...*, 1(16), 107–112. [http://ijhssnet.com/journals/Vol\\_1\\_No\\_16\\_November\\_2011/13.pdf](http://ijhssnet.com/journals/Vol_1_No_16_November_2011/13.pdf)
- Tantucci, V. (2016). Textual factualization: The phenomenology of assertive reformulation and presupposition during a speech event. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 101, 155–171. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2016.06.007>
- van Dijk, T. A. (1997). What is political discourse analysis? *Belgian Journal of Linguistics*, 11, 11–52. <https://doi.org/10.1075/bjl.11.03dij>
- van Dijk, T. A. (2015). Ideology. In G. Mazzoleni (Ed.), *The international encyclopedia of political*



- communication* (1st ed., pp. 1–11). John Wiley and Sons, Inc.  
<https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118541555.wbiepc011>
- Van Dijk, T. A. (1993). Principles of critical discourse analysis. *Discourse and Society*, 4(2), 249–283. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0957926593004002006>
- Van Dijk, T. A. (2006a). Discourse, context and cognition. *Discourse Studies*, 8(1), 159–177. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1461445606059565>
- Van Dijk, T. A. (2006b). Discourse and manipulation. *Discourse and Society*, 17(3), 359–383. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0957926506060250>
- Van Leeuwen, T. (1995). Representing social action. *Discourse and Society*, 6(1), 81–106. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1177/0957926595006001>
- Van Leeuwen, T. (1996). The representation of social actors. In C. R. Caldas-Coulthard & M. M. Coulthard (Eds.), *Texts and practices: Readings in Critical discourse analysis* (pp. 32–70). Routledge.
- Westfall, A., & Russell, Ö. Ç. (2019). The political effects of religious cues. In *Oxford Research Encyclopedia of Politics* (pp. 922–944). <https://doi.org/10.1093/acrefore/9780190228637.013.999>
- Wodak, R. (2001). The discourse-historical approach. In R. Wodak & M. Meyer (Eds.), *Methods of critical discourse analysis* (2nd ed., pp. 87–121). London.
- Wodak, R. (2014). Critical discourse analysis. In C. Leung & B. Street (Eds.), *The routledge companion to English studies* (pp. 302–316). Routledge. [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4419-1428-6\\_2104](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4419-1428-6_2104)