

**CRITICAL DISCOURSE ANALYSIS OF SELECTED CAMPAIGN SPEECHES OF
PRESIDENT MUHAMMADU BUHARI AND PRESIDENT GOODLUCK JONATHAN
IN THE 2011 ELECTIONS**

BY

**SARATU SHUAIBU ISA
P16AREN9040**

**A THESIS SUBMITTED TO THE POST GRADUATE SCHOOL, AHMADU BELLO
UNIVERSITY NIGERIA IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS
FOR THE AWARD OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY (Ph.D) DEGREE IN ENGLISH
LANGUAGE**

**DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH AND LITERARY STUDIES,
FACULTY OF ARTS,
AHMADU BELLO UNIVERSITY,
ZARIA, NIGERIA**

FEBRUARY, 2020

DECLARATION

I declare that this Thesis entitled “Critical Discourse Analysis of Selected Campaign Speeches of President Muhammadu Buhari and President Goodluck Jonathan in the 2011 Elections” is a record of my own investigation in the Department of English and Literary Studies, Ahmadu Bello University, Zaria, Nigeria. The sources of information in the research are duly acknowledged and a list of references provided.

This thesis has never been presented anywhere for the award of Doctor of Philosophy in English Language or another degree in any university or institution.

Name of Student

Signature

Date

CERTIFICATION

This thesis entitled “Critical Discourse Analysis of Selected Campaign Speeches of President Muhammadu Buhari and President Goodluck Jonathan in the 2011 Elections” by Saratu Shuaibu Isa meets the regulations governing the award of the degree of Doctor of Philosophy (Ph.D) in English Language of the Ahmadu Bello University, Zaria, Nigeria and is approved for its contribution to knowledge and scholarly presentation.

Professor A.A. Joshua
Chairman, Supervisory Committee

Date

Dr. S.A. Abaya
Member, Supervisory Committee

Date

Dr. J. E. Amodu
Member, Supervisory Committee

Date

Professor T.Y. Surakat
Head, Department of English and Literary Studies

Date

Professor Sani Aubakar
Dean, School of Post Graduate Studies

Date

DEDICATION

This research is dedicated to my husband, Mr. Shuaibu Nana Isa and my children, to my grandchildren Samara, Samina and Samaila who gave me their goodwill all through. Above all, I give God Almighty all the glory for the privilege to undertake this study and finish it successfully.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I give gratitude to God Almighty for His faithfulness and for seeing me through this programme. It is important to note that no individual can claim to have achieved success in undertaking such a task; therefore some people deserve sincere appreciation.

I am very much indebted to my team of supervisors without who this work would not have seen the light of the day. First, special thanks go to Professor Adebayo Joshua the Chairman of the supervisory committee for his ever readiness to guide and contribute to enrich this work.

This profound gratitude also goes to Dr. S.A. Abaya, an Associate professor of English Language for his preparedness to read thoroughly and make this work attain this level of standard. My appreciation would be incomplete without mentioning my third supervisor Dr. Jonah Amodu for the interest shown in the work and ensuring that it is a success.

Special thanks go to other lecturers in the department for their contributions in the course of this work. These are: the Head of Department, Professor T.Y. Surakat for encouraging me to continue, Professor Dili Ofuokwo for his criticisms to enrich the work, Professor Gani Ikilama for her interest in the progress of the work, Dr. Hauwa Mohammed Sani, the Departmental Post Graduate Seminar Coordinator for her role in facilitating this work, Dr. Joyce Agofure, the Coordinator of Postgraduate Programmes for the Department, Prof. F.A. Frank-Akale, Dr. Saminu Isyaku and Prof. G.Y. Sadiq for their support and understanding.

Special thanks and gratitude go to my colleagues in the Department of Languages, Kaduna Polytechnic, for the team spirit and good contributions to this work. They are: Dr. Hassan Suleiman, the Head, Department of Languages, Mr. Kenneth Anumudu, Dr. Yahaya Zubairu, Dr. A.A. Elejo, Dr. Babayo Aliyu, Dr. A. Okpe (of blessed memory), Mrs. Larai A. Atinga, Mrs. Maryam Kangiwa, Mrs. Felicia A. Ojo, Mrs. Patricia S. Achi, Mrs. Habiba Dantudu and many other colleagues in the Department that cannot all be mentioned here.

I deeply thank my dear husband, Mr. Shuaibu Nana Isa for always standing by me. My children, Safiya, Samaila, Samira, Samiru, Kabiru, Sunesis, Godiya, Elizabeth, Alisa, Solo, Aliya and Jessica for your prayers. I like to appreciate my friends, Pst. and Mrs. Abdullahi for their concern and goodwill. I am also grateful to my in-laws Rev. and Mrs. Yunusa Audu and Professor and Mrs. Zamani Kafang, who did not cease to encourage me. I thank all my siblings for your prayers. God bless you all.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Title	Page
Title page - - - - -	i
Declaration Page - - - - -	ii
Approval Page - - - - -	iii
Dedication - - - - -	iv
Acknowledgements - - - - -	v
Table of Contents - - - - -	viii
Abstract - - - - -	x

CHAPTER ONE

GENERAL INTRODUCTION

1.1	Background to the Study	- - - - -	1
1.2	Biosketch of Buhari and Jonathan	- - - - -	2
1.3	Statement of the Research Problem	- - - - -	5
1.4	Research Questions	- - - - -	6
1.5	Aim and Objectives of the Study	- - - - -	7
1.6	Significance of the Study	- - - - -	8
1.7	The Scope/Delimitation of the Study	- - - - -	9

CHAPTER TWO

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE AND THEORITCAL FRAMEWORK

2.0	Preamble	- - - - -	10
2.1	Review of Previous Studies	- - - - -	10
2.2	Conceptual Review	- - - - -	12
2.3	Language and Communication	- - - - -	14
2.4	Rhetorics: An Overview	- - - - -	
2.5	Critical Discourse Analysis	- - - - -	
2.5.1	Pragmatics and Critical Discourse Analysis: Interconnectivity	- -	
2.5.2	Power and Ideology in Political Campaigns	- - - - -	
2.5.3	van Dijk's Notion of Ideology Square	- - - - -	
2.6	Political Discourse	- - - - -	
2.6.1	The Nature of Politics	- - - - -	
2.6.2	Campaign as Political Discourse	- - - - -	

2.6.3	Features of Political Campaign Language	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
2.6.4	Varieties of Political Campaigns	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
2.6.5	Politics and Political Campaigns in Nigeria	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
2.7	Language and Politics	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	\
2.8	Linguistic Strategies	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
2.9	Theoretical Approaches to CDA	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
2.9.1	Fairclough's Three Dimension Model	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
2.9.2	The Vienna School of CDA	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
2.9.3	van Dijk's Cognitive Model	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
2.9.4	Chilton's Representative Model	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
2.10	Theoretical Framework	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

CHAPTER THREE

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.0	Preamble	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	90
3.1	Method of Data Collection	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	90
3.2	Sources of Data	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	90
3.3	Sampling Procedure	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	91
3.4	Analytical Procedure	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	91

CHAPTER FOUR

DATA PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS

4.0	Preamble	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	93
4.1	Presentation of Data	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	93
4.2	Data Analysis	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	94
4.2.1	Manifestation of Power Relations in Buhari's Campaign Speeches	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	94
4.2.2	Rhetorical Devices in the Campaign Speeches and their Functions	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	103
4.2.3	Structure of Language use and Identity Construction	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	129
4.2.4	Manipulation of Language to Serve Ideological Interests	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	146
4.5	Comparison between both Speeches	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	166
4.6	Discussion of Findings	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	169
4.7	Summary of Findings	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	172

CHAPTER FIVE

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

5.0	Preamble	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	175
5.1	Summary	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	175

5.2	Conclusion	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	176
5.3	Suggestions for Further Studies	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	177
5.4	Contribution to Knowledge	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	177
	References	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	179
	Appendixes	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	188

ABSTRACT

This study emphasizes that the pursuit, gain for, and exercise of power is characterized by the crafty use of language. Persuasion and conviction of the electorate to obtain their support and acceptance, manipulating the audience towards accepting a particular ideology depends to a large extent on the kind of language used by the politician. The aim of the study is to investigate the pattern of language used in the selected campaign speeches with a view to determining the extent to which language works in any political dispensation. In this regard therefore, the study is a critical discourse analysis of selected campaign speeches of President Muhammadu Buhari and President Goodluck Jonathan in the 2011 elections. The study utilizes the eclectic approach to CDA which consists of Fairclough's (1992) three dimensional model, van Dijk's (1998) ideological model and Chilton's (2004) representation model. Data for the study were speeches purposively selected and obtained from National Television Authority (NTA), Abuja and downloaded written speeches from the internet. The speeches are of the two strong presidential aspirants from the leading parties in the country, Muhammadu Buhari, Congress for Progressive Change (CPC) and Goodluck Jonathan, People's Democratic Party (PDP). The data obtained were analysed through the following mechanisms: Power Relations, Rhetorical Devices, Identity Construction, and Ideological Interests. The findings revealed that both speakers used different rhetorical devices to persuade and appeal to the audience to attain political power; that the discourse structure of campaign speeches is such that politicians first of all carry out their image construction before they address national issues, and that the use of intertextuality permeated the campaign speeches where the mechanism was used to portray the background of the two aspirants. The study has concluded that campaign speeches by politicians are ideological and often invested with the tendencies to confuse, persuade, dominate and control the minds of the electorate. The study therefore, recommends that for any rigorous analysis to be carried out in campaign speeches, attention should be given to two matters: matter of language and matter of politics which are ultimately ideological.

CHAPTER ONE

GENERAL INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background to the Study

This study is located within the ambit of political discourse analysis. It focuses on language as the main system of social interaction and one that makes all other activities possible. In politics, language is used in much a crafty way than in everyday use of language. Hence, this study is motivated by the way politicians use language in a much different way than the ordinary day-to-day use of language. This is much more prevalent in campaign speeches where politicians obfuscate their intentions using certain language choices to disguise their real ideological intentions. Therefore, the study focuses on the campaign speeches of presidential candidates in the 2011 elections in Nigeria, using the framework of Critical Discourse Analysis (henceforth CDA) to analyse the linguistic strategies and discourse structures employed by the contestants to control and garner support from the electorate.

Basically, the study adapts the methodology framework used by most outstanding practitioners in CDA (Fairclough, 1989, 1992, and 1995, 2001, 2003; van Dijk, 1988, 1991, 1993, 1995, 1998 and 2000, Chilton 2004). Appreciating the interdisciplinary nature of CDA, Fairclough conceptualises discourse in a three dimensional model which are intricately related. This includes the text, discourse practice, and social practice, and seeks to map these three separate forms of analysis onto one another (Fairclough 1995). According to van Dijk (1988), CDA is concerned with analysing written texts and spoken words to reveal the discursive sources of power, dominance, inequality, and bias and how these sources are initiated, maintained, reproduced, and transformed within specific social, economic, political, and historical contexts. Hence, it illuminates ways in which the dominant forces construct texts that favour their interests.

From a critical discourse perspective this study is located around a rule-of-three: language, politics and ideology, part of which forms the principles of political discourse. In Nigeria, politicians are classifiable into inter - and intra - party factions which breed subjectivity, partisanship and oppositions in politics. This, in turn, affects the choice of words and expressions in politicking. It is in line with this that language analysts submit that language use in political discourse is therefore subjected to individual manipulation (See, for example, van Dijk, 1998, Silverman, 2000, Chilton, 2004, Abaya, 2008, Ayoola, 2010) and that various linguistic properties are deployed deliberately to align with a political party or to distance from it.

1.2 Biosketch of Buhari and Jonathan

This study takes on the campaign speeches of Muhammadu Buhari, Congress for Progressive Change (CPC) and Goodluck Ebele Jonathan, Peoples Democratic Party (PDP) for critical discourse analysis. The choice of these aspirants is because the parties they belong to are considered popular and strong in Nigeria, with widespread supporters from the thirty-six states and the Federal Capital Territory (FCT), the former being the ruling party with its candidate from the south- south and the latter, the opposition, with its candidate from the north-west.

1.2.1 Biosketch of Muhammadu Buhari

General Muhammadu Buhari was born on December, 1942 in Daura, Katsina State in the North West zone, Nigeria. He became Nigeria's Head of State on December 31, 1983. He was overthrown on August 27, 1985. As a military Head of State his administration introduced "War Against Indiscipline" (WAI) campaign.

Before he became the Head of State, Buhari had been the Chairman of Nigerian National Petroleum Cooperation (NNPC), Minister of Petroleum and Natural Resources and Governor of North-Eastern State of Nigeria. He was also Chairman of Petroleum Trust

Fund (PTF), under General Sani Abacha; since 2003, Buhari has sought to become Nigeria's civilian president, without success. He contested in the 2003 and 2007 presidential elections under the platform of the All Nigerian People's Party (ANPP), losing out on both occasions to the Peoples Democratic Party (PDP) candidates. He fell out of the leadership of the All Nigerian People's Party. In spite of this, he pursued with strong passion, determination and succeeded in pulling out with him some of the supporters of the party which formed the Congress for Progressive Change (CPC). He was ratified as the presidential candidate of the party in 2011 elections. He aims at objectivity but his view on the past government makes him confrontational, critical and at the same time confident that change must take place in the country.

1.2.2 Biosketch of Goodluck Jonathan

Dr Goodluck Ebele Jonathan was born on November 20, 1957 in Otuoke, Bayelsa State South-South zone, Nigeria. He has a PhD in Hydrobiology and Fisheries. He was appointed as Science Inspector of Education, Rivers State Ministry of Education between 1983 and 1993. He took up employment as a lecturer in the State College of Education. He was appointed Assistant Director of the defunct Oil Mineral Producing Areas Development Commission. His desire to better the lot of Nigerians motivated him to go into politics in 1998. Simplicity, charisma, quiet strength, and determination made him an ideal running mate to chief D.S.P, Alamieyeseigha on the Bayelsa PDP gubernatorial ticket. They won the elections and he served as a deputy Governor from 1999 to 2000. But on 12, December 2005, he became the substantive governor of Bayelsa State. After that, fate once again beckoned. He was busy preparing for re-election to his party when PDP, nominated him as running mate to the presidential candidate, Ahaji Umaru Yar'Adua on May 29, 2007; he was inaugurated as Nigeria's Vice- President.

In February 9, 2010, Dr. Jonathan assumed office as Nigeria's Acting President by virtue of a National Assembly's resolution empowering him following President Yar'Adua's long absence for Medical attention in Saudi Arabia. Goodluck Ebele Jonathan was sworn in on May 6, 2010 as President, Commander-in-Chief of the Federal Republic of Nigeria. In April, 2011 the incumbent President Goodluck Jonathan was re-elected as President, Commander-in-Chief of the Federal Republic of Nigeria, and with a transformation agenda.

Ideological Standpoints of CPC and PDP

Andaolotu (2011) points that the CPC lies towards the left wing of the political spectrum which can be described as neo-socialism, supporting individual liberty, rights, and social welfare of the less privilege. For example, Buhari outlined his 'change agenda' for Nigeria which include the following; That is, to provide access to justice, respect for fundamental human rights, security, corruption, employment, health, economy and education. In the area of the economy Buhari's ideology is that no matter the amount of wealth created it will be meaningless unless it benefits the majority of the people. This he observes was lacking in the government of the Peoples Democratic Party where the wealth of the country was concentrated in the hands of a few to the detriment of the welfare of the larger society. In the case of corruption, Buhari's view is that no matter how vast the resources if they are not efficiently utilized, they will only benefit a privileged and corrupt few, leaving the majority in poverty. He believes that if Nigeria does not kill corruption; corruption will kill Nigeria. That is to say, the personality of the presidential aspirant has influenced not just his ideology but that of the party – CPC.

Conversely, Goodluck Ebele Jonathan's government was an offshoot of the Yar'adua administration, his commitment was to continue with the seven point 'transformation agenda'. This agenda include the total transformation of Nigeria to ensure that Nigeria is

a true home for all her citizens, a country where there is adequate power supply, a secured environment for business and leisure where the infrastructure is comparable to anywhere in the world, improved educational standard, that is, he wants the schools to deliver the best education to children and the institutions must work in the interest of the people, and he wants to see a country where no one goes to bed hungry. Practically, here, the party, PDP appeared to play lip service to this laudable agenda as some of them were truncated by their strong members and as such the citizenry could not feel the impact of government's programme which was meant to ameliorate the suffering of the masses. So, on the whole, PDP aligns to the capitalist ideology as opposed to CPC's neo-socialist stance.

It is against this background that this study interrogates the language used in the campaign speeches delivered by two presidential candidates of two ideologically opposed political parties in the Nigeria presidential election of 2011. Several levels will be observed: linguistic features (wording, phrasing and sentence structure), rhetorical devices, forms of indirectness and strategies which aim at positive self-presentation and negative other-presentation so as to explain the extent the speakers' partisan ideologies reflect their linguistic choices.

1.3 Statement of the Research Problem

One essential property of political discourse is its interest in the ideological layers of the text which many previous studies within the context of Nigeria from the perspectives of both theoretical linguistics and applied linguistics (critical discourse analysis) have glossed over or completely ignored. There is no doubt that studies abound on the discourse structure of political communication as evident in the works of Abaya (2008), Akodu (2009), Abdullahi-Idiagbon (2010), Kamalu and Agangan (2010), Aremu (2010), Ahmed (2012), Balogun (2015). However, these studies were more preoccupied with the

discourse structures of political language rather than with the ideological contents of such speeches. Political language is ideologically charged and value laden such that what is said cannot be considered to be neutral and taken at its face value. The basic difference between the politician and others resides in the ideology which the politician's language contains that may be inaccessible to any cursory observation but can only be laid bare upon critical and rigorous interrogation. One approach, through which the ideological contents of political speeches can be accessed, analysed, laid bare and understood is Critical Discourse Analysis which previous studies have substantially ignored or which they have hardly applied in the analysis of political speeches in Nigeria. The major orientation of CDA is an understanding of the hidden ideological contents which are shrouded in the deliberate and sometime not so deliberate choices of language which politicians make in their speeches.

The current study on CDA proceeds on the assumption that no language use is face value free; all language structures exploit one ideological position or the other. These ideological positions as far as campaign speeches are concerned include the representation of perception, manipulation as well as the construction of image and intentions. The focus of this study therefore is to identify, compare, and contrast the discourse structures and ideological strategies used in the campaign speeches delivered by two presidential candidates of two ideologically opposed political parties in the Nigerian presidential election of 2011 using Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA). The choice of CDA as the analytical tool for this study is borne out of its major concern on revealing the ideological layers inherent in campaign speeches.

1.4 Research Questions

This study is therefore an attempt to answer the following questions:

- a. To what extent do the selected campaign speeches manifest political power?

- b. What rhetorical devices permeate the campaign speeches and what are their functions?
- c. How does the structure of language used in campaign speeches construct the identity of the aspirants as well as the electorates?
- d. What are the pattern of campaign speeches by Muhammadu Buhari and Goodluck Jonathan?
- e. How do the selected presidential candidates manipulate language to serve their ideological interests?

1.5 Aim and Objectives of the Study

The aim of the study is to investigate the pattern of language used in the campaign speeches of Buhari and Jonathan in 2011 presidential elections with the view to determining the extent to which language works for politicians in controlling and wooing the electorate. In particular, the study investigates the speeches produced by Muhammadu Buhari and Goodluck Jonathan. Special attention will be paid on the use of rhetorical devices, framing, naming, hedging, modality and lexicalization which are often conveyed through deliberate choice of words. In doing this, the objectives of the study are to:

- a. highlight the extent to which campaign speeches manifest political power;
- b. identify the rhetorical devices that permeate the campaign speeches of Buhari and Jonathan and what are their functions;
- c. assess how the structure of language used in the campaign speeches construct the identity of the aspirants as well as the electorate;
- d. demonstrate the pattern of campaign speeches of Buhari and Jonathan;
- e. reveal how these presidential candidates manipulate language to serve their ideological interests;

1.6 Significance of the Study

The fact that our unconscious knowledge of language is much greater than our conscious knowledge of it cannot be overemphasised. Hence, it is no doubt that the facts about language that are easily accessible to the average person covers part of what language is and how it is used. For instance, it is not out of place for the general public to pay close attention to the way language is used in different contexts even in campaign speeches. There is, therefore, the need to examine the peculiar use of language in campaign speeches.

The audience listens to the campaign speeches without critically reacting to the messages which are full of persuasion and manipulation in order to win their votes. Thus, the need to examine the campaign speeches of Muhammadu Buhari and Goodluck Jonathan in 2011 elections as they employ language to make the audience accept their ideology. In addition, account of language use in campaign speeches by the researcher enlarges the coast of political discourse linguistically and socially. It also needs a critical discourse analysis perspective if the audience is to understand political campaign speeches in a critical sense. It will help students of language who want to study political discourse and reawaken the consciousness of politicians on how to use language in a better way not only to carry people along but also to create agreement and not crises.

1.7 The Scope/Delimitation of the Study

The research should have covered more presidential candidates and speeches but for effectiveness and thoroughness, this work is limited to two presidential candidates of the PDP and CPC in the 2011 campaign elections. The choice of these parties is based on the fact that these major parties (PDP and CPC) have captured the majority of the electorate in the northern and southern parts of the country.

The study utilizes an eclectic or abridged method of CDA of Fairclough (1992), van Dijk (1998), and Chilton (2004). This is because they have adopted socio-cultural approach to analyze text and talk. However, it is difficult to study all the campaign speeches of the presidential candidates as a result the study has been restricted to some selected speeches in States like Kaduna, Plateau, Nasarawa, Kogi, Kwara and Abuja (Federal Capital). A total of six (6) speeches for both candidates are examined in this research.

CHAPTER TWO

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE AND THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

2.0 Preamble

This chapter as the name suggests is a review of related literature to the current study. This is divided mainly into three sections: review of previous studies, conceptual review and the theoretical framework. For the purpose of clarity, the review focuses on political discourse/language, campaign language and its variants, CDA and its differing methods, and the theoretical framework.

2.1 Review of Previous Studies

Ayoola (2005) examines the declaration speech of President Olusegun Obasanjo which was delivered in a climate of suspicion from many opposition groups that the president was contemplating going for an unconstitutional third term. The study employs critical discourse analysis (CDA) to analyse the political background, the use of personal deixies, emotive lexis and structures, Nigerian English political lexicon and the semantic field of war. Ayoola's work is similar to this study as it is based on the analysis of a political campaign speech. However, the point of departure is that the present study analyses the pattern of language use in campaign speeches of two presidential candidates from different political parties and how the candidates manipulate language to serve their ideological interest.

Kulo (2009) explores the rhetorical strategies of persuasion in the political speeches of two presidential candidates in the 2008 American presidential campaign namely: Barak Obama and John McCain. Kulo analyses rhetorical strategies such as metaphors, metonymies, analogies, pronoun, the passive and active voice of transitive verbs, sound-bites, three-part lists and contrastive pairs which are all within the ambit of Discourse

Analysis. It is worthy to point out that while Kulo's research is on rhetoric strategies of persuasion, this study apart from identifying the rhetorical devices that permeate the campaign speeches of the presidential candidates also sets out to evaluate how positive self-representation and negative other-representation are portrayed in the speeches and to determine how they manipulate the electorates through language to serve their ideological interests.

Kamalu and Agangan (2010) study the text of President Goodluck Jonathan's declaration speech of his candidacy for PDP presidential primaries. They employ a qualitative approach in the analysis of the text to unearth the meaning potential of the rhetorical strategies deployed in the speech and the ideology they encoded. Kamalu and Agangan use CDA in the analysis of the text to reveal the underlying ideology and persuasive strategies used in the declaration speech. It is pertinent to show that Kamalu and Agangan (2010) and the present study dwell on rhetorical strategies and their ideological underlining. Apart from the fact that the studies are similar in terms of their interest in rhetoric and ideology, the preoccupation of the present study is on analysing the pattern of language use in the campaign speeches of two presidential aspirants; Muhammadu Buhari and Goodluck Jonathan while Kamalu and Agangan's (2010) is concerned with Goodluck Jonathan's declaration of interest in the presidential primaries.

Abaya (2011) investigates the military coup speeches which he says is a manifestation of the relation of language and power. He argues that since politicians are assumed to have a particular way of perceiving the world of a particular ideology; they differ in ideologies. Hence, their approach to political issues is from different perspectives and often they find contrasting solutions to the political problems. In terms of theoretical framework, Abaya uses the determinism theory to establish that coup speeches are a variant of political

language. Whereas, Abaya (2011) and this study are both researches on political language, the former employs a pragmatic analytical frame work and the present study analyses the pattern of language use in campaign speeches of two presidential candidates using the critical discourse analytical (CDA) approach.

Matic (2012) studies the campaign speeches of two American presidential candidates; Barak Obama, the Democratic Party flag bearer and John McCain who was flying the flag of the Republican in the 2008 presidential election. Matic adapts an eclectic approach which includes Fairclough's (2001) model, van Dijk (1998), Chilton and Schaffer's (1997) models, to identify and compare the political discourse structures such as the semantic macrostructures, local meanings and linguistic devices which are used in the speeches of these candidates. This study is similar to Matic's work as it also compares the speeches of two presidential candidates using tools offered by CDA but dissimilar in their socio-cultural context.

In sum, while these works under review and many others such as, Ayoola (2005), Kulo (2009), Kamalu and Agangan (2010), Abaya (2011) and Matic (2012) particularly relate to language or language and communication studies, this study offers insight into domains- political discourse. Thus, giving clues as to why campaign speech is written the way it is.

2.2 Conceptual Review

The conceptual review is carried out in an attempt to locate the campaign speeches within the purview of language and politics (i.e. political language). By this, issues related to language reviewed on the one hand, and those related to politics on the other.

2.3 Language and Communication

With several definitions of language by many authors, some relevant ones are reviewed here. Awoniyi (1982 as cited in Anifowoshe, 2006: 10) puts that 'language is a system of communication by which we pass from one person to another our ideas, our feelings our knowledge and our requests. He says that in the absence of language or communication there will be chaos and human existence will disappear from what we know it today.

Hence, the importance of the definition of language to this study cannot be over emphasised. Osasinwo (2003) supports Sapir's view, that language is the human beings supreme tool of communication. Thus, Block and Trager (1949 cited in Abaya, 2008) and Essien (2006: 2 cited by Odumuh, 2007: 1) define language as a system of structured vocal symbols by means of which human beings make meaning, communicate and interact with each other in a given community. They add that language is a system of roles and principles in which sound, structure and meaning are integrated for the purpose of communication. However, Chomsky (1957 as cited in Abaya, 2009: 1), views that language enables us to influence one another's behaviour and to influence it in great detail and thereby makes human cooperation possible. This means that the effectiveness of any communication system depends on language. Whereas words can be used in the society, to express our ideas and feelings, they can also constitute an obstacle in our effort to communicate. All these depend on how language is used. In fact politicians need suitable words which will fit into particular context and situation and will serve as tools to articulate and sell their programmes to the electorate. It is on this basis that politicians choose words which are captivating and create dramatic response from the general public.

According to Lyons (1997: 32), “language serves as an instrument of communication”. It is indeed difficult to talk about language without some reference to the notion of communication. It is the most important; most often used and most highly developed form of human communication. Omamor (2003) observes that the big difference in the case of humans is not just that both sender and receiver are humans as would naturally be expected, but also that the message is either sent vocally through the air and the vocal organs, or graphically by making particular kinds of marks on paper. He goes on to say:

The signals are consistent, highly structured and systematic; and they as well as what they transmit are mutually shared by an identifiable community of speakers and guided by firmly established and verifiable conventions which, at the end of the day, constitute the very essence of what facilitates human communication. (Omamor, 2003)

Palmer (1996: 5) argues that:

If language is regarded as information system, or more strictly as a communication system, it will associate a message (the meaning) with a set of signs (the sounds of language or the symbols of written text). The expression “communication” is normally used to cover the exchange of messages; information between humans whether as individuals, corporate entities or whatever via a mutually understood code, normally termed language” (Amodu, 2010: 14).

He adds that understanding language requires a prior internalisation of this common, mutually understood and thus, shared code which is central to making sense of the messages, and information that we receive in the process of communication. The spoken language represents one form of communication but communication itself goes beyond just the spoken language, encompassing gesture, sign, vocalisation, the written language and even body movement and physical behaviour. The concern of this study is the written language and it consists of words. As in the campaign speeches the words of a language, that is, its vocabulary or lexicon are also studied with a view of making clear the various ways in which they relate to, and define each other.

Crystal (1999) quite correctly points out that:

Language is not simply patterns of noise. No matter how systematic noise is. It cannot be language until it has been given a meaning; and it derives this meaning largely from its use in real life situations. Language does not exist in a vacuum; it has no independent existence apart from its users and the uses to which we put it.... A sequence of sounds remains nonsense until we see how people are using it in relation to some aspects of our experience.... (Crystal 1999: 50)

He states that the study of meaning can, of course, focus on what people actually do with the units of language in the whole process of communication. This aspect of the study of meaning is often referred to as Pragmatics but our interest is how meanings are constructed, that is, the way language is used in text / the campaign speeches. Also, competence in language will not be of much value at all without performance especially as regards language use in communicating with the public through campaign especially during election campaigns. If the campaigner, for instance, who is linguistically competent keeps mute, by refusing to speak during election campaigns or refuses to make language signals, he has not put his ability to any use rather the situation could be regarded as “communication recalcitrant”. If on the other hand, the campaigner uses his linguistic competence to show a level of performance, even if this is mischievously done, communication could take place. Furthermore, in the words of Trager, (1964:274):

Language is the principal mode of communication for human beings. It is further assumed that language is always accompanied by other communication systems that all culture is an interesting set of communications and ... communication as such results and is composite of all the specific communication systems as they occur in the total cultural complex (1964:274)

The emphasis is on the fact that human language is vital in communication and that language can be supported with pictures, fliers, banners and so on as is the case with the language of campaign. This is to make the use of language carry more weight and meaning and our focus here is the written text.

The communicative act is the means by which a group's norms are expressed, roles are allocated, co-ordination of effort is achieved, expectations and mode manifest and the

entire social process are carried on. Without such exchange of influence, human society would simply collapse. Thus, how politicians go about this manipulation in their campaign speeches forms part of the focus of this study. It is worth noting that communicative act could start from the encoding level where information is packaged and subsequently disseminated. This is because the essence of language is human activity- activity on the part of the other to understand what was in the mind of the first. The speaker must communicate to the target audience to understand this message but how does this happen? These two groups, the campaigner/contestant and the electorates as they are more conveniently called and their relations to one another are the focus in order to understand the nature of language in campaign speeches.

Therefore, in this study, the view of language and communication examines how the presidential candidates communicate messages through their campaign speeches. This involves explaining the occurrence of certain forms in particular speeches in terms of the communicative strategies they realize and the social purposes of the speeches. These explanatory efforts could in turn have an effect on how the electorate would take and interpret the campaigns to persuade them in voting for a selected candidate.

Canale (1981) provides a broader outline of the components of communicative language use. He first of all distinguishes between communicative competence (the underlying knowledge of the rules of communication) and actual communication (the use of this knowledge in real acts of communication) this parallels the distinction between linguistic competence and performance; the difference, however, is that language used for communication is not an impoverished manifestation of an idealised system of knowledge but an ongoing process of negotiation and evaluation which is a product of complex interactional processes. Thus, language use in campaign speech is consciously chosen and patterned in such a way that the target audience are carried along. But, both

the competence and performance of the speaker must be at the high level of proficiency.

That is why we have expert speech writers.

Canale further outlines four major components of communicative competence: grammatical competence, including knowledge of vocabulary, rules of words and sentence formation, linguistic semantics, pronunciation and spelling; sociolinguistics competence, including rules of appropriateness of both meanings (allowed messages) and grammatical forms in different sociolinguistic contexts; discourse competence, the knowledge required to combine forms and meanings to achieve unified spoken or written texts; and strategic competence, knowledge of verbal and non-verbal communication strategies that may be called upon to compensate for limitations in one or more of the other areas of communicative competence. The knowledge of these communicative competencies is vital in the crafting, understanding and interpretation of the language of campaign speeches.

Following Breen and Candling (1989), Morrow (1977) and Widdowson (1978) Amodu (2010: 19) observes that communication is understood here to have the following characteristics: It is a form of social interaction, and is therefore normally acquired and used in social interaction;

- a. Involves a high degree of unpredictability and creativity in form and message;
- b. Takes place in discourse and socio-cultural contexts which provides constraints on appropriate language use and also clues as to correct interpretations of utterances;
- c. Is carried out under limiting psychological and other conditions such as memory constraints, fatigue and distractions;
- d. Always has a purpose (for example, to establish social relations, to persuade, or to promise);

- e. Involves authentic, as opposed to textbook-contrived language; and
- f. Is judged as successful or not on the basis of actual outcomes.

In a similar view, communication is understood in the present study as the exchange and negotiation of information between the campaigner and the audience through the use of oral and written and this is exactly what a campaign speech is. It is a form of communication between the politician and the target audience. The politician plays the role of an advertiser, where he advertises/sells his manifesto and his promises to the electorates.

Palmer (1978:9) assumes that authentic communication involves a “reduction of uncertainty” on behalf of the participants; for example, a speaker asking a (non-rhetorical) question will be uncertain as to the answer but this uncertainty will be reduced when an answer is provided. He goes on to say that although such uncertainty can be reduced at a given level of information, it does not seem likely that uncertainty can be eliminated at all levels in any authentic communication as it is the case. It is this issue of uncertainty and unpredictability that makes the language of campaign complex and controversial.

Blum-Kulka (1980: 21) distinguishes three types of rules that intersect in determining how effectively a given communicative function is conveyed and interpreted: Pragmatic rules, social-appropriateness rules and linguistic-realization rules. He adds that Pragmatics rules refer to the situational preconditions that must be satisfied to carry out a given communicative function. (For example to give a command, one must have right to do so.) Social- appropriateness rules deal with whether or not a given function would normally be conveyed at all and, if so, with how much directness (for example asking a stranger how much he earns).

Linguistic-realization rules involve a number of considerations, such as the frequency with which a given grammatical form is used to convey a given function, the number, and structural range of forms across functions and situations, and the means of modulating the attitudinal tone of a given function. His findings are that universality of socio-linguistic appropriateness decreases as one goes from pragmatic rules to social-appropriateness rules to linguistic-realization rules. These findings are relevant to this study as the issue of language rules as they apply to the language use in campaign speeches and how the politicians' speeches comply or intentionally deviate from language rules is examined to convey their idiosyncracies.

It must be noted at this juncture that language is the development of the basic form of communication between human beings in a society; and just as it is the basic form; it is also the most developed. Thus, politicians cannot communicate their views to the electorate in any real sense without language, other than through gestures. Though it is possible also to communicate through some non-verbal forms like, pictures, banners, and praise songs. Therefore, politicians are at their best during their campaign speeches. In the real sense, the culmination of true, articulate, communication is through language.

This study is not focusing on the problem of understanding meaning in language use but one of the interests in this work is to critically explore the underlying messages in the language of presidential campaign speeches.

2.3.1 Use of Language

Language is the most potent of human weapons. Sani (2011: 9) states that despite other instruments of coercion to a polity to win their votes, it is through language that a more humane and universally accepted mobilization or immobilization of support is affected. Because of its manipulative potentials, language can be used to persuade, deceive, or liberate a people. That is why it constitutes the sole weapon in the political arena. Thus,

in an attempt to reach out to their targeted audience politicians struggle to control the linguistic definitions of problems, enemies, and solutions. That is to say the ability to communicate effectively is the hallmark of all known politicians and the use of English as an international language has made more people to be aware of the immense power of words in politics and communication.

According to Asher (1994) “Language is an instrument of control as well as communication.” Hartley (2001) adds that people can be both informed and manipulated by language and of course can inform and manipulate others, and words can have commanding effect on a listener or reader’s mentality.

Thus, language is capable of being utilised not only for communication, but for changing opinions of others and shaping ideas. “There is no doubt about this power of speech to mobilize strong feelings, common prejudices, common desires, common fears, and all forces of public opinion. Speech may let loose an army of devils, may literarily create pandemonium. It also commands great forces, great alliances and in writing has by its conquest created man’s new world (Firth, 1964: 14). However, language conveys different kinds of information relating not only to the speaker’s beliefs but also identity and relationship with his listeners and hearers which re-enforces that language is vital to human experience. In other words, language serves as an important tool through which effective interaction, mobilization for national development and transformation are achieved.

2.4 Rhetorics: An Overview

Rhetoric is a synonym of persuasion, spoken or written to inform, educate, persuade or move an audience. Hatt (1975) defines rhetoric as “that aspect of speech or writing that makes an utterance persuasive or effective through a particularly noticeable device”. Richard, Platt and Platt (1992) define rhetoric as “the study of style through grammatical

and logical analysis”. It is therefore “the art or talent by which discourse is adopted to its ends” rhetoric differs from propaganda in the sense that while the former aims at persuading through the beauty of language, the latter seems to persuade through some negative manipulation of language.

Aristotle (quoted in Ajadi 1990:76) defines rhetoric as the faculty of discovering all the available means of persuasion. Broadly, classic speech or rhetoric could be categorised into deliberative, forensic and epideictic. Deliberative oratory deals with the future and seeks to win assent or dissent from the audience about some matters or public policy. It has war or peace, national defence, commerce and legislation as its major focus. Forensic oratory on the other hand is called court room oratory. It is concerned with the past as in the case of alleged criminality. Epideictic oratory is rhetoric of display. It has praise or blame of persons or institutions as its objectives. Its temporal province is the presentation of farewell speeches: dedication speeches, ceremonial address, etc., are forms of epideictic oratory.

However, propagandist use rhetorical devices to provoke thought on the part of the audience; to make the audience change their mind and see why they must reject their opponents. Rhetoric is the study and practice of effective communication: the art of persuasion and an insincere eloquence intended to win the listener in discourse.

2.5 Critical Discourse Analysis

Discourse consists of coherent chains of propositions which establish a ‘discourse’ ‘world’ or ‘discourse ontology’ – in effect, the ‘reality’ that is entertained by the speaker, or meta-represented by speaker as being someone else’s believed reality. There are various meaning ingredients that go into these discourse realities, but the essential one is

the projection of 'who does what to whom, when and where'. In language use the speaker postulates discourse referents with different thematic roles. The roles are defined by the relations between the discourse referents. How do these abstract meaning schemata map into language in use? The prototype is the clause, with (in English) its subject-verb-object structures. However, argument-predicate structure, along with their relations and roles, pop up in other forms- inside some arguments might be implied, and in the semantic phenomenon of presupposition which is triggered by various syntactic and lexical structures. Presupposition is of interest because it frequently is 'existential' – it expresses the taken-for-granted existence of some referent. Overall discourse coherent is achieved, at least in part, by the recurrence of and links between the different discourse referents of the discourse world.

Critical Discourse Analysis is a branch of Applied Linguistics. It is a field that is concerned with studying and analysing written and spoken texts to reveal the discursive sources of power, dominance, inequality, and bias (van Dijk, 1998). It examines how these discursive sources are maintained and reproduced within specific social, political and historical contexts. In a similar vein, Fairclough (1993: 135) defines Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) as a discourse analysis which aims to systematically explore often, opaque relationships of causality and determination between (a) discursive practices, events and texts, and (b) wider social and cultural structures, relations and processes; to investigate how such practices, events and texts arise out of and are ideologically shaped by relations of power and struggles over power; and to explore how the opacity of these relationships between discourse and society is itself a factor securing power and hegemony. Sheyholislami (2001) puts it that "Critical Discourse Analysis aims at making transparent the connections between, discourse practices, social practices and social structures, connections that might be opaque to the layperson." In the late

1970s, Critical Linguistics was developed by a group of linguists and literary theorists at the University of East Anglia; (Fowler et. al., 1979; Kress and Hodge, 1979). Their approach was based on Halliday's Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL). Critical Linguistics practitioners such as Trew (1979: 155) aimed at "isolating ideology in discourse" and showing "how ideology and ideological processes are manifested as systems of linguistic characteristics and processes." This aim was pursued by developing Critical Linguistics' analytical tools (Fowler et al., 1979; Fowler, 1991: 79) based on Systemic Functional Linguistics.

Following Halliday, these Critical Linguistics practitioners view language in use as simultaneously performing three functions: ideational, interpersonal, and textual functions. According to Fowler (1991: 71) and Fairclough) (1995: 25), whereas the ideational function refers to the experience of the speakers of the world and its phenomena, the interpersonal function embodies the insertion of speakers' own attitudes and evaluations about the phenomena in question, and establishing a relationship between speakers and listeners.

Instrumental to these two functions is the textual function. It is through the textual function of language that speakers are able to produce texts that are understood by listeners. It is an enabling function connecting discourse to the co-text and con-text in which it occurs.

Halliday's view of language as a "social act" is central to many critical discourse analysis practitioners (Chouliaraki and Fairclough, 1999; Fairclough, 1989, 1992, 1993, 1995, 1995; Fowler et al., 1979; Fowler, 1991; Hodge and Kress, 1979). According to Fowler et al. (1979: 185), critical linguistics, like sociolinguistics, asserts that, "there are strong and pervasive connections between linguistic structure and social structure." However, in sociolinguistics "the concepts 'language' and 'society' are divided...so that one is forced

to talk of 'links between the two'", for critical linguistics, "language is an integral part of social process" (Fowler et al., 1979: 189).

Another central assumption of Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) and Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL) is that speakers make choices regarding vocabulary and grammar, and that these choices are consciously or unconsciously "principled and systematic"(Fowler et al., 1979: 188). Thus, choices are ideologically based. According to Fowler et al. (1979), the "relation between form and content is not arbitrary or conventional, but . . . form signifies content". In sum, language is a social act and it is ideologically driven.

Over the years, Critical Linguistics (CL) and what recently is more frequently referred to as Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) (Chouliaraki and Fairclough, 1999; van Dijk, 1998) has been further developed and broadened. Recent work has raised some concerns with the earlier work in Critical Linguistics. Among the concerns was, first, taking into consideration the role of audiences and their interpretations of discourse possibly different from that of the discourse analyst. The second concern has called for broadening the scope of analysis beyond the textual, extending it to the intertextual analysis.

Fairclough (1995: 28) has raised both issues. He claims that the earliest work in critical linguistics did not adequately focus on the "interpretive practices of audiences." In other words, he claims that critical linguistics has, for the most part, assumed that the audiences interpret texts the same way the analysts do. In a similar vein, commenting on Fowler (1991), Boyd-Barrett (1994: 31) asserts that there is "a tendency towards the classic fallacy of attributing particular 'readings' to readers, or media 'effects,' solely on the basis of textual analysis".

The other issue put forward by Fairclough (1995: 28) is that while earlier contributions in CL were very thorough in their grammatical and lexical analysis they were less attentive

to the intertextual analysis of texts: "the linguistic analysis is very much focused upon clauses, with little attention to higher-level organization properties of whole text. Despite raising these issues with regard to earlier works in critical linguistics, Fairclough (1995: 28) inserts that "mention of these limitations is not meant to minimize the achievement of critical linguistics--they largely reflect shifts of focus and developments of theory in the past twenty years or so". The "shifts of focus and developments of theory" which Fairclough (1995: 28) talks about, however, have not resulted in the creation of a single theoretical framework. What is known today as critical discourse analysis, according to Bell & Garret (1998: 7), "is best viewed as a shared perspective encompassing a range of approaches rather than as just one school". Also, van Dijk (1998) tells us that CDA "is not a specific direction of research" hence "it does not have a unitary theoretical framework." But, van Dijk (1998) asserts, "given the common perspective and the general aims of CDA, we may also find overall conceptual and theoretical frameworks that are closely related

2.5.1 Pragmatics and Critical Discourse Analysis: Interconnectivity

Pragmatics is a branch of linguistics that studies the ways in which context contributes to meaning. Morris (1983) defines pragmatics as the language used under a particular context, while Bar-Hillel in Anifowoshe (2006:3) sees it as the study of indexical expressions whose meaning can only be determined in relation to user and context. It is the study of linguistic acts and the context in which they are performed.

One of the cardinal tasks of pragmatics is to explain how participants move from the de-contextualized meaning of the word and phrases to a grasp of their meanings in context. Thus, there are a number of reasons why some pragmatic concepts such as context, implicature, presupposition and speech act theory seem to fall in the same line when we discuss the use of language in socio-cultural situations.

Therefore, the interconnectivity between pragmatics and critical discourse analysis lies in the areas of language use and socio-cultural fields. For instance, discourse is divided into; field of discourse, tenor of discourse and mode of discourse. The three areas represent the three meta-functions of language: ideational function, textual function, and interpersonal function (Halliday's Systemic Functional Linguistics).

Similarly, Fairclough (1992) in his explanation of CDA states that it is the use of an ensemble of techniques for the study of textual practice, and language use as social and cultural practices. He also draws from Bourdieu's Sociology the assumption that actual textual practice and interactions with text become embodied forms of cultural capital with exchange value in particular social fields.

Thus, pragmatics and Critical Discourse Analysis are interconnected, such that the linguistic parameters like presupposition, implicature, entailment and speech acts can be used to carry out analysis in both.

2.5.2 Discourse, Power and Ideology

Foucault (1926-1984) cited by Schofield (2008:71) puts that the French social philosopher was an early documented user of the term 'discourse' to describe a system of representation through language. He sees discourse in linguistics 'as practices which systematically form the objects of which they speak.' Prior to this 'discourse' was used as a linguistic concept to describe connected pieces of writing or speech. According to Arnoff and Rees-miller cited by Butari (2013:237) the concept focuses on language use which is motivated by real communicative needs and language as means through which we accomplish various actions and interactions. However Brown and Yule (1983) cited in Butari (2013:237), the concept in its most general usage refers to any form of 'language in use' which can either be interactive (in form of text) or non-interactive

monologue. On a whole, it is language above the sentence or above the clause level (Stubbs 1983).

Foucault was critical of traditional essentialist notions surrounding the author or 'subject' of a speech act or piece of written text. Essentialism regards the individual as 'fully endowed with consciousness; an autonomous and stable entity, the 'core' of the self, and the independent, authentic source of action and meaning' (Hall 2001:79). Foucault however, argues that knowledge is produced by discourse and not by the individuals who speak it. According to Foucault (1972), discourse can be explained as the production of knowledge through language. He describes discourse as a group of statements, which provide a vehicle for talking about, or representing the knowledge about a particular topic in historical time. Discourses, through what is said, written or represented in a visual image, construct the phenomena of the world. In postmodern thinking therefore, anything that can be 'read' for meaning forms a text, and a discourse about an object is read through text.

Burr specifically describes discourse as 'a set of meanings, metaphors, representations, images, stories, statements and so on that in some way together produce a particular version of events' (Burr 1995). She continues, '...a discourse can be thought of as a kind of frame of reference, a conceptual backcloth against which our utterances can be interpreted' (Burr 1995:50) cited in Butari (2013:237). There may be a variety of different discourses, each with a different story to tell about the world, a different way of presenting it to the world. A political discourse for example, is predominant in institutional fields of politics; it underpins the activities of politicians. It has already been posited that '...discourse is not the possession of a single individual' (Gergen 1994:8). It arises out of social interdependence, from the actions of at least two people, and where there is agreement on the meaning of language in use. The view that meaning shapes and

influences our actions, challenges the notion that language is a neutral, transparent medium that gives expression to things which already exist within a person and within the world, and that the world, language and people are separate entities (Gergen 1985; Wetherell 2001). The way that language is structured in turn determines the structure of experience and consciousness. In everyday life dominant discourses are often taken-for-granted by those who produce them, and moreover, producers are unaware that they are constructing a particular version of events. It is this taken-for-granted aspect of discourse production, which indicates a need for a critical approach that will uncover hidden discourses in order to bring them into the consciousness of those who produce them, and to society in general. Once covert discourses are out in the open then there is potential to identify their hegemonic influences.

Foucault posits that discourse constructs the topic and shapes the way it can be meaningfully talked about and reasoned about, so that there are different ways of talking about a topic at different points in time. Not all ways of talking about a topic are given equal value however. Foucault (1977) echoing social constructionist thinking claims that the dominant discourse operating at any one particular time is closely bound up with power. Foucault did not solely perceive power in a negative sense, as a means of repression, but as consensual networks of power, which enable versions of knowledge, in the form of dominant discourses to be produced and widely known. Dominant discourses however, have the effect of limiting and excluding how people think about a particular aspect of reality. Discourse 'rules in', ways of talking about a topic and constructing knowledge about a topic. At the same time it 'rules out', limits or restricts other ways of talking about the same topic. According to Foucault (1972) discourse produces the objects of knowledge so that nothing has any meaning outside discourse. Discourse is not therefore about whether things exist but rather, how meaning is determined. In this study

the discourses that the presidential candidates used in their campaigns to convince their target audience and win their votes, were exposed through a detailed systematic sociolinguistic analysis. Foucault's work has influenced thinking in many fields within the humanities and social sciences. Among its major criticisms however, is its tendency to focus on discourse to the exclusion of material, economic, and political factors in the operation of power/knowledge. Additionally, although Foucault's writing emphasizes the exercise of power within local networks and points of resistance, it provides little explication as to how resistance can be achieved in practice (Best and Kellner 1991). Nevertheless, Foucault's ideas as embraced by Fairclough (1995), surrounding the 'micro-politics' of day-to-day life are useful for examining the campaign speeches through an analysis of the politicians' discursive practices in this thesis. On a whole, discourse can be summed up to mean the attempt made by researchers in linguistics to undertake a study of the organization of language above the clause level and by so doing studying larger linguistic units such as speeches in spoken and written texts.

2.5.3 Power and Ideology in Political Campaigns

Since language is a social human phenomenon, it develops and changes as people use it for social purposes. Much of the understanding of reality (models of the world and the way in which the world is represented) is dependent on language. (Bloor and Bloor 2004: 228). Anderson (1988) cited in Bloor and Bloor (2004: 229) posit that "language can help us to become aware of the unconscious pressure that operate in the ways we think and behave... We can become more aware of these pressures and so make ourselves liable to be influenced by them." This means that the exertion of power by individuals with certain social roles in particular social situations is often revealed in the form of the language, as is the corollary, lack of power.

Van Dijk (1993: 254) posits that “power involves control namely by (members of) one group over (those of) other groups.” He further says “such control may pertain to action and cognition:’ that is a powerful group may limit the freedom of action of others, but also influence their minds. However more effective power is mostly cognitive and enacted by persuasion, dissimulation, or manipulation among other strategic ways to change the mind of others in one’s own interests.

Fairclough (1992 as cited in Bayode, 2013: 14) states that “language is centrally involved in power and struggles for power and it is so involved through its ideological properties”. He further emphasises that we speak or write through the principles of what we believe in, who we are, who we hope to be, what we stand for, who we are trying to persuade or convince and what we are hoping to achieve (Fairclough, 1989: 37). If language is employed in any of these dimensions, then we are making use of its ideological potentials. If language is a powerful vehicle employed in daily pursuits, then its ideological capabilities remain one of its veritable passengers. The term ideology can mean a different concept to different people depending on the context it is used. For example, van Dijk’s notion of ideology seems closely related to that of Fairclough’s in terms of power and dominance but van Dijk emphasizes mainly on ideological square. It can have negative connotations, as well as positive ones. It is a mechanism of power in modern society, contrasted against the exercise of power through coercive means that was utilised in times past. Ideologies are “the mental frameworks, that is, the languages, the concepts, categories, imagery of thought, and the systems of representation that different groups use to explain the workings in society,” Hall (1996: 26).

Fairclough (1989) declares: “Ideologies are closely linked to language, because language is the commonest form of social behaviour and the form of social behaviour where we rely most on common sense assumptions.” Thus it is the set of established values in a

human being that makes up his ideology. This study examines how the presidential candidates manipulate language to serve their ideological interests.

2.5.4 Van Dijk's Notion of Ideological Square

Elaborating on his thesis, van Dijk (1998) contributes a useful theoretical concept he calls the “ideological square”, which encapsulates the twin strategies of positive in-group description and negative out-group description. The double strategy of this binary opposition is often manifested in discourse by lexical choice and other linguistic features (van Dijk, 1998: 33). Van Dijk maintains that many group ideologies involve the representation of ‘Self’ and ‘Others’, Us and Them. Many therefore seem polarized. We are Good and They are Bad, and the ideological square functions to polarise in-and out-groups in order to present the ‘We’ group in a favourable light and ‘They’ group in favourably. (Kuo and Nakamura 2005: 410). Thus, as van Dijk (1993) clarifies, an additional strategy used to express assimilationism is to represent the Other in a negative light which is known as negative other presentation (Tardy, 2009: 282). This ideological polarization may be implemented by a large variety of forms such as the choice of lexical items that imply positive or negative evaluation, as well as in the structure of whole proposition and their categories (as in active / passive, etc.). This strategy of polarisation consists of “emphasising our good properties /actions: emphasising their bad properties /actions, mitigating our bad properties /actions and mitigating their good properties /actions” (Kuo & Nakamura, 2005: 410).

2.6 Political Discourse

Political discourse is the use of language in ways that humans, being political animals, tend to recognise as “political”. Scholars can try to separate out aspects of language (structure and lexicon) that are frequently or typically found in association with what we, again as political animals, interpret as particular types of political behaviour.

In a study such as this, a Critical Discourse Analysis of the presidential campaign speeches in the 2011 elections, it is relevant to define political discourse. Akodu (2009: 72) states, “this is the institutionally bound texts and “talks” of politicians. Such texts include; issues as government deliberations, parliamentary debates, party programmes and speeches by politicians.” Van Dijk (1991: 10) refers to such talks as “professional realm of the activities of politicians.” He is also of the opinion that such topics may include for example those events that require collective decision making, policies regulation or legislation.

Political discourses are generally aimed at mind control or manipulation (van Dijk, 1995, 2006). Thus, politicians usually employ persuasive language to make the audience accept their ideology. They often employ emotional argument and language to arouse the interest of the audience.

De Wet (2010: 104) observes that “the language of political persuasion is geared towards guiding recipients’ attitudes and orientation or behaviour, that is, to forming, sustaining or changing their attitudes on a political issue or impelling them to act.” Hence, Ayeni-Akeke (2008: 83), submits that “political life, like other aspects of social existence is made possible by the ability to communicate.” He argues that “communication underlies the dynamics of political life.” In order to buttress this view, Pie (1978: 2 as cited in Joshua, 2003), points out that politics exists not only to push parties and candidates but covers also the pushing of ideas and point of view. So, politics involves a series of

connected activities designed to bring result. These include: campaign, advertising, canvassing, lawn sign, and so on. Behind these bits and pieces of political power games, is language which 'is an important aspect to political campaign and an interesting vessel of post election communication.

Kamalu and Agangan (2007: 33) add that:

“political discourses, like declaration of candidacy for a political office, political campaigns, presentation of party manifestoes and other forms of political speeches which fall within the purview of Aristotle’s deliberative rhetoric, aimed at marketing the ideology of the candidate and the party they represent. Thus, the campaign speeches of the presidential candidates in the 2011 election are discourse of politics based on the definition of political discourse”.

Also, Akodu (2009: 73) observes that the style and diction of political discourse may not be different from any other kind of institutional discourse as there are few words that are limited and are only used in political discourse. There are some political jargons which are specific to political discourse. Such jargons include the formula for addressing or speaking about specific members of government or the type of language use in the parliament. In our case, it is particularly the language use in campaign speeches.

On the other hand, Wodak (1989) defines political discourse in terms of its context rather than the basis of its verbal properties. She defines the genres of a political discourse in terms of such categories as:

- The global domain which is politics.
- The global acts being implemented which are legislation and policy making.
- The global setting which includes, house of parliament and session of parliament.
- The local political acts being accomplished which include tabling a motion and doing opposition.

- The political cognitions of the participants, which include political beliefs and ideologies, aims and objectives.

These categories are also of election campaign type but this study is particularly concerned with the last category. Akodu (2009: 74) citing Hann (1998), makes an assumption that language of politics cannot be separated from the politics of language and explaining that the notion of “political discourse” does not remain limited to the institutional field of politics such as parliamentary discourse, election campaigns, programmes and speeches, but opens to all linguistic manifestations that maybe considered political. He gives examples of issues that may have linguistic manifestations as discourse genres at the boundary of the domain of politics which include the discourse of a student demonstration, the messages of anti-corruption campaign, corporate talk intended to influence tax or investment legislation or an everyday conversation about politics. Even though, these discourses may belong to other social domains their intention is to influence political decision making as is the case with presidential campaign speeches.

Chilton (2004) highlights the following propositions regarding political discourse:

a. **Political Discourse Operates Indexically**

By indexical it means that one’s choice of language, or features of it, can implicitly signal political distinctions. Examples would be: choosing to speak one language rather than another, choosing a regional accent, or accent associated with social class, choosing words associated with particular political ideologies, choosing forms of address (and in some language, pronouns) that express distance or solidarity. Group boundaries and bonding can thus be expressed indexically.

b. **Political Discourse Operates as Interaction**

While indexicality is clearly an interactive mode, there are many other forms of interaction facilitated by the structure of human language. Using techniques of fine-grain transcription to show the micro-timing of verbal interactions, and to point out the ways in which these interactions are ‘political’. Verbal interaction is often indexical: for example, interruption and overlaps can implicate conflict or cooperation, depending on often complex factors in the ongoing exchange. Again, interactions often signal boundaries and bonding, as well as rank and role.

c. **Interaction Functions to Negotiate Representations**

By representations, this means the use of language oriented to the communication of conceptualisation of ‘the world’. People communicate among themselves partly in order to coordinate their world conceptions – this is what being in a polity is about, as Aristotle suggested. Shared representations may be presumed. For example, speakers take it for granted (that is presume) that certain presupposed meanings are shared by the relevant community, or that a local maxim of quantity, for example, is accepted and that a certain implicature will be generated by the hearer. The notion of presumption is necessary in analysing political texts. It is often very clear that hearers could not make sense of the language-in-use, unless they are expected to adduce pre-existing knowledge stored in memory concerning roles, institutions, values, etc., current in a particular polity. Implicatures in particular, require them. They are cognitive ‘frames’ of various kinds, but they are of a special kind called ‘presumptions’ because of their normative and sometimes coercive characteristics.

d. **Recursive Properties of Language Subserve Political Interaction**

Political actors need to guess what their rivals are up to. Without a ‘theory of mind’ ability which is a language-independent cognitive ability, this would be impossible. Human individuals have to decouple the representations of the world that they have stored as ‘true’ or ‘real’ from those that they reckon, other people have. They can do meta-representation. Meta-representation is essential for truly Machiavellian behaviour.

e. **Modal Properties of Language Subserve Political Interaction**

Probably all languages have grammaticalised modal expressions attached to concepts such as: social obligation-compulsion, certainty-doubt, evidence with credible-incredible source. If they do not have a grammaticalised system (e.g., modal auxiliaries), then there are plenty of ways in which any propositional attitude can be formulated. English for example, has grammaticalised concepts of social obligation, etc., degrees of certainty and straightforward ability. It also has ways of decoupling propositions and putting them in an ‘irreal’ or ‘hypothetical’ mental space, for the sake of various kinds of reasoning process (uses of ‘if’, ‘unless’, ‘in the event that’, and the like). It does not, like some languages, have ‘evidentials’, compulsory morphemes tagging the source of a truth claim but it has equivalents. Moreover, establishing ‘credibility’, claiming ‘rightness’ and ‘legitimising’ truth claims, constitute a political strategy that recruits many available linguistic mechanisms.

f. **Binary Conceptualisations are Frequent in Political Discourse**

Although the lexical potential can communicate skills of probability – possibility, social acceptability and legality, for example, the tendency in much political

discourse is towards antonymous lexical choices, and other lexical choices that must lead to hearers making mental models that are binary in character.

g. **Political Representations are Sets of Role-Players and their Relations:**

Political text and talk involve assuming, negotiating or imposing discourse ontologies – representations of the people, objects, places, etc., that exist, and the relations among them, that is, who does (did, might do, will do) who does what to whom, when and where, who or what caused what, etc. Language seems inherently designed to enable us to communicate such representations by enabling us to assign semantic role to referring expressions. One of the essential features of coherent language use is that it enables us to maintain continuities in which players ‘exist’ along with their roles, by linguistic phenomena, such as anaphora and conceptual abilities that search for and detect convergent reference across sentences. The achievement of coherence is heavily dependent on cognitive frames and political discourse relies on presumptive frames of particular kinds.

h. **Political Discourse Draws on Spatial Cognition:**

On the level of linguistic and cognitive science, the conception of space involves the evidence that metaphorical transfers from spatial (and other) based domains are important in the conceptualisation of abstract domains.

i. **Political Discourse Involves Metaphorical Reasoning**

Cross-domain metaphorical mappings make it possible to draw inferences that could not be drawn on the basis of direct evidence or the basis of direct experience. Chilton (2004:203) states that in political discourse metaphors are often not just embellishment of literal propositions but modes of reasoning about, for example, the future and about policies.

j. **Spatial Metaphors Make Concepts of the Group and Identity Available**

Chilton further explains that certain source domains from spatial cognition are found repeatedly in political discourse. Particularly prominent ones are the container image schemer and the path schemer. The former is fundamental to the conceptualisation of groups of all sizes from family to state, while the latter appears in political discourse as a means of representing policies, plans, national history and grand ideas like 'progress' because it is involved in the conceptualisation of time and of action.

k. **Political Discourse has Specific Connections to the Emotional Centres of the Brain**

Chilton observes that some politically relevant feelings such as territorial belonging and identity ('home'), love of family, fear of intruders and unknown people, such emotions might have an innate basis and be stimulated automatically in the political use of language.

l. **Political Discourse is Anchored in Multi-Dimensional Deixis**

One of the major claims of Chilton 2004 is that political discourse rests on the intersection of several deictic dimensions. These are cognitive dimensions tapped by language in use. He proposes the intersection of three axes, space time and modality but the model must be multi-dimensional. The space dimension for instance, has several forms derived metaphorically from one another. He claims that discourse worlds require entities in it to be relativised to the self, the self is the speaker, but the speaker may claim identity with the hearer and third parties, role-players in the discourse world are positioned more or less close to 'me' or 'us'. The self is positioned at the intersection that is conceptualised not only as 'here' and 'now' but also as 'right' and 'good'. Where does identity come from?

Chilton states that the human nervous system has its innate ways of producing the sensation of personal identity. But whether the subjective, experience of individual identity or that of group identity, all depend largely on linguistic communication. Thus, identity unfolds in discourse by positioning others on the axes of space, time and rightness, presuming the centrality and fixity of the self.

2.6.1 The Nature of Politics

Out of several existing definitions of politics we shall review a few of them that have bearing on this study, presidential campaign speeches. Webster's dictionary (2010:978) defines politics first, as the science of civil government, second, as political affairs in a party sense; party intrigues and third, one's political sentiments. From this definition of politics, we could infer from the second and third definitions that it is the vibrant participation of party members in diverse activities, opinions and plans in the pursuit of their common interests. According to Hague and Harrop (2001: 3), when protesters caused turmoil outside World Trade Organization Conference in Seattle in 1999, they were clearly making a political point of some description. Hague and Harrop refer to this example as the "heartland of politics." However, it is potent to refer to the protests on the streets of all the states in Nigeria in January, 2012 over the removal of fuel subsidy 'as clearly political'.

Therefore, Hague and Harrop (2001: 3) define politics as "the activity by which a group reaches binding collective decisions through attempting to reconcile differences among their members." Consequently, four significant points are derived from the definition above as put forward by them.

- i. Politics is a collective activity involving people who accept a common membership or at least acknowledge a shared fate.

- ii. Politics presume an initial diversity of views, if not about goals then at least about means. Were we all to agree all the time, politics would be redundant.
- iii. Politics involves reconciling such differences through discussion and persuasion. Communication is therefore central to politics.
- iv. Political decisions become authoritative policy for a group, binding members to decisions that are implemented by force if necessary. Politics scarcely exists if decisions are reached solely by violence, but force, or its threat, underpins the process of reaching collective decisions.

Miller (1991: 390) in Hague & Harrop,(2001:4) shares similar view as he defines politics, as a ‘process whereby a group of people, whose opinions or interests are initially divergent, reach collective decisions which are generally accepted as binding on the group, and enforced as common policy.’ For Miller, the political process involves elements of persuasion and bargaining, together with a mechanism for reaching a final decision. It is obvious that campaign speeches have features of persuasion, bargaining and manipulation in order to convince the electorates that they are the solution to the existing problems. We understand from this that there is a tool to be employed for the political process to be carried out successfully which undoubtedly, is language.

Hague and Harrop (2001: 4) further argue that ‘although the term politics is often used cynically, to criticise the pursuit of private advantage under the guise of the public interest, politics is in fact an inescapable feature of the human condition.’ It means not just that politics is unavoidable but rather that; it is the essential human activity and political engagement is the feature which most sharply separates us from other species. In other words man’s superiority is more heightened through political participation.

Max Weber in Anifowoshe and Enumuo, (1999: 2) puts across that politics is ‘the operation of the state and its institutions’. That means, striving to share power or striving

to influence the distribution of power among individuals and groups within a state. Hence, the presidential candidates had the drive to engage in political campaigns in order to gain power and supremacy over each other. It can be observed from this that politics is a bid to have an effect on the issues of the country.

David Easton in Anifowoshe and Enumuo (1999: 3) argues that the definition of politics should emphasise a kind of activity that may express itself through a variety of institutions. Thus, he sees politics as the 'authoritative allocation of values for a society' and stresses on the authoritative allocation of values. This in essence gives a vivid picture of the society where people have their different objectives and interests which must be allocated or distributed somehow. This is similar to the Nigerian situation where people from the different geographical areas of the country have their objectives and interests which the different political parties and their presidential candidates claimed are paramount in their agenda. Wareing et al (1999: 36 cited in Abaya, 2008: 35) opine that "politics is concerned with power; the power to make decision to control resources, to control other people's behaviour and often to control their values." This phenomenon is what is obtainable in Nigerian politics.

According to Anifowoshe and Enumuo (1999: 3) politics gives an answer to the question 'who gets what, when, and how?' Abaya (2008: 195) agrees that 'it is a process whereby a group of people whose opinion or interest are initially divergent, reach collective decisions which are generally regarded as binding on the group, and enforced as common policy'. Similarly, Mohammed (2012: 14) emphasises that politics is an inevitable feature of any human society. He shares the view on the important questions as to 'who should get what, how resources are distributed, and through which means collective decisions are arrived at, fall within the realm of politics'.

It is obvious from these definitions that these weighty issues will stimulate disagreements and rivalry will erupt within the society since there will always be rival opinions, different wants, competing desires, opposing needs and interest. This shows that politics is inseparable from conflict or rivalry in the pursuit to meet the groups or individual's aspiration. In the light of the above assertion politics is a highly interactive activity that is solely dependent on language. This brings us to the relevance of language to the study.

The political life of the society cannot function without the use of language. It is therefore our stand that politicians use language either to convince or persuade the public to win their support for the main purpose of achieving victory. According to Wareing (2002: 11) power is often achieved and demonstrated through language. This is to say political power exists by means of language, through speeches, debates, through the rules of who may speak and how debates are to be conducted. In political campaign it is one of the effective tools for motivation, persuasion and manipulation. It is the goal of this study to undertake a critical discourse analysis of the selected speeches of Muhammadu Buhari and Goodluck Jonathan.

2.6.2 Campaign as Political Discourse

Ginsberg (2009) in Olujide Adeyemi and Gbadeyan (2010:9) defines political campaign as "organised efforts by a political party or candidate for public office to attract the support of voters in an election." Similarly, Olujide, Adeyemi and Gbadeyan (2010: 52) observe that the past two decades have witnessed the increase use of political rallies, and speeches which have been popularly used for mobilizing electorates support for elections. These political strategies are well supported by political advertising which is just an element of political campaign that contestants employ to emerge their parties candidates and not only that, mobilise support and woo voters for elections.

They further agree that the increase in popularity of the political advertising is probably as a result of development in information technology and the realisation of the potent force of media communication, in packaging not only products but ideas (Olujide, Adeyemi and Gbadeyan, 2010: 52) and emphasise that political advertising is the use of media by political candidates to increase their exposure to the public. In this way, the extensive use of television and radio has supplanted direct appearances on the campaign trail which was popularly used by politicians in the past five decades.

The importance of language and its use as a vital instrument of modernisation and technological development is on the increase daily. As a result, governments all over the world are putting all efforts on language as it affects all human endeavours. One of the major purposes for the study of language is to establish the nature of its linguistic demand and how it has been used to meet up such demands.

This accounts for the numerous varieties found in English. Some of the varieties found in English are regional, situational, occupational to mention but a few. Varieties of English are ascribed to different professions that are special fields of human endeavour as the language of advertisement the legal profession, creative literature, science and technology, medicine, engineering and so on. Here, we are saying that, the issue of varieties of language is one that treats registers and dialect accordingly.

Varieties of language are viewed from three perspectives; regional varieties, educational varieties and functional varieties (styles and registers).

Sandell (1977: 175) states that “register is the language according to use”. It is the language commonly regarded as peculiar to a particular field or area of human activity. Every register has its feature to match the social setting where language is required. That is why; the language which a politician chooses to use is different from that of a lawyer.

The major concern in this study is therefore with the functional variety, the regular choice of politicians for the purpose of convincing their audience. The main interest of a politician is to manipulate language to condition the mind of the electorate to believe his view.

Political campaign, according to Wilmot (1987: 6) is an occasion for pedantic and self gratifying political orations as discussants martial their points with bravado and style. George,(1976: 17) says the language of political campaign “is characterised by the cacophonous drumming of partisan politicians and talking drums of a varied kind: sweet, delicious, bitter, poisonous, short lived its effect can be hallucinatory and alcoholic, casting a voodoo spell on the electorate”.

All this is geared toward manipulation, persuasion and conviction of the electorate in order to achieve political victory. It is in this light Anya, (1993: 13) puts that “political campaigns bring out the intellectual ebullience and occasional robust reasoning of some politicians and the mediocre performance of intellectuals in politics who ultimately succumb to the manipulation by another powering political chess veteran as pawns.” He goes on to say “any contrived solution of political campaign which is not founded on widely accepted notion of justice cannot enjoy widespread con-census among the people and will in the long run inaugurate disaffection, alliteration, disharmony and instability within the nascent polity”.

Madungu (1994: 2) points out the present situation in the third world countries, that ‘politics is characterised by poverty of intellectualism and unprincipled inconsistency’. It is no doubt that politicians make promises during campaigns, but these promises are most often not fulfilled.

Furthermore, Opeibi (2005 cited in Idiagbon, 2010) rightly observes that because the politician faces opposition from opponents in the race he has to appeal to the conscience of his electorates despite his attack, he uses language of flattery to win their sympathy. In the words of the All Nigeria Peoples Party Presidential candidate, Ibrahim Shekarau 2011:

The present administration of government must owe up the seven point agenda. I will challenge them to bring out one single item of the designed agenda to show to Nigerians that has been fulfilled, not even one. It has been a period of deceit. If our president is an offshoot of the Yar'adua administration then this has been a period of none fulfilment of promises. What we bring to you as a government in ANPP, we promise to give you what we call Human Development....

From the above we can see the petty jealousies and rivalry among the presidential candidates. Language of politics reveals impact, force, and power. It has to do with the expressions which are used by politicians to capture the minds of the public into believing their utterances. So also, language of political campaign here is to sound powerful and thought provoking to the mental processes of the general public to change their views, or attitudes. As in the following extract;

“I have come here and I have seen it change has taken place, change has taken place in Ilorin, change is here in Kwara, change has come to Nigeria, we are grateful to God for this wonderful, wonderful people of Kwara. We have seen you today and we have listened to you. We want to assure you that indeed change has come to this great country. It is time for change.” (Nuhu Ribadu Action Congress of Nigeria, 2011).

It is also designed to carefully brainwash the thinking processes of the public. Since the ultimate ambition of a politician is to capture political power, he designates his language in such a way that it would appeal to the hearts of the electorate in order to win their support.

This is further resealed in the following speech;

“We are going to go into election. It will start from the national assembly members. We are going to do it. We are going to elect new set of people .We are not going to elect those people who will promise and fail. We are going to elect those who will work for us. We are going to get new set of people, those with fear

of God, and those who will not cheat you and make themselves rich and forget about you, Insha'Allah. We are going to have a new beginning with finger prints. Go out and elect the broom, elect the broom, elect the broom and on the 9th young men and women Ribadu 'muke so', Ribadu 'muke so'."

2.6.3 Features of Political Campaign Language

According to Jones and Peccei (2004: 15) "language can be used to influence people's political views by exploring in detail the ways in which politicians can use language to their own advantage." From the presidential speeches we observe some of the uniqueness of political campaign speeches that campaign speeches consist of some features like using of 'ornamental expression.' That means sweet and appealing expressions in order to convince the audience.

The language of political campaigns usually comprises the use of foreign phrases known as political jargons, three part statements, use of rhetorical questions and pronouns to influence and impress the target audience. There is a large use of quotations and adequate use of repetitions. The mode is manipulative, persuasive and the language is ideologically embedded. (myspeechlab.com)

Quoting Richard, Platt and Platt (1992) Omozuwa and Ezejideaku (2007: 47) in order to further highlight the features of language of political campaign, point out that the features of language use in political campaign makes it distinct and different from other forms of language. Hence, in their view, politicians endear themselves to the audience's heart through rhetorical skills such as repetition, rhetorical questions, colloquialisms, promise, use of pidgin, word coinage among others. In addition, Omozuwa and Ezejideaku (2007: 47) share the same view that language use in political campaigns has certain characteristic features which differentiate it from other varieties of language use. Common as some of these features may be in everyday situation, they remain very unique with politicians and politics. Also, that the language of political campaign

embodied in propaganda and rhetoric is persuasive. They emphasise, that politicians adopt these linguistic devices to cajole the electorates to vote for them and their parties by presenting themselves as the only capable persons for the job. Furthermore, the language of political campaign as a variety of language use is intended to pass the needed information to the electorates with a view to convincing or appealing to them. It is usually laden with emotion and has the effect of causing the electorate to have a change of mind on an issue (Omozuwa and Ezejideaku, 2007: 41).

They, among others maintain that political language is one and the same thing as Propaganda; scholars like Orwell 1946, Damron 1998, Jones and Wareing 1999, Hershell 2001, Mohammed 2002, belong to this group. They shed more light thus, “politics is one aspect of human activities that use by far the greatest amount of propaganda.” Because according to them, “the word is often associated with deceit because propagandists have seldom scruples to lie or to distort the truth in order to persuade and gather people behind them.” They go on to say, “propaganda can be honest or dishonest while its purpose might be to elicit help or tarnish image. In other words, “propaganda is a fundamental instrument of the language of politics.” They stress, “It is used in moulding and changing opinion.”

Ajibola (1997: 18) adds that “propaganda apart from being emotive, evocative and affective is often couched in symbolism and imaginary”. She adds that “the personality, the idiosyncrasies and the thought pattern of the politician and the party are built on symbolic and imagistic referents which form some of the important aspects of the campaign speeches. Thus, a vocal and eloquent politician with a flair for manipulating language will have more supporters. Often, in political campaigns so much sentiment is whipped, so that the extent of the sentiment depends on the evocation of the sensation the politician is able to infuse into his speech or manifesto. Thus, the more intense the

sensation of the speech, the more perverse the sentiment and the response it attracts. It is more often than not this feature of propaganda that does the work for the politician in his political campaign. This is the instance in the 2011 election campaign where this study examines the language of selected campaign speeches of the two opposing presidential candidates Dr. Goodluck Ebele Jonathan (PDP) and Gen. Muhammadu Buhari rtd (CPC). The contestants deployed propaganda to draw support from the electorates.

By and large the choice of words in campaign speeches are consciously selected and deployed to rouse sentiment and score a political point. For example in the campaign speech of the Democratic presidential candidate, Mr. Barack Obama (August, 21 2007);

To keep our sacred trust, I will improve mental health screening and treatment at all levels: from enlistment, to deployment, to re-entry into civilian life. No member should be kicked out of the military because they are struggling with untreated PTSD.” “As President, I will do everything in my power to ensure that those who serve today and those who have served in the past have access to the highest quality health, mental health and rehabilitative care in the world. The disgrace of Walter Reed must not be forgotten. Neither should we accept a situation in which veterans are denied access to care due to great travel distances, backlogs of appointments, and years of pending disability evaluation and claims. John McCain, Republican candidate. (April 7, 2008)

Thus, what both Obama and McCain did was to work on the emotions of their respective audiences during the campaigns through the agency of propaganda. The goal of which is to indoctrinate, to persuade, to be self assertive and to win support.

In addition, Hall (1979: 107), Joshua (1997) Hudson (1998: 55 as cited in Akodu, 2009: 80) also holds a strong view that propaganda is highly associated with politics and measured prominently in political campaign. In Joshua’s words politicians being very crafty in their use of language employ this strategy in attacking an opponent through the circulation of wrong information about the candidate.

Szanto (1978: 6 also cited in Omozuwa & Ezejideaku, 2007: 42) in contrast define “propaganda as a specific form of activated ideology” they opine that “propaganda is one

of the manifestations of the ideology that involves the selling of specific concept". But for Longe and Ofuani (1996: 17) they argue that "the sole purpose of propaganda is to misinform and mislead and to consciously indoctrinate" they go on to emphasise that propaganda aims at deliberate slanting of facts and arguments as well as displays of symbols in ways the propagandist thinks will have the most effects. For maximum effects, the propagandist may deliberately withhold pertinent facts, and try to divert the attention of the people he is trying to sway from every side by his own propaganda. It is based on this that we agree with Szanto (1978: 5) where he argues that propaganda could be "total falsehood on the one hand and on the other a totally valid depiction of reality or truth". Politicians usually during campaigns attempt to persuade their audience by means of expressions that may damage the character of the opponent and discredit him through a conscious manipulation of language. Longe and Ofuani (1996: 17) therefore argue that propaganda is derogatory because it tends to "damage or take away credit" from something or someone. Propaganda could be in the form of exaggeration, rhetorical questions, vague and abusive utterances. For the purpose of the study we shall briefly explain each of these below:

a. **Propaganda through Exaggeration**

Omozuwa and Ezejideaku (2007:42) observe that it could be through the exaggeration of the candidates little achievements or the over-bloating of the wrong acts of the opposition. In their campaign speeches the politicians present the mistakes and failures of their opponents in such a way that the followers of the opposition would become confused as to want to reconsider their stand.

For example, in the following extract:

They told us they have reformed the economy, which economy? No Electricity 95% of business and homes depend on generator for electric power. No fuel,

Government imports 100% of petroleum products for local consumption, insecurity, security of lives and property, almost nonexistent. Poverty, there is absolute hunger and unemployment in the land. Orji Uzor Kalu (Daily Sun, Tuesday, April 17, 2007:5)

b. **Propaganda through Rhetorical Questions**

According to Hatt (1975:11), Joshua (2002:107”) rhetoric is “That aspect of speech or writing that makes an utterance persuasive or effective through a particularly noticeable device.” (Omozuwa and Ezejideaku 2007: 43, Richard, Platt and Platt, 1992: 136) define rhetorical question as “a forceful question which has a form of a question but which does not expect an answer”. From this definition, we see that rhetorical questions are questions which the speakers already have the answers but deliberate attempt is made to discredit the opponent. The questions more often than not do not need any answer; the answers are already evident with the facts provided by the propagandists. This device is very effective as the propagandist use such rhetorical questions to provoke thoughts on the part of the audience; to make the audience change their minds and see why they must reject their opponents. Consider the following extract:

“I will challenge them to bring out one single item of the agenda to show to Nigeria that has been fulfilled, not even one. Have you seen any? Have you seen any? Have you seen any? Why would you vote what you are voting? (Ibrahim Shekarau, Ibadan 2011) The essential features of the language of political campaign are meant to show what this language is aimed at achieving. This is also a piece of advice to Nigerians.

c. **Vague Utterances**

Politicians make use of certain words that are vague or indefinite, Omozuwa and Ezejideaku (2007:44) describe them as words that have no realistic way of validating them. They say like rumour, they lack verifiable facts. Orwell (1946) clarifies further that the writer or speaker either has a meaning or cannot express it, or he is almost inadvertently saying something else, or he is almost indifferent as to whether his words mean anything or not. He further observes that this mixture of vagueness and sheer incompetence is the most marked characteristic of modern English prose and especially of any kind of political writing as in the following examples of vague utterances (Omozuwa &Ezejideaku 2007: 44)

“Kalu doesn’t respect old age, tradition.” (Obasanjo, *Punch*, Saturday, March 3, 2007).

“Go ahead we love you, Lagosians” (*Punch* Tuesday, March 20, 2007: 47).

The statements above are not definite they lack clarity. Here, one person is speaking for everybody. The opinion expressed may not necessarily be everybody’s.

d. **Abusive Utterances**

Politicians, in their desperation to discredit their opponents engage the use of some unpleasant negative utterances that may be termed abusive. The utterances may be consciously or unconsciously used. Examples of such utterances are seen below:

“The entire southwest is too important, too sophisticated and too educated to be in the hands of rascals who are currently controlling it...” Dr Goodluck Jonathan. (2011)

“...the time has come for Nigerians to stand up and support the bid to uproot the ruling People’s Democratic Party which is a republic of thieves!” Gen. Muhammadu Buhari rtd 2011. These statements are to present the political parties and their members in bad light.

e. **Lies and Deceit**

During campaign rallies most successful or unsuccessful politicians tell lies by making false promises that sound very realistic and are aimed at achieving success. Abaya (2009: 203) opines that “in most political discourse, politicians do not tell the truth. Lies are told in order to mislead the public. He refers to Orwell (1949, Mohammed 2001: 3 and Iornem 1995: 35) that what politicians do is to guide what they write or say as in the words of Orwell, political language is “largely the defence of the indefensible”. This in essence is an act to cover up the factual thing on ground, through political language, (Abaya, 2009: 204) points that ‘they are packaged in a nice box labelled national security’. Abaya further puts that there is a distinction between lies and deceit, “both concepts are analogies. Whereas a lie is an explicit statement known by the speaker to be untrue and said with the intention to deceive; deception which is a broader term includes all kinds of omissions, suggestions and non-verbal”. For instance, during a campaign, a politician promises all that he knows are the heartbeat of the electorates and such promises remain unfulfilled. This amounts to telling of lies, “designed to make lies sound truthful and murder respectable and give an appearance of solidity to pure wind” (Mohammed, 2001: 3).

f. **Hyperbole**

To Joshua (1997: 12) one other feature of language of political campaign is making use of hyperbolic statements. That is, some political utterances are exaggerated by the politician for instance in his maiden speech in 1979, Bola Ige

says: “I promise, once again, that during my own time life will be made more meaningful. I will turn stone to bread; the poor will reap the fruits of their labour. I know that, you my fathers and mothers will pray for me and our state and your prayers shall be heard” (Ayeomoni, 2005: 159).

This type of speech shows exaggeration by the politician to make the electorate believe he is capable of achieving success, if voted into office. It is the language use which brings out the force of a campaign speech. It is what communicates the intention of the politician. Therefore, the totality of the language usage of the politician becomes synonymous with his political party.

In addition, Abaya (2009: 204) mentions, ‘hyperbole is an excessive exaggeration employed by politicians in order to appeal to the emotions of the audience’. According to him, it is persuasion not backed by argument or evidence capable of evoking emotions, he also lists the issues that are quite often exaggerated and work on the sentiment of the audience that is, the electorate, which include; tribalism, cheating, religious discrimination, accusation of corruption, misappropriation or stealing money belonging to the people, injustice, immoral sex involving another man’s wife and so on. Consider this extract:

Today, no girl paid us a kobo for education at all levels; primary, secondary and tertiary. Any female to study in the moon, my government is prepared to promote them because we believe that educating the woman is educating the nation (Mallam Ibrahim Shekarau ANPP at Ibadan, 2011).

This presidential campaign speech is hyperbolic. Thus, some political utterances tend to be exaggerated by the politician in order to deceive the electorates. Such statements are sometimes hyperbolic. To buttress the fact that hyperbole is a prominent feature of political campaign language, O’Barr and O’Barr (1976) in Akodu (2008: 84) gives examples of such slogans as, “power to the people”, “one nation one destiny”. In other

words, a careful look reveals that power actually belongs only to those in leadership who control the apparatus of state power and not to the general public.

g. **Ambiguity**

According to Joshua (1997 as cited in Akodu, 2009: 81), language of politics include, ambiguity where politicians make use of words that reveal inequality with difference whose meaning are connotative. Connotative refers to the associated meaning which a word may have. Most politicians during their campaign speeches employ the use of connotative words and expressions while addressing an audience. This is done, to enable the candidate manipulate language to suit the needs of the electorates and to gain more supporters which enables him to have an edge over the opponent and to achieve victory.

De wet (2010: 110) in Kamalu and Agangan submits that ambiguity is especially a conspicuous language because politics invariably concerns conflicts of interest. Thus, Ojiaka (1981: 278) points out that a politician would say “we hope to achieve a stable economy in six months” this implies that within the next six months, economic stability will be achieved. Thus, it is to the advantage of the politician in the case of any controversy which helps the politician to manipulate language to his advantage. It is no wonder Hudson (1998: 55) submits that the features of ambiguity sometimes are statements similar to bureaucratese. It is the idea of saying something and meaning another thing entirely. It is to create good feelings and flatter the audience in order to achieve the politician’s goals in the society. In this case, of the election campaign it is to win votes.

Han (1998:89 as cited in Abaya, 2008: 95) as regards ambiguity as the feature of political language says, “political language depends upon ambiguity because politicians need the ability to place their own interpretations on what they have said, to deny others

interpretations, to change their emphasis without changing their words, to allow their audience to hold different interpretations simultaneously without offending those who hold any one interpretation, and perhaps for other reasons yet to be identified.”

According to Idiagbon (2010) euphemism entails disguising whatever is intrinsically ugly, repulsive, immoral or otherwise, unacceptable in more attractive, less offensive or neutral labels. He goes on to say, though at everyday level, it is considered simple politeness and civilised conduct, in the hands of politicians, euphemism is used as a sinister device to indoctrinate the public into accepting things which are intrinsically repugnant or contrary to the national interest. Consider this extract:

After almost two decades of deep and serious reflection, increased exposure and review of our past and present, I am today, even more convinced and indeed determined to take on fully the challenges ahead of the country... my renewed desire to participate in the political process is motivated by very compelling challenges, which confront the country. (Gen. Ibrahim Badamasi Babangida rtd)

He is being subtle, presents himself as a candidate who can surmount problems the opponent cannot solve. Thorne (1997 as cited in Abaya, 2008: 78) in her view euphemism in political language is employed by politicians and governments alike to conceal the truth such that harsh realities are presented in a palatable manner. Abaya shows three functions of political language from Thorne’s view:

- i. Informative (referential function)
- ii. Persuasive (connotative function)
- iii. Rhetorical function

She observes that the uniqueness of political language can better be understood if, the speaker, the audience, the purpose and the context of the discourse are considered as each of these factors could change the nature of the language used in politics. According to Abaya (2008: 7) “political language can be studied either with the aim to describe or prescribe.” He adds, if it is intended to describe, it is realised through highlighting some

of the ways politicians make use of the available linguistic system in their day to day communication. Prescriptive study however, pertains to how political language influences political thoughts. Abaya's (2008: 79) emphasis is on hidden or underlined truths to lay base the illogicality or unfairness of political rhetoric. Thus, politicians, world over are known as saying one thing and meaning another at the same time. This is one of the central focuses in the critical discourse analysis of the campaign speeches.

Similarly, Thorne (ibid: 90) considers four basic linguistic characteristics of political language – register, lexis, grammar, metaphorical and rhetorical language. She stresses they are but checklist that can be used appropriately to identify key characteristics of political language. These, as she notes might not be examples of all the features listed in every text or transaction. The following characteristics identified are also guided with some questions that are quite instinctive.

1. **Register**

She suggests three variables, such as mode, manner and field. The concern in mode is the nature of the speech whether it is spoken or written, written to be read or spoken or spontaneously spoken answer? And for the manner, is the relationship between the participants formal or informal, the same or different ideology, supports or opposes? As for the field, which is the subject matter, the concern is, does it reflect political variety or not?

2. **Lexis**

In this area the following are noticeable;

Firstly, are there any examples of subject specific vocabulary or general, typical of a certain ideological stance?

Secondly, are there any abstract nouns reflecting beliefs or political policy?

Thirdly, how are the participants named: the use of titles, forenames or surnames, focus on the mode of the individuals, the relationship between speeches, topic and audience?

Fourthly, is there anything significant about the connotation of words, positive or negative?

3. **Grammar**

Further in Thorne's view, the grammar of a political language varies, depending upon

whether the utterances are spoken or written. She acknowledges that written statements tend to be more complex than speeches that have been written to be spoken or oral replies to questions. Thus, in her view the following features can be applied in the analysis of a political language written or spoken.

Are there any pronouns creating a sense of distance, dividing the speaker and audience by using these, dehumanising the reference and making it seems faceless and threatening, by using 'it' and 'them'? Conventional sense of opposition by using 'they' creating a very formal tone often associated with high social class by using one as the first pronoun or second person personal reference, distancing the speaker from an action or conveying a sense of authority by using?

Are there any pronouns bringing the speaker and audience together, giving an individual tone and suggesting a sincere attitude by repeating or blocking the 'I', particularly within mental process verbs like (think, feel or believe), establishing a report with the audience by using the 'I', linking issues and policies to a particular person by using 'his', 'hers' and 'theirs'. Thus, are placing an emphasis on people rather than policies, focusing on the institutions as well as the individual by using 'we' thus including the speaker and suggesting support for actions or policies, drawing the audience in by using 'you'?

Are there any pronouns conveying degrees of responsibility by using 'I', marking the speaker as the instigator of an action or process by using 'I', showing an acceptance of responsibility by using 'I', making the degree of responsibility, less clear by using are, allowing speakers to subtly alter the personal responsibility for certain acts by using 'we' exclusively rather than inclusively, placing responsibility at a distance explicitly excluding the speaker by using 'they'?

How are the questions framed, negatives allowing questioner to lead addressee to a particular answer, by suggesting that their propositions are undeniable modal verbs like 'will' suggesting that any rejection will seem unacceptably rude, structures aiming to make the addressees commit themselves to action, closed yes/no questions attempting to force the addressee to accept or deny any proposition directly words requiring a more focused answer, embedded statements within the question enabling the speaker to establish a context or viewpoint?

Are there any examples of the passive voice, refocusing the audience's attention on certain elements concealing the person(s) responsible for an action by omitting by agent?

Is the sentence statement structure varied, simple sentences making direct and emphatic statements, compound sentences balancing arguments, complex sentences exploring abstract concept?

Metaphorical and Rhetorical Language:

These are the questions that are raised,

Are there any metaphors, establishing a direct link between abstract theories and concrete examples, helping the listeners to understand extend metaphors, emphasizing a particular message?

What is the focus or theme of key sentences/utterances to bring key elements to the attention of the audience?

Are there any examples of repeated words, phrases or clauses emphasising important concepts helping to establish a core topic or attitude?

Therefore, the difference between a sentence and an utterance, simply put is that a sentence is defined within a theory of grammar while an utterance is a sentence fragment in an actual context. The desire of the speakers is largely to communicate and express themselves to the audience, which is natural for all humans. This is what Mey (2001:43) refers to as speaker meaning of an utterance, where as the sentence meaning is purely conventional as it operates only with the rules of the grammar and the context of a given society.

Consequently, according to them “the language of political campaign, whether it is in the interrogative, declarative, imperative or exclamatory mode, contains some forms of promises to the electorate.

In the light of the above, the presidential campaign speeches in the 2011 elections are among several instances in the terrain of Nigerian politics with many promises made by the candidates to the electorate; as when Goodluck Jonathan made the following promises in his speech.

I am Goodluck Ebele Azikiwe Jonathan, my goal is the total transformation of Nigeria and I want to ensure that Nigerian is a true home for all its citizens. A country where there is adequate power supply, a secured environment for business and leisure and where the infrastructure is comparable to anywhere in the world. I want our schools to deliver the best education to our children; our institutions must work in the interest of the people, I want a country where no one will go to bed hungry. Vote me in for the next four years and together we will achieve the Nigeria of our dream. I promise I will not let you down.

From the speech above, indeed perhaps more than any person else, we can say, in the words of Ajibola “the politician needs an armoury of words which are his tools for articulating and selling his ideas and programmes to the electorate. Words colour his speeches and spice up his campaign slogans.” It is also certain here that words are tools or weapons often used to subdue or conquer other people’s prejudices, preconceived

notions and ideas and to liberate the minds of people from certain formed impressions on particular issues. Because of the efficacy of certain words to be able to affect and arouse emotion in his campaign speech, the politician uses carefully ordered words to pass his ideas to his audience as in the example given. Ajibola (1997: 29) states, they use words which qualify a given situation and imbued their messages with so much sensation that is intended to arouse sentiment or subdue sentiment in certain quarters. These in several ways capture the imagination of the electorate and the politicians go all out to give them what they want to listen to. This can be seen in one of Nuhu Ribadu's campaign speeches;

This agricultural production is critical to the economy and the welfare of our people. We will encourage this by providing to farmers affordable fertilizers to improve high yield with modern farming prices. Vote for action Congress of Nigeria. Vote Nuhu Ribadu for president.

The language use in the above speech explains how language is used to persuade an audience in voting for a selected political party. The key in grasping voters is the language used as earlier observed in Omozuwa and Ezejideaku (2007: 41) and Ajibola (1997: 30).

Thus, it is apparent from the various opinions stated above that language is key factor in political behaviour concerning mobilizing people to support and accept. It is this relatedness of language and politics that justifies the need for this study so as to critically explore how language is used in the selected speeches.

2.6.4 Varieties of Political Campaigns

Political discourses like declaration of candidacy for a political office, political campaigns, presentation of party manifesto and other forms of political speeches which fall within the purview of Aristotle's deliberative rhetoric, aimed at marketing the ideology of the candidate and the party they present. Other discourses are advertising campaign and military coup speeches. Political campaign is vote-seeking activities: a

series of events, for example rallies and speeches that are intended to persuade voters to vote for a specific politician or party (Encarta 2009). Also, Ayeni-Akeke (2008: 83) adds that political campaign is an important exertion in presenting or marketing a candidate for an elective office. In other words, it is an organized effort which seeks to influence the decision making process within a specific group. The message of the campaign contains the ideas that the candidate wants to share with the voters. The message often consists of several talking points about policy.

These points summarize the main idea of campaign and are repeated frequently to create a lasting impression with the voters. The objective of every campaign speech is to convince the electorates that they have the blueprint for tackling the numerous challenges facing the country. For example, in Nigeria issues like power generation and distribution, job creation, the nation's general economic revival, industrial development, repositioning of the education sector, revival of health sector delivery, security situation in the land and the fight against corruption featured prominently as they indeed dominated the campaign speeches of the presidential candidates. As such, language use in political campaigns has certain characteristics which differentiate it from other varieties of language use. For instance, it is often associated with insincerity, vagueness and ambiguity (Abaya 2013: 198) certain words are repeated, the objective being to condition the minds of the electorates. Some of the features of language use are without timelines and specific strategies for actualization. However, in many elections, the opposition party tries to get candidate "off message" by bringing up policy or personal questions that are not related to the talking points. Most campaigns prefer to keep the message broad in order to attract the most potential voters. Unfortunately, a message that is too narrow can alienate voters or show the candidate down with explaining details. For example, in the 2008 American presidential election, John McCain originally used a message that focused on his

patriotism and political experience. “Country First”; later the message was charged to shift attention to his role as “The Original Maverick” within the political establishment. Barack Obama ran on a consistent, simple message of ‘change’ throughout his campaign. In other words, if the message is created carefully, it will assure the candidate’s victory at the polls.

In addition, in modern politics, the most high profile political campaigns are often focused on candidates for head of state or head of government – President or Prime-Minister. This was the situation in Nigeria in the 2011 presidential campaign. Kessel (1998: 79) observes those substandard differences that exist between nomination politics and electoral politics. He says nomination campaigns are aimed at getting delegates but electoral campaigns are aimed at winning votes and are party wide and nationwide. This takes off fully after the acceptance speech, division is put aside, and the party is transformed into a victory rally. He further explains that the presidential candidate is joined by the vice presidential candidate, and both are joined by their families. Other party leaders, those who have held key positions and others who have sought the nominations themselves, make appearances at the presidential campaigns to symbolize the party wide support to be given the nominee.

This claim is further supported by Oota, (2011: 1) that in advanced democracies, particularly in the United States of America, oration and conduct at debates and rallies are some of the benchmarks used to gauge the popularity of all those seeking political offices. Suffice it to say that packaging of campaigns in terms of slogans and contacts are also the main key in advanced democracies and this window of popularity and acceptability was well explored by the then president of the USA, Barack Obama through his grassroots mobilization of the people. We can say that to some extent the presidential candidate of the Peoples Democratic Party, PDP in Nigeria, Dr. Goodluck Ebele Jonathan

employed a similar campaign pattern, as in the neighbour to neighbour campaign advertisement and the frequent sophisticated electronic campaign.

Advertising campaign is another form of campaign which is similar to political campaign in terms of its language use. It is a planned and organized series of actions intended to achieve a specific goal, especially fighting for or against something or raising people's awareness of something. Wright (1983: 8) remarks that advertising is a powerful communication force and a vital marketing tool helping to sell goods and services, image and ideas. Similarly, Roderick (1980: 4) defines advertising as "a message specified by its originator, carried by a communication system intended to influence and/or inform an unknown audience. There seems to be a synergy between political campaign and advertising. The common goal is to convincingly present a product/candidate better than an existing one and win the minds of the target audience. Both political campaign and advertisement are considered as techniques for reaching out, informing, communicating with, and persuading the electorates. Similarly, military coup speeches are related to the political campaign as the purpose is political and having political language (Abaya, 2008: 2).

Finally, there is a common thought unit on the explanations of what political campaigns, advertising and military coup speeches are, they are geared towards achieving a specific goal, which focuses on the merits of the candidate, and apart from highlighting the positive side of the candidate, discredits the opponent. This study is concerned with the political campaign speech types, to seek votes. In particular, the critical discourse analysis of the language of campaign speeches of the presidential candidates of the two opposing parties, Goodluck Ebele Jonathan, Peoples Democratic Party (PDP) and Gen. Muhammadu Buhari Rtd., Congress for Progressive Change (CPC).

2.6.5 Politics and Political Campaigns in Nigeria

Joshua (2002: 106) refers to the political discourse in Nigeria as the new political discourse. He goes on to say that it is a common knowledge that the language of politics exhibits the socio-political and linguistic complexities of any society in question. Hence, the present language of politics in Nigeria is a reaction to the peculiar political situation in the country.

According to Joshua, (2002: 109), any discussion of the legitimacy of the language of politics, implies the justification of that notion as a linguistic reality. Wright (1974: 4) cited by Joshua (2002: 109), states clearly that ‘languages are tools for human communication and under certain cultural, social and political conditions a community may opt to change one set of linguistic tools for another.’

So, language behaviour must be viewed within the larger dimensions of society, since language is fundamentally a social behaviour that also subsists of the cultural and political aspects of the society. Joshua (2002: 109) holds the same view as Pie, (1978: 2) that “politics exists not only to push parties and candidates, but covers also the pushing of ideas and points of view, which may not necessarily be connected with election campaigns but may sell persons by adding to their prestige and vogue.” Therefore, the politicians’ desire to gain the support of the electorate to get the seat of power has become direct factor influencing the production of the linguistic structures often used in the political discourse and which subsequently influence the creation of the language of politics in Nigeria. Joshua reaffirms that “in so far as the language of politics differs lexically and grammatically, it is rational to say that it is clearly a linguistic as well as a sociolinguistic fact and not just simply a convenient linguistic phenomenon”.

Suffice it to say that quite a good number of our public speakers especially politicians in this country and the presidential candidates in the 2011 election campaigns used for this

study are on the average level of literacy. They communicate their intentions to the electorate using the language of politics during campaigns. It is from some selected speeches that this study will critically explore the different linguistic choices deployed in the campaigns of the presidential aspirants to achieve their aim. This is to say that different situations call for different language use.

The Nigerian saga on political campaigns, which has great bearing on our contemporary situation, has its roots in the pre-independence era with the formation of political parties. Appadorai (2003:282), states that a political party is an organised group of citizens who hold similar political opinions and who work to get control of the government in order that the policies in which they are interested may be carried into effect. Since the Pre-Independence and First Republic of 1959 and 1964 respectively, political parties have participated in political campaigns which prepared them for the general elections. But, political parties have had their ideological differences, which were reflected in their manifestos. Mohammed J. (2004:144-145), (Ogbodo, 2011:109), (Mohammed, A. 2004:143). Thereafter, other successive elections in Nigeria were the 1979, 1983, 1993, 1999, 2003, 2007 and 2011. Each of these elections was not without vibrant political campaigns by the various parties that aspired to rule the country. Some of these were transition elections organized by military regimes that had to hand over power to a democratic civilian government (1979,1993 and 1999) while the elections held in 1964, 1983, 2003, 2007 and 2011 were organized by incumbent civilian governments whose offices and positions were also in contest. (Sekibo, 2010), (Ogbodo, 2011: 140).

In the 2011 elections which is the period under study, there were sixty-three (63) political parties but a total of fifty-four(54) submitted candidates for various elective positions (Ogbodo, 2011: 162), (Corcoran, 2011). This is against the nine (9) political parties that participated in the 1959 and 1964 general elections. However, this set the stage for a

vibrant presidential campaign, for no fewer than twenty-one (21) political parties presented candidates for the elections. Prominent among the twenty-one (21) political parties were: Peoples Democratic Party (PDP), Congress for Progressive Change (CPC), Action Congress of Nigeria (ACN), All Nigeria Peoples Party (ANPP), Labour Party (LP), Democratic People's Alliance (DPA), and All Progressive Grand Alliance (APGA). This, therefore, made the political atmosphere in Nigeria to become undoubtedly charged and political campaigns took centre stage. Ogbodo, (2011:162) observes that instead of parties competing to better the lot of the electorates, it has become a warfare with each party trying to defeat and if possible eliminate the opponents.

The contest for who occupies the exalted office of the President and Commander-in-Chief of the Armed Forces of the Federal Republic of Nigeria is certainly democratic (Oota, 2011: 1). However, one of the major avenues which the electorates' minds were prepared for the elections was through the political campaign speeches of various presidential candidates. This was also the same avenue whereby these presidential candidates sold their party manifestos and (also) made their campaign promises to the electorates. De Wet (2010: 103) observes that "politicians rise to power mainly because they can talk persuasively to voters and political elites... politicians are endlessly geared to persuading voters to their own or party's point of view." Van Dijk (1995, 2006) and De Wet (2010) further perceive politically structured discourses as instruments of mind control by the dominant ideology.

2.7 Language and Politics

Abaya (2009: 96) defines political language as "the terminology and rhetoric of political activities and of politicians acting in their professional capacity which is comparable to the discourse of other occupations such as the laws, medicine and religion." This shows that users of language engage in different ways of communicating their views, ideas and

opinions. Hence, Sani (2011: 9) posits that political language has been generally identified as a variety of language used in the political process which is the concern of this study. This shows that language users have different ways of communicating ideas which are largely as a result of profession, human activities, age, sex and status among others. Abaya (2013: 185) upholds the view that political language can be traced to the theory of linguistic determinism which states that not only does our perception of the world influence our language but that the language use profoundly affects how people think. In other words language is perceived to provide a framework for our thought. Thorne (1997: 369), maintains that:

Many people believe that language influences thought: therefore if language is manipulated, so are the processes of thought. In other words, politicians can influence the way we think about the events around us, and the words they choose are a social part of that process.

Here, language is an instrument of manipulation by politicians used to achieve their personal set goals. Thus, it is assumed that politicians have a particular way of perceiving the world or a particular ideology. Because the politicians have different ideologies, they approach political issues from different perspectives, and often find solutions to the same political problems. Hence, through their use of language, politicians persuade the electorate to identify with their own ideology or worldview.

Mbuh (1997: 7) maintains that language and politics relate to the interplay between language and society. This means that language and politics is an inseparable pair, the two cannot be put apart; rather the union is strengthened for a mutual benefit of both. In the words of Aristotle:

Human beings use reason and language to declare what is just and unjust. Therefore, it is peculiarity of man, in comparison with the rest of the animal world, that he alone possesses a perception of the good and evil. Human faculties make moral judgement and therefore also political discussion (Aristotle 384-322 BC).

It is therefore seen from the above that the issue of language and politics is easily understood since one works as a tool to achieve the objectives of the other as it deals with cohesion for a better focus and experience of ideas and feelings to bring about a perfect understanding of one of the main motives of politics to the role of language.

Hence, Anifowose and Enemuo (1991: 1) quote Aristotle that “man is by nature a political animal.” By this, they mean that the essence of social existence is politics and that two or more men interacting with one another are invariably involved in a political relationship. Therefore, it is evident that both language and politics intersect at the point of interaction. Similarly, Merk (1967: 13) cited in Anifowose and Enemuo (1991: 1) argues that politics is the “art of influencing, manipulating, and controlling others; which are all indubitable functions of language in verbal communication.

Thus, According to Joshua (2002: 106) language is the life blood of politics. Political power struggles, and the legitimisation of political policies and authorities occur primarily through discourse and verbal representations. Power can either be exercised through coercion or what Walter Lippmann, a U.S commentator termed in the 1930s “the manufacture of consent”. He goes on to say that the manufacture of consent is a language based process of ideological indoctrination, but a remarkably subtle process. Joshua (2002: 10) suggests that discourse carries the very assumptions under which the things it alludes to are known and ordered in the context of political language in which it is used. This, in concrete terms means that content of political language contains the very rational by which it is to be framed, defined, understood and acted upon. Commonly, this produces the manufacturer of consent. It applies that political discourse transmits and unconsciously reinforces the ideological foundations and the ways of knowing of the dominant political authorities.

Kamalu and Agangan (2010: 33) further comment that the language of politics is essentially aimed at persuading the audience to accept the perspective of the speaker. They quote Beard (2000: 2) that “it is important to study the language of politics because it enables us to understand how language is used by those who wish to gain power, those who wish to exercise power and those who wish to keep power”. Beard (2000: 35) draws attention to the fact that “making speeches is a vital part of the politician’s role in announcing policy and persuading people to agree with it.” Indeed in these speeches language is the armoury employed by the politicians to bring down their opponents and to pave their way to victory. This to a large extent is also the case with Nigerian politics.

Mohammed (2001: 1) throws more light on the subject that English is the official language of Nigeria, the language of power mastered by only a few. It therefore features prominently in the political dramatisation of inter and intra group struggles for power. He observes that the Nigerian situation provides ample opportunities for language manipulation and language abuse for the purpose of influencing or controlling the way the people think, what George Orwell calls newspeak (double speak or double talk).

What makes language of politics peculiar is that words are deliberately constructed for political purposes: intended to impose desirable mental attitude upon the electorate. Such words as transformation agenda, change, smart and intelligent policy, national security, jobs opportunities, robust intelligent infrastructure, good roads, railways, dividends, empowerment are common words in political campaign speeches. Words such as youth employment, poverty alleviation, and development of the oil sector are expressions that are supposed to give hope to the citizens as well as propaganda to win the support of the people. Consequently, this has given a variety of language from the political register as it is seen in the presidential political campaign speeches.

Crystal (1987: 5 as cited in Anifowoshe, 2006:12) remarks that, the variety of the English language encompasses all social institutions. As soon as people come into contact with each other, the language they use is likely to develop feature, which reflects bonds that exist between them and which distinguishes them from other social groups.

Anifowoshe (2006: 12) identifies one of the communicative strategies of language in its social context as the directive, which is designed to influence the behaviour or attitudes of others this comes nearer to what we are concerned with here as seen in the presidential campaign speeches in the study. The following extract buttresses the fact that political use of language is not just for communication of information but an evocation of emotion which is seen to consciously have persuasive effect on the electorates. This is exemplified in the following extract; from Mark Anthony's persuasive speech in Shakespeare's Julius Caesar. It aims at inciting the Romans to rise against the conspirator, led by Brutus that assassinated Caesar.

Friends, Romans, countrymen, lend me your ears; i come to bury Caesar, not to praise him. The evil that men do lives after them; the good is oft interred with their bones; so let it be with Caesar. The noble Brutus hath told you Caesar was ambitious: if it were so, it was a grievous fault; and grievously hath Caesar answered it. Here, under leave of Brutus and the rest for Brutus is an honourable man: so are they all, all honourable men.

The quotation above proves the fact that the political use of language is not just for communication of information but an evocation of emotion, which is no doubt used consciously and deliberately to have a persuasive effect on the electorates. This is one of the major objectives of the speech above; apart from creating a vivid picture in the minds of the audience clearly showcase the political situation which the politician seeks to create.

Wareing et al (2002: 34) and Abaya (2009: 1) uphold the view that language influences people's perception of the world and the way they think. They agree that if language is manipulated so are the processes of thoughts. They go on to say that politicians can

influence the way we think about events around us and the words they choose are a social part of that process. We can see that the politician uses language as an instrument to express himself in order to sell his programme.

Abaya (2009: 1) further argues that because it is assumed that politicians have a particular way of perceiving the world of a particular ideology; they have different ideologies. They approach political issues from different perspectives and often find contrasting solutions to the political problems. Consequently, politicians have the ability to use language to dribble their audience into believing and accepting their idea in order to win support.

Jones and Wareing (1999) argue that whereas language is supposed to be used clearly to express beliefs, political language does not just express beliefs, but it is deliberately used to mobilize and inspire. This can be better understood in what is obtained in the presidential campaign speeches as it will be made clearer in this work. They are also of the opinion that sometimes, political language is used for avoiding serious argument about political issues. They further unfold the all encompassing role of political language that sometimes exerts some level of power and influence on the listener or reader of the discourse not necessarily to persuade in particular but to control. That is, not stimulating the thought of the audience but rather to prevent rational thinking, sometimes instead of conveying information, some may conceal it.

Wilson (1990) describes language of politics as “a lexicon of conflict and drama of ridicules and reproach of pleading and persuasion.” He says that language of politics is a language designed “to rally many men and women to destroy some, and change the mind of others.” While Iornew (1995:75) observes that political language tends towards deceit and sometimes outright lies, he argues that what politicians do is to guide what they write or say. He believes that politicians hardly say what they mean and they rarely mean what

they say. He adds that the language of politics is nothing but how we manipulate language. Mohammed cited in Abaya (2009: 196) supports the view of Iornew (1995) and describes political language as 'language manipulation' and in his opinion it is widely used to acquire and regain power, this also supports the opinion of John and Wareing (1999) above.

Orwell (1945, 1946: 8) considers that the whole tendency of modern prose was away from correctness, 'ugly and inaccurate'. He says political prose was formed 'to make lies sound truthful and murder respectable, and give an appearance of pure wind. He believes that because the prose was intended to hide the truth rather than express it, the language used was necessarily vague or meaningless and that in present time political speech to a large extent is the defence of the indefensible. Orwell's foresight has great bearing on the country, Nigeria.

Abaya (2009: 196) adds that political language is the perfect example of mismatch between "the map and the territory". He goes on to say "it is not reality in any testament or observable sense that matters in shaping political consciousness and behaviour but rather the beliefs that language helps evoke about the causes of discontent of satisfaction and about policies that bring about a future closer to the heart's desire and about other observables." It is therefore understood from this that political language is easily manipulated by politicians as it is not a neutral instrument that can be used to interpret the world impersonally and objectively.

For Orwell (1946: 8) the effect of language misuse or abuse in the political sphere is 'viciously cyclical' and political speech and writing are deceitful, consisting largely of euphemism, question-begging and sheer cloudy vagueness. He adds, "Political language is designed to make lies sound truthful and murder respectable and give appearance of solidity to pure minds."

To buttress this view of Orwell about the negativism of political language Mohammed (2002: 2) says “political language is in particular used to rationalize operational excesses and shortcomings and to over-magnify achievements if any”. He further describes the brand of Nigerian political language as ‘tokunbonness’ (something that is not genuine) a phenomenon that lacks sincerity. We understand this assertion in the light that the concept of political language is universal, one bedecked with complexities and awe. It is therefore uncertain if political language can be associated to a particular period.

Hershell (2001 as cited in Abaya 2009: 196) adds thus, “political language has become so familiar to us that it can easily be taken for granted.” He says, as a result, “We hear politicians’ speeches on television, on the radio and at public addresses and the terrain of political language is also unlimited.” He goes on to say, “ideas and beliefs in political language extend beyond political rhetoric and into the practical realities of everyday life.” In this light the approval of political speeches is most obviously and immediately demonstrated through applause. That is to say, “a political speech can only be legitimised by the people.”

Austin, (1962), Searle, (1969), Grice, (1975), draw attention to the fact that we sometimes mean more than what we say, less than it or even something completely different from it. They further point that the utterances of political leaders have the force to persuade or manipulate the public to a predetermined ideological line of action. Thus, Language is considered the vehicular expression of politics, it is the means by which politics or political discourse and ideas are widely disseminated. Ali (1975: 48) corroborates this when he states that “language is the most important point of entry into habits of thought of a people. It embodies within itself cumulative association derived from the total experience of its people” and words have a powerful effect (Harris, 1979: 58).

It is apparent from the various opinions stated above that language is the key factor in political behaviour concerning mobilizing people to support and accept the candidates. It is this relatedness of language and politics that justifies the need for this research so as to identify and highlight features inherent in the language of political campaign of these presidential candidates using CDA.

2.8 Linguistic Strategies

Obtaining consensus from consistent groups of citizens or from other political groups is an essential criterion to achieve political power. Political rhetoric across human history has always used language to obtain this kind of consensus and the consequent political power. In this context, language has been carefully shaped and largely employed for precise goals along with specific linguistic strategies. Scholars such as Edeiman (1977), Blommaert and Bulcaen (1998), Fairclough (1989) and Bailey (2004) have highlighted the importance of the use of these strategies. For instance, of specific hedging devices, framing, face work, slogans, discourse markers or even personal pronouns and specific expressions and phrases to address the audience in political speeches in order to obtain positive reactions especially during political campaigns aiming at obtaining votes in imminent elections.

The presidential campaign speeches of Goodluck and Buhari electioneering is an example of political episodes in which language provided an essential tool to guide the public opinion to ascertain votes. The campaign was managed and organized through the use of English language in order to support the ruling party Peoples Democratic Party (PDP) or the opposition party Congress for Progressive Change (CPC).

The aim of this study is to investigate the pattern of language use in the campaign speeches of the presidential aspirants in order to determine the extent to which language

works in political dispensation. In particular the study will investigate the speeches (texts) produced by two presidential candidates.

Some of the linguistic strategies are as follows:

- a. **Hedging:** By the slant of their aims presidential candidates rely on their own rhetorical assertions to win the acquiescence of the public. Hedges are one of the sub-categories of meta-discourse markers and are among the rhetorical tropes which assist politicians to increase or decrease commitment, blur or sharpen the boundaries between good and evil and bolster or emasculate solidarity. Despite the many functions hedges can play, political discourse studies address these devices in relation to their persuasive effects in campaign speeches. Hedging is described as a rhetorical strategy to save the face of the politicians. Such a strategy can prevent a politician from being refuted in case of rhetorical failure (Fraser, 2010). Since rhetoric is often understood as a weapon to win or to lose, no politicians want to risk themselves taking manoeuvres in vulnerable circumstances. Politicians have to make themselves aware of the consequences of mass communication failure. At this point, hedges serve as means to successfully maintain circumspection of rhetoric. This study focuses on delineating the strategies and objectives of these hedges in conspicuous way such as the use of modality.

Hedging in political discourse is mainly employed to save the face of the politicians. Hedges serve as rhetorical strategy to help a politician stay in save zone as hedges protect him from any forth coming criticism. In case of being wrong a hedge also represents means to express indirect messages which makes it demonstrate politeness strategy.

- b. **Framing:** comprises a set of concepts and theoretical perspectives on how individuals, groups and societies organize, perceive and communicate about reality. Framing involves the social construction of a social phenomenon by mass-media sources, political leaders or other actors and organizations. It is an inevitable process of selective influence over the individual's perception of the meanings attributed to words or phrases. Framing is considered in one of two ways: as frames in thought, consisting of the mental representations, interpretations and simplifications of reality and frames in communication, consisting of the communication of frames between different actors.

One can view framing in communication as positive or negative depending on the audience and what kind of information is being presented. Framing might also be understood as being either equivalence frames, which represent logically equivalent alternatives portrayed in different ways or emphasis frames which simplify reality by focusing on a subset of relevant aspect of a situation or an issue. In the case of equivalent frames, the information being presented is based on the same facts but the frame in which it is presented changes, thus creating a reference dependent perception.

In the context of politics or mass-media communication a frame defines the packaging of an element of rhetoric in such a way as to encourage certain interpretations and to discourage others. For political purposes, framing often presents facts in such a way that implicates problem that is in need of a solution.

Members of political parties attempt to frame issues in a way that makes a solution favouring their own political leaning which appear as the most appropriate course of action (VanderPas 2014:42, Goffman, 1974) for the situation at hand.

- c. **Face work:** Bloor and Bloor (2007: 102) citing Goffman (1999: 306) define facework as the positive value a person claims for himself by the line others assume he has taken during a personal contact. They go on to say it is an image of self delineated in terms of approved social attributes. The concept is present in everyday language in expressions like *save face*, *lose face*, *shamefaced*, *barefaced*.

Protection of face is the responsibility of all participants in an interaction; interactants strive to protect both their own face and also that of the others. However, maintaining face is not normally the purpose of the discourse; rather, it is a condition for the interaction since without it, the interaction may break down. Behaviour which protects face is described as tactful or diplomatic, and behaviour which goes too far the other way is tactless, crass, *gauche* or undiplomatic. Bloor & Bloor (2007: 102) observe that any action or utterance, however mild, which might conceivably upset the delicate balance of face maintenance, is a *face-threatening activity* (FTA). There are occasions when speakers deliberately and maliciously try to cause another to lose face.

- d. **Slogans:** are fixed expressions, usually chosen carefully by organizers and activists, which are often chanted by political groups (*liberte, egalite, fraternite*) and protestors at demonstrations (such as *no paseran, stop the war, troops out, feed the world*). Slogans are also widely used by advertisers (*your very own Ireland*) and encouraged by football teams.
- e. **Sound bite:** A sound bite is a quotable short piece of text, a snappy answer to a question or merely an extract from a recorded interview or speech that pungently characterizes the essence of a message. Because of the way they have been used in the media and by politicians, such expressions carry positive or negative

connotations. Some appear to be thrown into current politicians' speeches and interviews simply for their connotations so that an utterance can be given a positive or negative slant.

2.9 Theoretical Approaches to CDA

According to Fairclough (2010), CDA is not a discrete academic discipline with a fixed unit of research methods but rather a problem-oriented interdisciplinary research movement involving different approaches. Each of these approaches is with different theoretical models, research methods and agenda (Fairclough, 2010). Thus, the following paragraphs contain overview of some of the important theoretical approaches to CDA research.

2.9.1 Fairclough's Three Dimension Model

One main approach in critical discourse analysis relevant to the study of the language of campaign speeches is that of Fairclough whose theory has been central to CDA over more than the past ten years. Fairclough, in his earlier work, called his approach to language and discourse, Critical Language Study (1989: 5). He describes the objective of this approach as "a contribution to the general raising of consciousness of exploitative social relations, through focusing upon language" (1989: 4). This aim in particular remains in his later work that further develops his approach so that it is now one of the most comprehensive frameworks of critical discourse analysis, (Fairclough, 1992, 1993, 1995, 1995; Chouliaraki and Fairclough, 1999). For Chouliaraki and Fairclough (1999: 6), critical discourse analysis "brings social science and linguistics ... together within a single theoretical and analytical framework, setting up a dialogue between them". The linguistic theory referred to here is Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL), which has been the foundation for Fairclough's analytical framework as it has been for other practitioners in CDA (Fowler et. al., 1979; Fowler, 1991; Hodge and Kress, 1979).

Fairclough's approach also draws upon a number of critical social theorists, such as Foucault that is, concept of orders of discourse, Gramsci concept of hegemony, Habermas that is, concept of colonization of discourses, among others (Fairclough, 1989, 1992, 1995, 1995).

Chouliaraki and Fairclough (1999: 30) posit that Critical Discourse Analysis has a particular contribution to make. They argue that, "the past two decades or so have been a period of profound economic social transformation on a global scale". They believe that although these changes are due to particular actions by people the changes have been perceived as "part of nature" (1999: 4), that is, changes and transformations have been perceived as natural and not due to people's causal actions. The recent economic and social changes, according to Chouliaraki and Fairclough (1999: 4), "are to a significant degree . . . transformations in the language, and discourse", thus, CDA can help by theorising transformations and creating an awareness "of what is, how it has come to be, and what it might become, on the basis of which people may be able to make and remake their lives". With such an objective in mind, Chouliaraki and Fairclough (1999: 113) claim that Critical Discourse Analysis of a communicative interaction sets out to show that the semiotic and linguistic features of the interaction are systematically connected with what is going on socially, and what is going on socially is indeed going on partly or wholly, semiotically or linguistically. Put differently, CDA systematically charts relations of transformation between the symbolic and non-symbolic, between discourse and the non-discursive.

In this approach of CDA, there are three analytical focuses in analysing any communicative event. They are texts such as campaign speeches, discourse practice and socio-cultural practice for example, social and cultural structures which give rise to the communicative event (Fairclough, 1995, Chouliaraki & Fairclough, 1999: 113). These

closely resemble van Dijk's three dimensions of ideology analysis: discourse, sociocognition, and social analysis, that is, analysis of social structures respectively. What seems to be the main difference between Fairclough's and van Dijk's approach is the second dimension, which mediates between the other two. Whereas van Dijk perceives social cognition and mental models as mediating between discourse and the social, Fairclough believes that this task is assumed by discourse practices – text production and consumption (Fairclough, 1995: 59). In this case, these two approaches of CDA are "similar in conception" (Fairclough, 1995: 59) on Fairclough's framework for analysing a communicative event.

A. Text

The first analytical focus of Fairclough's three-part model is text. Analysis of text involves linguistic analysis in terms of vocabulary, grammar, semantics, the sound system, and cohesion-organization above the sentence level (Fairclough, 1995:57). Linguistic analysis is applied to text's lexical-grammatical and semantic properties, two aspects that have mutual impact on each other (1995: 57-58). Following Systemic Functional Linguistics, Fairclough also views text from a multifunctional perspective. According to Fairclough, any sentence in a text is analysable in terms of the articulation of these functions, which he has relabeled: representations, relations, and identities – particular constructions of writer and reader identities (for example, in terms of what is highlighted – whether status and role aspects of identity or individual and personality aspects of identity, particular construction of the relationship between writer and reader (as for instance, formal or informal, close or distant) (Fairclough, 1995: 58). According to Fairclough (1995: 58), linguistic analysis is concerned with presences as well as absences in texts that could include "representations, categories of participant, and constructions of participant identity or participant relations".

B. Discourse practice

According to Fairclough (1995: 58-59), this dimension has two facets: institutional process and discourse processes. For Fairclough, "discourse practice straddles the division between society and culture on the one hand, and discourse, language and text on the other" (1995: 60).

In this analytical framework, while there is linguistic analysis at the text level, there is also linguistic analysis at the discourse practice level that Fairclough calls "intertextual analysis" (1995: 61). According to Fairclough (1995: 16) intertextual analysis focuses on the borderline between text and discourse practice in the analytical framework. Intertextual analysis is looking at text from the perspective of discourse practice, looking at the traces of the discourse practice in the text.

Furthermore, Fairclough states that "linguistic analysis is descriptive in nature, whereas intertextual analysis is more interpretative" (1995: 16). In addition Fairclough (1992: 84) defines intertextuality as, "basically the property texts have of being full of snatches of other texts, which may be explicitly demarcated or merged in, and which the text may assimilate, contradict, ironically echo, and so forth."

C. Social Practice

At this level of Fairclough's three-dimensional framework, the focus is on discourse in relation to ideology and to power. It also locates discourse within a view of power and hegemony, and a view of the evolution of power relations as hegemonic struggle (Fairclough, 1992: 86). In view of this, social practice or socio-cultural practice relates to such things as the immediate situation or event that has given rise to a discourse. In campaign speeches, however, appealing to the consciousness of the electorate and gaining votes from them is the essence and the ideological grounding of political campaign speeches.

2.9.2 The Vienna School of CDA

Furthermore, one of the directions in CDA is discourse sociolinguistics, associated with Wodak and her colleagues in Vienna (The Vienna School of Discourse Analysis). Wodak bases her model "on sociolinguistics in the Bernsteinian tradition and on the ideas of the Frankfurt school, especially those of Jürgen Habermas" (Wodak, 1995:209).

According to Wodak (1996: 3) "Discourse Sociolinguistic is a sociolinguistics which not only is explicitly dedicated to the study of the text in context, but also accords both factors equal importance." It is an approach capable of identifying and describing the underlying mechanisms that contribute to those disorders in discourse which are embedded in a particular context whether they be in the structure and function of the media, or in institutions such as a hospital or a school and inevitably affect communication. Wodak has carried out research in various institutional settings such as courts, schools, and hospitals, and on a variety of social issues such as sexism, racism and anti-Semitism.

Wodak's work on the discourse of anti-Semitism in 1990 led to the development of an approach she termed the historical method. The term 'historical' occupies a unique place in this approach. It denotes an attempt on the part of this approach "to integrate systematically all available background information in the analysis and interpretation of the many layers of a written or spoken text" (1995: 209). The results of Wodak and her colleagues' study (Wodak et. al., 1990) show that the context of the discourse has a significant impact on the structure, function, and context of the anti-Semitic utterances." Focusing on the historical contexts of discourse the process of explanation and interpretation is a feature that distinguishes this approach from other approaches of critical discourse analysis especially that of van Dijk.

In the discourse historical method approach which is similar to Fairclough's it is believed that language "manifests social processes and interaction" and "constitutes" those processes as well (Wodak and Ludwig, 1999: 12). According to Wodak and Ludwig (1999: 12), viewing language this way entails three things at least. First, discourse "always involves power and ideologies. No interaction exists where power relations do not prevail and where values and norms do not have a relevant role". Second, "discourse is always historical, that is, it is connected synchronically, and diachronically with other communicative events which are happening at the same time or which have happened before". This is similar to Fairclough's notion of intertextuality, as we will see.

The third feature of Wodak's approach is that of interpretation. According to Wodak and Ludwig (1999: 13), readers and listeners, depending on their background knowledge and information and their position, might have different interpretations of the same communicative event. Therefore, Wodak and Ludwig (1999:13) assert that "the right" interpretation does not exist thus, a hermeneutic approach is necessary.

2.9.3 Van Dijk's Cognitive Model

However, what noticeably distinguishes van Dijk's approach from other approaches in CDA is another feature of his approach: cognitive analysis. For van Dijk it is the social cognition and personal cognition that mediates between society and discourse. He defines social cognition as "the system of mental representations and processes of group members" (1995: 18). Thus, for van Dijk, "ideologies are the overall, abstract mental systems that organize socially shared attitudes". Also, ideologies "indirectly influence the personal cognition of group members, in their act of comprehension of discourse among other actions and interactions" (1995: 19). He calls the mental representations of individuals during such social actions and interactions "models". For him, "models control how people act, speak or write, or how they understand the social practices of

others" (1995: 2). Of crucial importance here is that, according to van Dijk, mental representations "are often articulated along "Us" versus "Them" dimensions, in which speakers of one group will generally tend to present themselves or their own group in positive terms, and other groups in negative terms" (1995: 22). Analysing and making explicit this contrastive dimension of "Us" versus "Them" has been central to most of van Dijk's research and writings (1988, 1991, 1993, 1995, 1996, 1998, 1998). He believes that one who desires to make transparent such an ideological dichotomy in discourse needs to analyze discourse in the following way (1998b: 61- 63):

- a. Examining the context of the discourse: historical, political or social background of a conflict and its main participants.
- b. Analyzing groups, power relations and conflicts involved.
- c. Identifying positive and negative opinions about "Us" versus "Them."
- d. Making explicit the presupposed and the implied.
- e. Examining all formal structure: lexical choice and syntactic structure, in a way that helps to (de)emphasize polarized group opinions.

2.9.4 Chilton's Representation Model

Representation refers to the language used in a text or talk to assign meaning to groups and their social practices, to events, and to social and ecological conditions and objects (e.g. Fairclough, 1989; 1995; van Dijk, 2002) Implicit in this view of the role of language in social life is that meaning is not embedded in the reality that is perceived but rather that it is construed by linguistic representation (Fairclough, 1992; Goatly, 2000; Halliday, 1990; Hodge and Kress, 1993; Mehan and Wills, 1988; Muntigl, 2002; Shapiro, 1988; van Dijk, 2002; Wenden and Schaffner, 1999; Wodak, 2002). Of course, modes of representation will vary depending on the perspective from which they are constructed, whether biographical, historical, and socio-cultural (Voloshinov, 1986 cited in Mehan

and Wills, 1988). Moreover, in as much as linguistic representations determine the way in which we think about particular objects, events, situations and, as such, function as a principle of action influencing actual social practice (Shapiro, 1988; Fairclough, 1989; Hodge and Kress, 1993; Wodak, 2002; Karlsberg, 2005), there will be competition among groups over what is to be taken as the correct, appropriate, or preferred representation (Holquist, 1983; Fairclough, 1992; Wodak, 2001).

Chilton (2004:50) in his theory of representation states that individuals match logical forms, derived interpretively from the utterances produced by others, to their mental representation of reality derived via perception, and limited or coloured by their cognitive apparatus. Such mental representations are not arrived at individualistically, rather, it involves a collective, inter- subjective cross- checking via linguistic and other interaction among individuals who contribute to whatever representations are entertained, and circulated. He further opines that the investigation of how mental representations are built up during the process of communication involves observing the diverse aspects of the linguistic structure. These linguistic structures include but are not limited to the following:

Cognitive Approaches

The cognitive approach considers political discourse as necessarily a product of individual and collective mental processes. It seeks to show how knowledge of politics, political discourse and political ideologies involves storage in long-term memory (as personal or ‘episodic’ memory and social (or ‘semantic’) memory). Short-term memory deals ‘online’ with ongoing processes of discourse production and understanding, generating mental models of content and context. That is to say, representations are both stored and generated, those that are generated online being in part a function of long-term knowledge stored as social information about ideas, values and practices.

Frames

Frames can be defined as “‘an area of experience’ in a particular culture’ (Werth 1999: 107). They are theoretical constructs, having some cognitive, ultimately, neural reality. In terms of their content frames can be thought of as structures related to the conceptualization of situation types and their expression in language. Situations involve ‘slots’ for entities (animate and inanimate, abstract and concrete, human and non-human), times, places, with relationships to one another, and having properties. The properties include cultural knowledge about such things as status, value, physical make-up. Certain properties specify prototypical roles in relation to other entities – for example, whether a participant entity is acting as an agent, on the receiving end of action, experiencing a sensation, and the like. For example, the meanings of the verbs kill, murder, assassinate, execute can be defined in terms of stored mental frames in which different types of actor fill the agent and the victim’s roles, the killing is legal or not legal, and other kinds of social and political background knowledge is involved.

Metaphor

The standard cognitive account stresses that metaphor is a part of human conceptualization and not simply a linguistic expression that occurs especially frequently in oratory and literature. It is thought that metaphor works by mapping well understood source domains of experience onto more schematic ones. The source domains may be innate or acquired in development; they provide a source for conceptualization. For example, vision and manual control provide a source for conceptualizing conceptualization itself: the concept of control, rank and moral superiority appears, to go on the lexical evidence in many languages, to be conceptualized in terms of conceptual frames captured by terms like over-under and high-low. Political concepts involve leadership and political action, conceptualized by movement, or journey metaphors. This

is why, for example, political discourse often includes systematic expressions like coming to crossroads, moving ahead towards a better future, over-coming obstacles on the way, not deviating from its plans, and so forth. Social groups and in particular sovereign states, involve the spatial source domain rooted in the experience of containment and boundary-setting. Social entities have ‘a centre’, ‘insider’ and ‘outsiders’, people ‘on the margins’, etc. Such systematic lexical patterns appear to be grounded in essentially spatial experience. It could of course be the case that some social concepts are themselves basic and provide source domains. The linguistic evidence suggests that this would be true for ‘family’, which is mapped onto social entities that are not in the basic sense families, as well as onto concepts that do not involve humans at all. It is important to be aware that metaphorical mappings can enter into quite complex bundles of meaning that involve other cognitive factors, in particular frame representations that are in effect stores of structured cultural knowledge such as knowledge about transport, the structure of houses, what illness is and what doctors do. A further important point about the cognitive theory of metaphor is that metaphorical mappings, which are usually unconscious, are used for reasoning, reasoning about target domains that are ill understood, vague or controversial. This is so because the source domains are intuitively understood and have holistic structure, so that if one part is accepted other parts follow. Such ‘entailments’ can be mapped onto the unstructured target domain, in order to derive inferences that would be otherwise not conceptually available, or vague in some way.

Discourse Worlds

There are various meaning ingredients that go into these discourse realities, but the essential one is the projection of ‘who does what, to whom’ when and where’. In language use the speaker postulates discourse referents with different thematic roles. The

roles are defined by the relations between the discourse referents. How do these abstract meaning schemata map onto language.

This study is not concerned with meaning effects that have to do with social interaction (e.g., the use of ‘we’) but with the cognitive domain of participants, their roles and relations, that is with what exists and who does what.

Indexicality and the Dimensions of Deixis

Language-in-use consists of utterances generated and interpreted in relation to the situation in which the utterer(s) and interpreter(s) are positioned. The term ‘positioned’ can be understood as a spatial metaphor conceptualizing the speaker’s and/or hearer’s relationship to their interlocutor(s), to their physical location, to the point in time of the ongoing utterance, and to where they are in the ongoing discourse. ‘Indexical expressions’ or ‘deictic expressions’ are linguistic resources used to perform deixis – that is, to prompt the interpreter to relate the uttered indexical expression to various situational features.

Space, Time and Society

Pronouns are one class of words that can perform deictic functions. For example, in political discourse the first person plural (we, us, our) can be used to induce interpreters to conceptualize group identity, coalitions, parties, and the like, either as insiders or as outsiders. Social indexicals arise from social structure and power relations, and not just from personal distance. Spatial indexicals relate to political or geopolitical space. Thus, ‘here’ may mean ‘in the senate’, ‘in Abuja’, ‘in England’ that is, ‘here’ and its reflexes in come/go, bring/take, and the like, can require to be understood not simply in terms of a neutral physical location but in terms of some conventional frame.

Temporal deixis can have a political significance. It can require one to assume a particular historical periodisation – for example nowadays, today, or just now could

require to be understood as ‘after the campaigns’, ‘after the presidential election’, ‘after the state to state presidential campaign’. The concept of deictic centre according to Verschueren (1999:20) is sometimes used to denote the implied ‘anchoring’ point that utterers and interpreters construct or impose during verbal interaction.

Spatial representations, including metaphorical ones, take on an important aspect in political discourse. If politics is about cooperation and conflict over allocation of resources; such resources are frequently of a spatial, that is, geographical or territorial, kind. This is obvious in the case of international politics, where borders, territorial sovereignty, and access are often the issue. Politics can also be about the relations between social groups, viewed literally or metaphorically as spatially distinct entities. Political actors are, moreover, always situated with respect to a particular time, place and social group. Because of factors such as these, spatial representation in discourse is particularly important in the study of political discourse.

Inexplicit Meaning

Meaning is not always expressed in explicit form, nor indeed is it always possible to do so. It is important to remember that meaning is not ‘contained’ in words, nor is it a thing to be discovered, or uncovered; rather meaning is constructed by human minds on the basis of language, using language, together with massive amount of ‘background’ knowledge. However, there are evidently degrees of explicitness in the cues that language provides for the hearer. Of course, it may be misleading to say ‘language-in-use provides’, since it is people who produce utterances, and they have some degree of choice in how exactly they prompt their hearers to construct the mental representations they would like them to construct. That is to say, speakers have a degree of choice in the wording and phrasing that prompts hearers to experience particular meanings.

Entailment/Presupposition

Entailment involves the fact that the semantic structure of languages includes, among many other things, truth relations between sentences that hold irrespective of whether those sentences are empirically verifiable or not. Thus, to cite a classic example, the fanatic assassinated the president entails the president died. The entailment relation implies that if an entailing sentence p is true, then an entailed sentence q is necessarily also true, and if q is false, then p is false. Entailments of this type are generated by lexical structure and by syntax. The sense of the word assassinate apparently ‘includes’ the sense die – a relationship similar to hyponymy, which in general is a source of entailment. An example of syntactic entailment would be the active and passive forms of a sentence.

While this standard account focuses on truth and logic, from the point of view of discourse analysis, some further observations are necessary. The existence of apparent lexical entailments may in some cases be a function of social or ideological beliefs. This is perhaps tantamount to saying that lexical structure itself should not be regarded as entirely independent of social and ideological beliefs, or to saying that lexical structure should not be regarded as analytically separate from discourse.

The linguistic parameters for analysing text are interrelated and this accounts for the uniformity in the check list used by scholars in critical discourse analysis as has been reviewed earlier. However, the toolkits used for the analysis of data in the study are adapted from various CDA’s practitioners. These include: word/vocabulary (parallelism and lexical choice), presupposition/entailment, denotation and connotation, metaphor, grammar (pronoun, active and passive construction) and rhetorical devices etc.

2.10 Theoretical Framework

The present study adapts an eclectic approach to CDA which consists of Fairclough’s (1992) three dimensional model, van Dijk’s (1998) ideological model and Chilton’s

(2004) representation model. This eclectic approach to political discourse analysis aims at investigating the pattern of language use in our data obtained from the selected campaign speeches of Muhammadu Buhari and Goodluck Jonathan in the 2011 presidential election campaigns. The intention is to investigate meaning and ideological concepts behind a political campaign speech. Fairclough's (1992) adaptation of Halliday's interpersonal function: divided into representations, relations, and identities – particular constructions of speaker and hearer identities (for example, in terms of what is highlighted – whether status and role aspects of identity or individual and personality aspects of identity). Second, van Dijk's (1998) ideological model which encapsulates the twin strategies of positive in-group description and negative out-group description. The double strategy of this binary opposition is often manifested in discourse by lexical choice and other linguistic features and third, Chilton's (2004) representation model that investigates how mental representations are built up during the process of communication. The analysis is carried out through the identification and description of some micro properties that are inherent in the speeches such as pronoun, lexical and syntactic repetitions, parallelisms, collocations, metaphor etc. followed by the macro levels of analysis where issues such as positive self presentation and negative other – presentation, intertextuality and interdiscursivity among others. These were analysed in a tabular form based on the research questions.

CHAPTER THREE

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.0 Preamble

This chapter discusses the methodological approach in this study. This is divided mainly into; method of data collection, sources of data collection, sampling procedure, and analytical procedure.

3.1 Sources of Data

The study investigates the language of campaign speeches of the presidential candidates within a particular period of election in Nigeria. Therefore, the data for this study are speeches that were made during the state-to-state election campaigns in 2011. Specifically, the speeches were obtained from the secondary source. Data obtained include compact disks (CDs) from the National Television Authority (NTA) which were transcribed and written texts from the internet.

3.2 Method of Data Collection

The methodology adopted for this study is survey design and data were purposively collected based on the size of the text (campaign speech) since discourse analysis deals with text that is longer than a sentence. This will give the researcher the opportunity to consider different patterns of language use in a particular campaign speech. That is, one can have variety of patterns of language use in a text rather than a shorter one. Ultimately, the researcher can give a general verdict or submission on the text (campaign speech). Six speeches out of the various political speeches from Kaduna, Plateau, Nasarawa, Kogi, Kwara and the Federal Capital, Abuja, were chosen for this study. Some of these speeches which were obtained from National Television Authority (NTA), Abuja were transcribed and the written speeches that were downloaded from the internet were used to validate the audio recorded speeches.

3.3 Sampling Procedure

Purposive samplings of two presidential candidates is used in this study. It tends to focus on the examination of real life phenomenon and not to make statistical inferences. In this respect purpose or judgemental sampling is used to focus on the aspirants (Buhari and Jonathan) and the event (presidential campaign speeches) in order to provide important information that cannot be obtained from other choices. Hence, the choice of the two candidates and events emanates from the fact that they are the two strong contenders from the two popular political parties in the presidential campaign under investigation.

3.4 Analytical Procedure

The analytical procedure the study adopts is qualitative textual analysis. In this analysis insights were taken from interpersonal metafunction which is divided into representations, relations and identities – particular construction of speaker and hearer identities (for status and role aspect of identity or individual and personality aspects of identity).

The analysis follows two broad dimensions: One is the tabular analysis structured in three columns consisting of the following mechanisms: power relations, rhetorical devices, identity construction and ideological interests. Under power relations the columns are: utterance, denotation/ representation and implicature, while under rhetorical devices the columns are: utterance, rhetorical devices, and implicature. Similarly, for identity construction there are columns such as: utterance, identity construction and political implication in addition, Theme and Rheme and finally, under ideological interests there are columns such as: utterance, ideology and presupposition. Hence, the second dimension of the analytical procedure dwells on the detailed discussion of the tables foregrounding different properties of the study's toolkits. These include: word/ vocabulary (parallelism, lexical choice and framing), implicature,

presupposition/entailment, denotation and connotation, metaphor, grammar (pronoun, active/passive construction) and rhetorical devices etc.

CHAPTER FOUR

DATA PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS

4.0 Preamble

This chapter deals with the analysis of purposively collected data from the campaign speeches of the two presidential candidates; Muhammadu Buhari, Congress for Progressive Change and Goodluck Jonathan, Peoples Democratic Party (PDP). The attempt is to apply the theoretical framework adapted for this study. Furthermore, this chapter will also discuss the summary of our findings.

4.1 Presentation of Data

This study examines the campaign speeches of the two presidential aspirants during the 2011 general elections. The speeches were chosen for their significance in the political campaign and for the fact that the aspirants represent the major contenders in the election where no fewer than twenty-one (21) presidential candidates contested. The texts were taken from both written and unwritten campaign speeches of the aspirants, the unwritten speeches were transcribed and analysed along with the written through the following mechanisms:

Power Relations	Utterance	Denotation/representation	Implicature/
Rhetorical Devices	Utterance	Rhetorical devices	Implicature
Identity Construction	Utterance	Identity Construction	Political Implication
Ideological Interests	Utterance	Ideology	Presupposition

In order to achieve the aim of this linguistic exercise and for proper identification and ease of analysis, the data were grouped into Sample [I] and Sample [II]. That is, the

speeches of the presidential candidate of the Congress for Progressive Change (CPC), Muhammadu Buhari is tagged Sample I while that of the presidential candidate of the Peoples Democratic Party (PDP), Goodluck Jonathan is tagged Sample II. From each of these Samples, utterances were selected.

4.2 Data Analysis

4.2.1 Sample 1 Manifestation of Power Relations in Buhari's Campaign Speeches

Table 4.2.1i

Utterance	Denotation/Representation	Implicature
<u>“My friends, ladies and gentlemen, My name is Muhammadu Buhari, the former military head of state, and I thank the almighty God who gave me the unique opportunity to serve this nation from the humble rank of platoon commander to Commander-in-Chief, at the revered rank of a general in the Nigerian army.”</u>	The utterance denotes an introduction where the speaker introduces himself and his social status to the audience.	The expression implies that Buhari belongs to the powerful group of prominent/eminant politicians.

In the above table, Buhari uses the expression “My friends....,” to frame the audience by placing himself as one of them, this perhaps may be an attempt to give the impression that they are equal and they are together in the pursuit of common objectives. Here, Buhari chooses to foreground equality and play down background the issue of unequal power relation among social actors. But as a matter of fact, the speaker and the majority of the electorate do not share the same relation of power. This presupposes that there is a disconnect between the speaker's meaning and the hearers interpretation that is, the meaning has to be negotiated.

Sample 1 Manifestation of Power Relations in Buhari's Campaign Speeches

Table 4.2.1ii

Utterance	Denotation/Representation	Implicature
“ <u>Whatever role I played, whether as leader or member of government... my executive council</u> which always enabled <u>me... abuse of office and power.</u> ”	This expression denotes the leadership role of the speaker.	It implies that Buhari is not an ordinary man but rather a distinguished powerful individual.

In the first column, the underlined expressions are not only collocations that belong to the semantic field of Administration which the speaker had taken part in but also lexical items that reflect the power and role that Buhari has played. This of course, implies that the speaker is not an ordinary man rather he belongs to the class of the top leadership hierarchy and the powerful in the society.

Sample 1 Manifestation of Power Relations in Buhari's Campaign Speeches

Table 4.2.1iii

Utterance	Denotation/Representation	Implicature
“ <u>Nigerians have the legitimate right to ask the following questions:</u> ”	This represents the citizen's constitutional power to question the government on the affairs of the state.	The electorates have constitutional power

Although power relations exist unequally, the relations of power embedded in this underlined clause is in terms of the Constitutional right the electorate have to question any political office holder. The speaker feels his audience/ sympathisers have the power and privilege to question the government on the affairs of the state. Ironically, however, the speaker may or may not be aware that questioning government policies and

programmes is the sole responsibilities of the powerful and influential people in the society and not the ordinary and downtrodden masses who form the majority of the electorate. In democracy it is often said that power belongs to the people. This is in the sense that the power or mandate given to any political office holder can be withdrawn before the expiration of his tenure. In this instance the power that the electorate have can be seen in the light of what van Dijk (1998) and Fairclough (1989) termed the hegemonic tendency. The hegemonic tendency here is in how the electorate see themselves as powerless and accept whatever comes as their lot.

Sample 1 Manifestation of Power Relations in Buhari’s Campaign Speeches

Table 4.2.1iv

Utterance	Denotation/Representation	Implicature
“It is vital Nigerians make the right choice about <u>who would look after them.</u> ”	The relative clause denotes that the electorates have the power to decide on the person to protect them.	This implies that political power belongs to the electorates.

Here, it is clear that citizens have civic responsibility and power to decide who governs them, as in the best practices of the advanced democracies. This portends that where the right things are done, it is the masses that determine who wins the election. In other words, power resides in the people. Similarly, in this expression, Buhari carefully chooses his words to manipulate the minds of his target audience. Perhaps he wants the audience to believe that what he said earlier in his speech is of little importance compared to what concerns the audience and himself. Consequently, he uses as the premodifier a possessive pronoun ‘our’ in the noun phrase ‘our occasion today...,’ that is, including him. But he shifts to the third person plural, accusative pronoun ‘them,’ as in ‘...to look after them...’ so as to persuade the audience to see that it is now their responsibility to understand the situation in the country. This is reflecting the power relations between

Buhari and the audience. He is appropriating power as if they have the same power so to say, to decide the fate of the country. This class of supporters seems to have less power to effectively make changes compared to the speaker.

Sample 1 Manifestation of Power Relations in Buhari’s Campaign Speeches

Table 4.2.1v

Utterance	Denotation/Representation	Implicature
“Enough of PDP! Enough of them! The CPC movement is poised to restore confidence in our people.”	Directing that PDP be stopped from ruling the country.	It suggests that PDP has had its field day and Buhari has the power and is a custodian of the people’s expectation.

In this utterance, the power relations seem to be in terms of the rhetoric and communicative mechanism employed by the speaker to drive home his point. Arguably, the speaker dethrones PDP by the power of language as in the use of interjection ‘Enough of PDP!’ which he repeatedly used as if that is enough to send them packing. The truth of the matter is that the speaker emotionally uses the expression (Enough of PDP! Enough of them!) to persuade the electorate to vote out PDP who seem to have had a field day in the sixteen years of their rule in the country. In this respect, the persuasive use of language is mainly to control and direct the minds of the electorate, which in turn, portrays the unequal power relations between the speaker and the audience. Here we have top-bottom line of imperative sentence that is from the superior to the inferior.

Sample II

Samples on how Jonathan's Campaign Speeches Manifest Power Relations

Table 4.2.1vi

Utterance	Denotation/Representation	Implicature
"We <u>promise</u> you one thing, that we <u>will</u> run a government that will unite Nigeria. We will not separate this country; we will not preach a gospel of division."	A re-assurance that the country would be kept as one.	The utterance presupposes that the speaker has power which he will use to unite the country. In other words, he belongs to the powerful group.

In this particular utterance language is used to show how relations of power are shaped between social actors. It equally indexes how power and authority are constructed. This is evident in Jonathan's choice of expressions, "we will run a government that will unite Nigeria." The power relations here can be located in the use of epistemic modal "will" that expresses certainty of the speakers view or opinion to run the government that will unite Nigeria. Of course, running a government is not a business of an ordinary citizen it is the responsibility of the elite and the powerful. It is clear from this fact that the speaker (Jonathan) wields power which he presumes the audience are aware of especially because of the mutually shared contextual knowledge (that is, speaker being the president). Another point of interest is the use of performative utterance, "we promise you one thing". In speech acts theory every utterance a speaker performs is an act (Austin, 1962 as cited in Osisanwo, 2008:60). For example, the performative clause (we promise you one thing) has a performative verb "promise" because the actual act of promising is made. The utterance spells the illocutionary force the speaker is presenting his views. It is instructive to reiterate that performative acts are interpreted in the light of the speaker's social status and role.

Similarly, the epistemic “will” also indicates the strong belief, view and attitude of Jonathan in the unity and indivisibility of the country. The use of the nominative, first person plural pronoun “we” in the first clause of this excerpt also indicates some degree of power the speaker wields. Also, it presupposes that the speaker is sure of achieving success by not setting too many agenda for himself which is categorically stated in the indirect object of the main clause of the sentence “We promise you one thing”. The second sentence in the above excerpt shows the identity of a social actor who has the power to either unite or separate the country but in this case the president decides not to separate the country. For example, Jonathan states that “We will not separate this country; we will not preach a gospel of division.”

Samples on how Jonathan’s Campaign Speeches Manifest Power Relations

Table 4.2.1vii

Utterance	Denotation/Representation	Implicature
<u>“We have been working with the governors (to) solve the current erosion problems in the south east; we have a special package for that, the minister of finance has been on that.”</u>	This shows that Jonathan’s government has been functional in carrying out its duties and responsibilities.	It connotes that the speaker has statutory power.

In the above utterance, the inclusive “we” together with the word “governors” as shown in the expression indicates the power relations that exist between the president and the governors. In social context, it is only a powerful person that works with governors. Therefore, we can infer that the speaker is as powerful as the governors if not, more than the governors. The use of the present perfect continuous tense is to indicate an action that commenced in the past and as the time of the utterance the action is still in progress. This connotes that the speaker was in government and as at the time of the utterance still in government because tense is used to show the attitude and opinion of the speaker in

relation to what he is talking about. The reference to the minister of finance can also be explained in terms of power relations since citing an authority or a powerful source makes the entire utterance an incontrovertible fact. In this case it is also utilized to reassure the people of the south- east and the entire citizens that the government is proactive and target oriented in executing her projects as might have been stated in the year's budget.

Samples on how Jonathan's Campaign Speeches Manifest Power Relations

Table 4.2.1viii

Utterance	Denotation/Representation	Implicature
"I can assure you that we <u>will aggressively</u> approach this erosion..."	The expression shows the speakers capability to actively solve the existing erosion problem.	This infers that Jonathan is in charge or at the helm of the affairs of the country.

This utterance is a continuation of what we have in the preceding expression. Here, the speaker expresses authority and power that he possesses in addressing the ecological problem that is pervasive in the south-east geographical zone. It suggests that he is in charge and is in the position of leadership that controls activities in the contrary, this shows the power relations here; "I can assure you", "we will aggressively..." that means Jonathan and members of the executive council, where both have power over their areas of jurisdiction but the speaker has higher power over the governors. The use of modal 'will' along with epistemic adverb "aggressively," explicitly reflects the attitude of the president in solving the erosion problem which is aimed at attracting attention of the audience to that particular issue of erosion so that they will be convinced of how he will take action that is, aggressively.

Samples on how Jonathan's Campaign Speeches Manifest Power Relations

Table 4.2.1ix

Utterance	Denotation/Representation	Implicature
<u>"I will do everything within my power to revive the power sector... there must be improvement in the agricultural sector in particular and the economy at large."</u>	It denotes the speakers unconditional decision to carry out his duties.	It implies the speaker has absolute authority/power. He is resolute in his determination to act.

Power relations which are the focus of the analysis at this point, Jonathan through the use of high modality that expresses certainty and explicit evocation of power in the expression: "I will do everything within my power to revive the power sector" shows the social status of the speaker. As the president and Commander- in- Chief of the Armed Forces of the Federal Republic of Nigeria, no doubt possesses the constitutional power that is, he has the capacity to revive the poor condition of the economy, be it power or agriculture, as it is indicated in the sentence of the speech: "There must be an improvement in the agricultural sector in particular and the economy in general. I will do everything within my power to improve the sector." The speaker exercises his power as in the obligatory modal 'must', not probably. That means he has unrestricted power, unlimited opportunity to do at will, as he desires and nobody stops him. The speaker wants the audience to see him from this level of authority as the one in the right status or position with competence to provide the long awaited solution to the power and agricultural sector. This is in a bid to manipulate the electorate through language to serve his personal interest.

Samples on how Jonathan's Campaign Speeches Manifest Power Relations

Table 4.2.1x

Utterance	Denotation/Representation	Implicature
“This administration will not sweep any dime under the carpet, no matter how big or small. There will be no sacred cow. We will not stop investigation until we get you.”	This utterance represents Jonathan and the persons collectively who are entrusted with the execution of laws and the superintendence of public affairs.	Entails that the speaker and the executive council are aware that there are bad or enemies of the progress of the country who must be dealt with decisively.

Jonathan rhetorically and communicatively utilizes figurative expressions such as idiom and metaphor. In the idiomatic expression we “not sweep any dime under the carpet” while the metaphoric expression is “sacred cow.” This usage is consciously and deliberately used by the speaker not only to embellish his speech and give it an aesthetic effect but to give it a stronghold that his administration will use all his power to bring to book and punish any offender. Here, power relations are constructed through the use of lexical items such as ‘administration’, ‘investigation’, ‘no sacred cow’, which belong to the semantic field of government, authority and power as in the expression, “this administration will not sweep any dime under the carpet no _matter how big or small. There will be no sacred cow. We will not stop investigation until we get you.” This expression is full of authority.

One of the findings is that expressions are used figuratively to create fresh meaning other than the aesthetic value they give to creative works.

4.2.2 Rhetorical Devices in the Campaign Speeches and their Functions

Successful speakers, especially in political contexts, need to appeal to attitudes and emotions that are already within the listeners. This cannot be done solely by lexical means although linguistic performance is the most important factor (Charteris-Black 2005:10). Hence, to achieve a sense of congruence between audience and speaker, politicians often make use of symbols to foster national cohesion (Ball and Peters 2000:81). Thus, different rhetorical devices such as repetition, pronouns, parallelism, metaphor, simile, personification, etc. were employed in the speeches of the two presidential candidates, Buhari and Jonathan.

Repetition

Repetition of structure and idea is a rule in persuasion (Inogo-Mora 2004: 47). The repetition of specific phrase provides logic and rhythm and makes it easy for the hearer to understand as well as focus on the message. It has always been for the purpose of emphasis. The salient feature in Buhari's speech is the repetition of one word or phrase in parallel structures at the beginning of sentences and Jonathan's speech is replete with repeated words and patterns as rhetorical strategies that attract the audience on key issues.

Samples from Buhari on Rhetorical Devices: Repetition

Table 4.2.2i

Utterance	Rhetorical Devices	Implicature
"We are today facing an <u>uncertain future in an uncertain world.</u> "	Buhari uses repetition to denote the situation of the country on ground that it cannot be determined or it is capricious.	The speaker inherently shows that the country's situation is precarious and somewhat hopeless.

Here, Buhari in these repetitions of the noun phrase 'an uncertain future,' 'an uncertain world' shows his audience how gloomy the future of the country is in a time of global

hopelessness. The repeated words are means of manipulating the collective mind of the audience to see the speaker as having their interest in mind.

Samples from Buhari on Rhetorical Devices: Rhetorical Question

Table 4.2.2ii

Utterance	Rhetorical Devices	Implicature
“Where was the government when this great <u>country</u> of <u>ours</u> <u>took a nose dive</u> on <u>many</u> critical sectors?”	The speaker uses rhetorical questions to show that the country has fallen from its previous high position. The utterance can also be analysed in terms of its metaphorical value. For example, “This great country of ours took a nose dive...” This means that a fresh meaning is given to the expression “take a nose dive”.	Here, by extension that Goodluck’s government has lost control of the economic and administrative direction.

Rhetorical question is a forceful question which has a form of a question but does not expect an answer. Hence, in this utterance, Buhari uses rhetorical questions excessively and repeatedly for emphasis to try to persuade the audience to hold on one view that the opponent (PDP) has failed over and over again in ruling this country. That is, the speaker throws these questions to present to the electorate the incapability of the ruling party and to win their sympathy. The first person plural ‘our’ refers to all Nigerians whose economy is suffering from lack of power supply. The speaker uses ‘our’ to suggest a sense of collectivity of himself, the audience and even Nigerians. It is a clever way of manipulating the audience and making them believe he too is affected by the bad government of the PDP.

Samples from Buhari on Rhetorical Devices: Rhetorical Questions

Table 4.2.2iii

Utterance	Rhetorical Devices	Implicature
“Why does this government run from pillar to post? Why should our economy be left to operate on individual power generating sets? Should we <u>continue to vote the same people?</u> ”	Buhari stresses in the rhetorical questions that the ruling party goes from one tough situation to the other without any solution.	It implies that the government (PDP) cannot rule the country again.

Samples from Buhari on Rhetorical Devices: Rhetorical Question

Table 4.2.2iv

Utterance	Rhetorical Devices	Implicature
“...if their aspirations to govern Nigeria ...why are they unable to guarantee...security of life and property? Should we continue to vote the same people...for the last twelve years (12).”	The speaker in a dramatic way aggressively continues with the rhetorical questions merely to effectively make his point to his supporters, talking about the opponent	This entails that all the years (twelve) the PDP governed the country, they did not deliver their promises.

Here, Buhari continues with the use of rhetorical question device repeatedly to effectively persuade his audience to have a rethink of the ruling party and not to allow them to have another chance of coming to power. He clearly refers to the third person plural ‘their’ and ‘they’ ‘hence, the audience already perceive the category of people that are attacked that is the PDP who must not be voted for. This is stressed when the speaker shifts to the first

person plural ‘we’ as in ‘should we continue to vote the same people?’ The ‘we’ suggests his party members and Nigerians who do not need the failed government of PDP.

Samples from Buhari on Rhetorical Devices

Table 4.2.2v

Utterance	Rhetorical Devices	Implicature
“Shamefully, <u>these people</u> ... to rule Nigeria for sixty or 200 years.”	The speaker refers to the PDP.	It intends to ridicule the opposition.

In this utterance the speaker uses the demonstrative pronoun ‘these’ to refer to the PDP and to clearly dissociate himself from the negativism associated with the opponent, ‘these zoo keepers.’ Here, Buhari figuratively portrays the government of the PDP as chaotic. This shows no other but the PDP to emphasise the dichotomy between ‘us’ the good and ‘them’ the bad people.

Samples from Buhari on Rhetorical Devices: Repetition

Table 4.2.2vi

Utterance	Rhetorical Devices	Implicature
“...to secure Nigeria better and to manage it better.”	The repetition represents the speakers confidence to keep the country protected	It presupposes that the opposition have performed below expectation and the speaker will give the country the long awaited desire.

It is instructive here to state that the speaker repeats this expression three times in lines 68, 73, and 75 in the text for emphasis. This perhaps suggests that if Buhari wins the election, his first and important priority and task would be to improve on higher level what the present administration is doing in terms of security and management of the

country better. The use and repetition of the active verbs ‘to secure,’ ‘to manage’ along with the adverb ‘better’ is also a solid way of emphasizing his commitment and responsibility to ensure an improved security of the country than what is on ground.

Samples from Buhari on Rhetorical Devices: Repetition

Table 4.2.2vii

Utterance	Rhetorical Devices	Implicature
“... To stop them in their tracks. And stop them now.”	In this parallel structure. The expression denotes the authority Buhari has to enforce end to the PDP.	This implies that, the ruling party has no second chance to rule the country again. Buhari can put an end to the rule of the PDP

There is a repetition of an imperative sentence as well as the lexical items, ‘stop’ and ‘them’ in the excerpt in parallel structures that attract the audience’s attention on key issue, importantly that of not allowing the ruling party (PDP) to win the elections again. It shows that Buhari has confidence that he is in the position to arrest the continuity of the present government. He uses here the commanding tone repeatedly to sink into the minds of the supporters. The command is to show that the electorate should not think of another decision.

Samples from Buhari on Rhetorical Devices: Repetition

Table 4.2.2viii

Utterance	Rhetorical Devices	Implicature
“Enough of PDP! Enough of them!”	The repetition in the interjection here denotes that no more of PDP.	It suggests that the country does not want to have anything to do with the present administration.

The adjective ‘enough’ is repeated for emphasis. This strategy is employed here probably to under pin the ruling party couple with the persuasiveness with which Buhari speaks. It is suggestive that the speaker and the audience in fact the whole country is fed up with the government of the day. There should be a swift change or alternative choice to replace the PDP, which is long overdue and their time is up. Hence, the speaker’s repetition in this excerpt is commanding and the effect on the party supporters is persuasive to make them accept him and not ‘them,’ the bad (PDP).

Samples from Jonathan on Rhetorical Devices: Repetition

Table 4.2.2ix

Utterance	Rhetorical Devices	Implicature
“We promise one thing, that <u>we will run</u> a government ... <u>we will not separate</u> this country, <u>we will not preach a gospel</u> of division. <u>We will not preach a gospel</u> of destruction. <u>We will preach...</u> and make sure that <u>we will work with all Nigerians</u> irrespective of... religion and language.”	Jonathan employs alliteration and continues through the sentences to present his party’s manifesto.	Here the speaker expresses emphatically his government will be in power to maintain tolerance and unity which is not the case with the opponent who will divide the country.

The above expression has a pervasive effect of repetition which ranges from alliteration, word and phrasal expressions. In terms of the alliteration, the semi-vowel consonant /w/ is repeated in the third sentence of the excerpt, “...that ‘we’ ‘will’ ‘work’ ‘with’ all Nigerians...” Here, we have the repetition of the initial consonant in adjacent or succeeding words. Similarly, in terms of the repetition of phrases, the auxiliary “will” is utilized to co-occur with the first person plural pronoun “we” in all the sentences of the above excerpt as in the “we will run, we will not separate, we will preach etc.” “With”

expresses the future and much more the force of the speakers intention and ability to change the situation of the country. Also, the pattern of repetition here is a means of wooing and controlling the mind of the electorate so as to achieve his political agenda. In other words, here the speaker's repetition is aimed at soliciting the support of the audience.

Samples from Jonathan on Rhetorical Devices: Repetition

Table 4.2.2x

Utterance	Rhetorical Devices	Implicature
“<u>We will fight</u> for justice. <u>We will fight</u> for all Nigerians to access power. <u>We will fight</u> for qualitative and competitive education. <u>We will fight</u> for health care reforms...<u>We will fight</u> to create jobs, for all Nigerians .<u>We will fight</u> corruption. <u>We will fight</u> to protect all citizens. <u>We will fight</u> for your rights.”	The passiveness of repetition features to unveil Jonathan's campaign promises	The expression implies that the speaker is so confident that only his party if voted to power will forcefully deliver the promises and mould the country into a better state.

Jonathan in this utterance uses his pattern of plain, clear and easily apprehensible clausal repetition instead of using compound / complex sentences to create asyndeton – deliberate omission of conjunction. This suggests that Jonathan recognizes repetition of such statements make it easy for the hearers to understand and will have more powerful and convincing effects on his audience. He also makes use of positive statements in this expression all through such as “we will fight for justice, we will fight for all Nigerians to access power. We will fight for qualitative and competitive education...” the repetition of the above phrase “we will fight” serves the purpose of amplification and emotional effect. It also gives logic and rhythm consequently makes it easy for the hearer to understand as

well as to focus on the message. With the repetition of “we will fight” the speaker emphasizes equal importance to ameliorate justice, access to power, qualitative and competitive education, health care reforms, jobs, corruption, protection of all citizens and their rights. It shows his resilience and strong will to make all the things stated work. He is determined to make a difference in the lives of not only his listeners but all Nigerians.

Samples from Jonathan on Rhetorical Devices: Repetition

Table 4.2.2xi

Utterance	Rhetorical Devices	Implicature
“The challenge facing leaders together is <u>how to create wealth not how to create disaster</u> in the country.”	Jonathan repeats words in this expression to mark out key opposing issues that he needs to put in place in the country.	This by extension refers to the speakers focus on persuading the electorates that his leadership will overcome the difficulties faced by previous leaders. He infers that without economic boom there will be economic doom

In the utterance (11), the phrasal verb “... to create wealth” and “not how to create disaster” are both creating but one is positive appraisal and the other negative. Perhaps, this is because juxta positioning of “wealth and disaster” constructs a clear picture in the mind of the supporters that the president chooses to pursue their interest.

Samples from Jonathan on Rhetorical Devices: Repetition

Table 4.2.2xii

Utterance	Rhetorical Devices	Implicature
“I will do <u>everything within my power to improve the power sector.</u> ”	Syntactic repetition is employed by the speaker to emphasize his position and ability.	This suggests that Jonathan as the incumbent president has the power authority to make infrastructural development.

Here, it is syntactic repetition. Jonathan repeated the word ‘power’ authoritatively and for emphasis. In discourse, repetition is used to create readability to make the speech pleasing to the ears. Here, at the same time, it serves a rhetorical function of foregrounding the personality of the speaker. It may perhaps portray the speaker as arrogant but above that it indicates the social status and the powerful position of the speaker.

Parallelism

Parallelism is a great way to make connections between ideas and claims and so advance an argument. (Balogun, 2014). Jones & Peccei (2004:51) state that it is a device which expresses several ideas in a series of similar structures. This can serve to emphasize that the ideas are equal in importance and can add a sense of symmetry and rhythm, which make the speech more memorable.

Samples from Buhari on Rhetorical Devices: Parallelism

Table 4.2.2xiii:

Utterance	Rhetorical Devices	Implicature
“...To <u>treat everyone</u> and <u>every group</u> in the country with <u>fairness</u> and <u>equity</u> .”	Buhari uses parallelism here to show his ideology and that of his party.	The expression shows that the speaker’s ideology is the right choice for the electorate who have suffered from maladministration.

Here, the speaker employs parallelism; in the juxtapositioning of the identical syntactic construction “To treat everyone and every group... with fairness and equity” these words express the same general thought with a slight change added for rhetorical effect. Which gives a controlled repetition of the phrase and its effect is to emphasize his key view and

persuade the audience to sympathize with his views. Buhari uses ‘fairness and equity’ which are synonymous words ‘to stress that the ideas are equal in importance.

Samples from Buhari on Rhetorical Devices: Parallelism

Table 4.2.2xiv

Utterance	Rhetorical Devices	Implicature
“...our occasion today is not <u>about the past</u> rather it is an engagement that reflects <u>on the future</u> .”	Parallelism at clausal level with distinction between them to specify their choice.	It infers that Buhari sees the ruling party as already kicked out and the focus is him.

Similarly in this excerpt, the parallel occurs at clausal level where the speaker uses antonymous words, ‘past and future’ in order to evoke emotional response and the attention of the target audience to this particular message and make it stand out to drive home his point. Of importance also is the speakers choice of the inclusive pronoun “our” as to create a common ground between him and the audience to show that they are together in the pursuit of a better country.

Samples from Buhari on Rhetorical Devices: Parallelism

Table 4.2.2xv

Utterance	Rhetorical Devices	Implicature
“ <u>We can</u> and <u>we must</u> reverse these trends. The first step is for <u>Nigerians to vote PDP out. They are finished!</u> <u>They have passed their “sale by date.”</u> ”	Here, parallelism and pronouns are utilized to express the obligation to put the country in the right path.	The utterance suggests that the opposition are confident and well equipped to get rid of PDP by all means the speaker does not.

We have two rhetorical devices at work here, first parallelism in which there is the juxtaposition of the epistemic modal ‘can’ and the deontic ‘must’ to emphatically suggest the ability, obligation and necessity of the opposition party to reverse the trend of events

which they perceived as bad, where they say. ‘According to Halliday(1985) and Ravelli(2006) ‘must’ is considered high modality, while ‘may’ and ‘could’ are considered low modality, because they serve to indirectly accentuate the expression of opinion. Also, the referent ‘we’ most likely refers to his party including himself and ‘we’ may likely refer to the Nigerian people. The infinitive clause, ‘Nigerians to vote PDP out’ has Nigerians as the subject but which group of Nigerians is he asking to vote PDP out, since some Nigerians are supporters of PDP. However, Buhari is confident in the gloomy scenarios he presents to the target audience through these rhetorical devices (parallelism, pronouns) ‘They are finished! They have passed their “sale by date.” The expression implies that the speaker and his supporters are duty bound to carry out decisive actions on the PDP failed government. The ruling party is no longer wanted in the country. It also shows the stage is set for change, power must change hands.

The immediate shift to the third person plural ‘they’ serve as a subjective pronoun as in ‘they are finished,’ they are passed their sale by date.’ Studies of political pronoun use have illustrated that they can be used for distancing the speaker from the thing spoken of (Allen 2007:11). ‘They’ is anaphoric reference to PDP as Allen (2007:12) explains that personal pronouns are most typically used for backward referenced.

Samples from Buhari on Rhetorical Devices: Parallelism

Table 4.2.2xvi

Utterance	Rhetorical Devices	Implicature
“...think <u>of baking the national cake rather than how to share it.</u> ”	Buhari employs parallel phrasal verbs to point out to the electorate the good policy of his party (CPC) against the bad policy of the opposition	Here the expression means that the speaker among his reforms is the focus on revamping the ailing economy.

	(PDP).	
--	--------	--

Also, Buhari here raises the hope of the youths to become great entrepreneurs and not to remain at the receiving end. In this excerpt, the phrasal verbs “baking the national cake” and “how to share it,” are parallels and both are creative but one is to portray a positive change of attitude from a negative one. The expression is nice and appealing in order to convince the teeming youth that he is giving to serve their interest.

Samples from Buhari on Rhetorical Devices: Parallelism

Table 4.2.2xvii

Utterance	Rhetorical Devices	Implicature
“The unbridled depletion of the nation’s foreign reserve by <u>43- percent</u> within the last <u>eighteen months-</u> from <u>\$62.2 billion</u> to <u>\$35.24 billion</u> , is not only worrisome, but... Nigeria truly runs the most expensive, extravagant, ineffective and unproductive government in the world.”	The utterance shows number game and parallelism which represents contempt for the PDP	This suggests the economy of the country is weak and the PDP lacks prudence. Also, Buhari implies ideological orientation; he will reduce inflation drastically that PDP is the worst government anyone can ever find. It also implies that he is a just man, full of integrity.

Here, we have a couple of rhetorical communicative strategies, ranging from the use of ‘number game’, parallelism, as the piling up of epithet. In this excerpt, the use of ‘43 percent’, ‘eighteen months’, \$62.2 billion, \$32.24 billion are evidences that Buhari presents his speech as factual, reliable and authentic. Numerical figures tend to be verifiable and tend to give credence not only to the speaker but also the speech. For example, van Dijk (2004) states that much argument is oriented to enhancing credibility by moves that emphasise objectivity. Numbers and statistics persuasively display

objectivity, they represent the “facts” against mere opinions and impression. Hence, the speaker makes a strong impact on the decision of the electorate.

In terms of parallelism, as we have noticed the speaker uses preponderance of parallelism throughout the speech. For instance, bringing together a confirmation of the fact that Nigeria truly ‘runs the most expensive ...government’, suggests the ideological orientation of the speaker. Similarly, in this excerpt, the evaluative lexis shows clearly the attitude and opinion of Buhari towards the ruling party PDP as in “...the young and old and everybody but PDP cronies are the worse for it.”

Samples from Buhari on Rhetorical Devices: Parallelism

Table 4.2.2xviii

Utterance	Rhetorical Devices	Implicature
“I do not make idle promises. I mean what I say.”	Here, he uses asyndeton to make it more impactful.	Infers that the opposition cannot be relied upon. The electorate can be rest assured of his able leadership, that he is the ideal person.

In table (18) the two simple sentences are of equal status but Buhari refuses to use any conjunction or its equivalent just to create a rhetorical effect of asyndeton. That is, a deliberate omission of coordinators such as, but, and, for etc. this makes the message more emphatic.

Samples from Jonathan on Rhetorical Devices: Parallelism

Table 4.2.2xix

Utterance	Rhetorical Devices	Implicature
“The challenge facing leaders together is <u>how to create wealth not how to</u>	Jonathan employs parallelism here to clearly inform the	The utterance infers that he has come to override the impediment to the prosperity

<u>create disaster</u> in the country”.	audience the difficult task leaders are intimidated with in Nigeria.	of the country. He is perhaps suggesting that his opponent will ruin the country
---	--	--

The parallelism here is located between the noun “wealth” and “disaster” although the speaker employs the same infinite verb “to create” this can be explained in terms of negation and intertextuality. Negation in this regard is in the use of “not” that separates the two opposing text (“how to create wealth” and how to create disaster”) to achieve intertextuality. This is because when one thing is not this, certainly it will be that. Our material world is in such a way that opinions are always available for instance, if something is not up it must be down (Suleiman and Anumudu 2017).

Samples from Jonathan on Rhetorical Devices: Parallelism

Table 4.2.2xx

Utterance	Rhetorical Devices	Implicature
<u>“We should not just produce fertilizer but we should export fertilizer”</u>	The use of parallelism by the speaker is to present confidently his ability and promote the country’s economy	It is suggestive here, that Jonathan has the solution to boost the economy through sustainable agriculture.

In this compound sentence the use of coordinating conjunction “but” makes the meaning of the sentence parallel and this justifies the differences in the main verbs “produce” and “export”. The effect of this is to project the good intention of the speaker, that the country should explore all her economic resources to the fullest not just for national consumption but also for exportation. This intention is buttressed by the speaker in the succeeding sentences. “We cannot just be expelling gas; we should add value to those (sic) gas...”

Samples from Jonathan on Rhetorical Devices: Parallelism

Table 4.2.2xxi

Utterance	Rhetorical Devices	Implicature
“ <u>We are committed to boosting the economy; we are committed to transforming</u> the economy”.	Parallel clauses are used here to emphasize the task the speaker and his party will undertake in developing the country.	Jonathan wants a total overhaul of the economy to a mature industrial one and advanced one.

As has been expressed earlier, compound sentence is utilized to present two independent clauses. Here, the two independent clauses are parallel not only in terms of the structure but also in terms of the lexical items. Parallelism is achieved here through the use of the gerundive nouns “boosting” and “transforming”.

Samples from Jonathan on Rhetorical Devices: Parallelism

Table 4.2.2xxii

Utterance	Rhetorical Devices	Implicature
“... not in the Chad basin area but also in the Anambra basin”	He employs parallelism to draw the attention of the audience to the fact that the PDP government will not limit its activity to particular areas but similar areas.	It implies that Jonathan is not a partial leader. Gains of democracy are for all.

In this utterance Jonathan employs the use of coordinating conjunction which was earlier accounted for to achieve parallelism. This also gives negation through/via intertextuality as accounted for in the table.

Metaphor/Simile

Samples from Buhari on Rhetorical Devices: Conceptual Metaphor

Table 4.2.2xxiii

Utterance	Rhetorical Devices	Implicature
"I consider myself <u>on a rescue mission.</u> "	Buhari here uses conceptual metaphor to describe himself, and his leadership role, to save the country from the opponent	The expression implies that Buhari sees Nigerians as captives of long period of bad governance of PDP and he is their deliverance.

The speaker employs conceptual metaphor as a rhetorical device where he maps on the inherent qualities of a security personnel onto the politicians. In this way he conceptualizes politicians as security agents. This could also be explained in terms of inter-textual mechanism that Buhari is bringing in manifest inter-textuality into the present discourse using largely military terms in political campaign. Buhari wants his audience to know that they are in a helpless situation. This has a persuasive effect on the electorate to support the speaker who has come as the savior from the ills of the ruling party PDP.

Samples from Buhari on Rhetorical Devices: Conceptual Metaphor

Table 4.2.2xxiv

Utterance	Rhetorical Devices	Implicature
" <u>We in the CPC</u> here today offer a political platform <u>whose imperative is to rescue</u> Nigeria <u>and reposition</u> it for greater economic development and social well being."	Conceptual metaphor in this utterance reveals on the speakers intentions of politics and that of his political party.	The extended meaning of this statement is that Buhari sees the country lacking any political stance. He persuades the audience to see his party with the mandate to restore the reputation of the country.

Also, in this expression, the speaker evokes the conceptual metaphor to present his perspective of a political party where he maps the qualities of a security agent (military, police, state security service etc.) onto the political party. Lakoff and Johnson (1980) hold that the system of human beings is metaphorical. Metaphors are not merely linguistic instruments; they permeate perception, thought, and behaviour. Buhari objectively uses conceptual metaphor in this case to create a picture in the mind of the audience of a sort of a timely invasion of the country by his party CPC who will bring the desired change. It is meant to attain this goal of winning support of the public. The speakers choice of the inclusive pronoun “we” is to show the party supporters that it is not about him alone but he belongs to a group sharing a common ground.

Samples from Buhari on Rhetorical Devices: Conceptual Metaphor

Table 4.2.2xxiv

Utterance	Rhetorical Devices	Implicature
“ <u>Our education system does not need cosmetic reforms. 6-3-3-4 or 6-6-4 sounds to me like the formation of a football team.</u> ”	Buhari employs both conceptual metaphor and simile to motivate the electorate to visualize the state of the country’s education structure.	The expression suggests that there is no machinery put in place for education by the PDP. It is all deception. The speaker/his party will bring remarkable change.

From the first two sentences we have a couple of rhetorical devices. Here, simile and metaphor are embedded in one sentence, for example, ‘6-3-3-4 or 6-6-4 sounds to me like the formation of a football team.’ This is a clear example of simile signaled by the “like” pointer while the later constituent of the sentence is a metaphor in its own right. This is because 6-3-3-4 or 6-6-4 is seen as the formation of a football team by this; the speaker creates a kind of conceptual metaphor by mapping the characteristics of a football team onto education system. Here, the speaker projects his beliefs and that of his party CPC.

He shows his emotions through this strategy to convince the listeners and to help them have a better understanding of the situation on ground, so as to make the right choice.

Samples from Jonathan on Rhetorical Devices: Simile

Table 4.2.2xxv

Utterance	Rhetorical Devices	Implicature
“...but <u>gas</u> is as <u>important</u> to government <u>as crude oil</u> .”	Jonathan employs simile here to show that gas was trivial but assures the audience of upgrading the status of gas to that of oil.	The implication is that the issue of unemployment in the country will be drastically reduced with the gas sector receiving attention as the oil sector.

Here, Jonathan uses simile to lay emphasis on how important gas is to his administration as crude oil in order to convince the audience, in particular the youth who will benefit from massive employment in those parts. He assures them that gone are the days when ‘gas was not very attractive.’ This is to win the support of the audience.

Samples from Jonathan on Rhetorical Devices: Simile

Table 4.2.2xxvi

Utterance	Rhetorical Devices	Implicature
“... and whoever is involved, <u>big as iroko tree</u> , or <u>small as the grass</u> will go for it.”	The speaker uses simile to emphasise he is impartial in passing judgement on the culprit, regardless of who they are especially with regard to this issue of bombing. It helps the audience to have a vivid picture in their minds.	In this utterance, it implies that the speaker and his government have laid down strict measures to curb crime as one of their policies.

Jonathan here expresses in a drastic comparison through the use of simile ‘iroko’ meaning gigantic and ‘grass’ representing small. That is, likening the positions or status

of those involved in bombings notwithstanding shall face the wrath of the law. It is suggestive that even if the culprits are members of the executive council. This is to persuade his supporters to believe and accept him.

Samples from Buhari on Rhetorical Devices: Simile

Table 4.2.2xxvii

Utterance	Rhetorical Devices	Implicature
“Our national economy which largely depends on crude oil exportation to earn income can only be likened to flying on a single engine aircraft with a single point of failure.”	He employs simile here to make the listeners imagine the risk of which the ruling party PDP had been running the economy.	The implication of the strategy is that the speaker has contempt for the opponent they have no improved plans for the economy.

Here, we have obvious use of simile which denotes a vivid comparison of one thing with another which correspondence can be established or inferred as in ... ‘crude oil exportation ... can only be likened to flying on a single engine aircraft...’ and the use of repetition to emphasise the extent to which the country’s economy is not diversified. That is to demonstrate the poor state of the economy. Hence, it might be suggestive that his sympathizers should have a re-think of giving him their support to enable him bring a vibrant economy instead of ‘... a single engine aircraft with a single point of failure.’ The impact this strategy has on the listeners is perhaps to pass a vote of no confidence on the ruling party PDP.

Personification/ Idiom

The speakers use personification where inanimate objects or abstract ideas are represented as possessing human qualities, power, or feelings. That is, they give non-

living things human attributes. Also, the speakers like in other figurative expressions employ idioms in order to create an effect on the listeners as in the following excerpts:

Samples from Buhari on Rhetorical Devices: Personification

Table 4.2.2xxviii

Utterance	Rhetorical Devices	Implicature
“In my own case, <u>it is destiny that threw me up to serve</u> as the Head of State of this great country...”	Here, the speaker uses personification to convey his message; that his elevation was an act of God.	The expression implies that Buhari coming to power as head of state was unique. His was an unusual occurrence.

Here, Buhari uses personification in explaining the power of God in his attainment of the position of Head of State and Commander-in Chief of the armed forces of the Federal Republic of Nigeria. In this case, ‘destiny’ an abstract noun is given a quality of an animate object that can take someone up from one level to the other. The speaker deliberately employs this strategy in order to create a notable effect on the audience to manipulate them to believe that even in this occasion because of his rare qualities destiny will catapult him to be the president.

Allusion

Allusion is a rhetorical device that directs the minds of the hearers or readers to what has been written or spoken before. It brings back to memory knowledge and experience of the past in order to understand the current discourse or text. (Alabi 2003). In discourse analysis, allusion is included in manifest intertextuality or constutive intertextuality that is, interdiscursivity. This is illustrated in the following excerpt.

Samples from Buhari on Rhetorical Devices: Allusion

Table 4.2.2xxix

Utterance	Rhetorical Devices	Implicature
“They have <u>almost transformed Nigeria into the proverbial Animal Farm</u> where sycophants dominate both the airwaves and print media.”	Buhari employs allusion to remind the audience of the experience in Animal Farm in order for the public to have a clear picture of the happenings in Nigeria.	Buhari in this utterance implies that the PDP have dichotomized the country into the influential (haves) and the down trodden (have nots).

In this utterance Buhari criticizes the media for propagating the government that is literally doing nothing. The manifest intertextuality here is bringing in the story in the George Orwell novel, “Animal Farm” as a means of exaggeration into the campaign speech so as to recreate the event in the minds of the audience. The purpose is to achieve a satiric effect in order to principally ridicule its opponent and provoke them.

Samples from Buhari on Rhetorical Devices: Allusion

Table 4.2.2xxx

Utterance	Rhetorical Devices	Implicature
“ <u>No responsible government</u> would allow religious killings ... to continue unchallenged within its jurisdiction.”	Allusion is used to intimate the listeners that there has been laxity on the part of the government in securing lives.	This infers that the PDP government is the primary cause of insecurity and are not trustworthy.

In this excerpt, the fronting of polarity does not only allude to the fact that government is not responsible but also presupposes that Buhari thinks that his party will be a responsible one when it comes to power.

Symbolism

Symbolism, like imagery is the use of something to philosophically imply another.

Samples from Buhari on Rhetorical Devices: Symbolism

Table 4.2.2xxxix

Utterance	Rhetorical Devices	Implicature
“The <u>Nigerian education system needs a root and branch</u> reform.”	The speaker employs symbolism here as a strategy to represent the condition of education set up in Nigeria that needs drastic change.	Here it is suggestive that Nigeria’s education lacks organization and the CPC has come to salvage the sector.

This expression shows both symbolism and imagery and presents a wholistic reform of the education system. Meaning every aspect of the education system will be examined and reformed.

Samples from Buhari on Rhetorical Devices: Symbolism

Table 4.2.2xxxix

Utterance	Rhetorical Devices	Implicature
“Some Nigerians have wondered why <u>we chose the pen as part of CPC logo</u> .”	In this expression, Buhari uses symbolism with the ‘pen’ as the pointer to his party’s passion for education,	This expression implies that the Buhari government is to bring the citizens of the country to the stage of enlightened literate people.

What “pen” in this expression as clearly stated by Muhammadu Buhari is used to achieve symbolism where it symbolizes the party’s (CPC) commitment to qualify education and by extension knowledge, development and progress.

Code-switching

Samples from Buhari on Rhetorical Devices: Code-switching

Table 4.2.2xxxiii

Utterance	Rhetorical Devices	Implicature
<u>“a kasa, a tsare, a raka, a jira , idan zaa taba ku hana.”</u>	He employs code switching purposefully to get the message across to the audience this particular sensitive piece of information that will require serious action to be taken by the audience to preserve their votes.	Here the speaker expresses his distrust of the ruling party (PDP) the conduct of the election and fears foul play. He incites his supporters to go any length to secure their votes.

Buhari in this utterance uses code switching. It is a communicative strategy used to achieve a purpose. Here, the speaker switches to what van Dijk (2011) describes as local semantics. The speaker’s reason for employing ‘local semantics’ is mostly contextual. They are a kind of information that mostly influences the mental models and hence the opinions and attitudes of recipients. Its function is that it allows meaning to be recalled and mostly reproduced by recipients and therefore has most obvious social consequences.

Pronoun

The use of pronouns may tell us a lot about how much responsibility a speaker wants to assume for an idea. Pronouns are words substituting for nouns or noun phrases (Beard 2000:24) According to Jones Wareing (1999:4) the first person singular pronoun ‘I’, for instance, clearly declares who is responsible while the first person plural ‘we’ makes the status of responsibility more unclear. The first person plural pronouns in the introduction of a speech aim at an appeal to the sharing of interests between speaker and audience. A

very crucial strategy in political campaign speeches is the use of pronouns; here we refer to it as pronomilisation which is used extensively.

Samples from Buhari on Rhetorical Devices: Pronouns

Table 4.2.2xxxiv (a)

Utterance	Rhetorical Devices	Implicature
“ <u>My</u> friends, ladies and gentlemen <u>my</u> name is Muhammadu Buhari, the former military Head of State. And <u>I</u> thank the Almighty God who gave <u>me</u> the unique opportunity to serve this nation from the humble rank of Platoon Commander to Commander-in-Chief, at the revered rank of a general in the Nigerian army. <u>I</u> acknowledge the hand of God on <u>me</u> when <u>I</u> found <u>myself</u> ...”	Buhari uses pronoun [my] here to draw attention of the audience, as ‘me’ introduces himself to them, his associates. Also, to project no other but self that God favoured.	The use of the pronouns in this expression implies that Buhari believes no other head of state or president came to power by divine providence only him, perhaps because he considers himself righteous hence, the right choice for the people.

In terms of rhetorical devices used in the campaign speech of Buhari personal pronouns are extensively repeated. For instance, in this excerpt first person singular pronoun ‘I’ is used three (3) times, the accusative ‘me’ is used two (2) times, while the possessive ‘my’ is employed two (2) times. Similarly, reflexive pronoun ‘myself’ features one (1) time. Here, Buhari uses the possessive pronoun ‘my’ in attempt to give impression that he has close association with the audience and they are together in the pursuit of common objectives. The following table shows the distribution of pronouns used in the speech of Buhari.

Figure 4.1: Statistical Distribution of Pronouns in President Buhari's Speech

Lexical choice	Type	Frequency of occurrence	Percentage
Pronoun (I)	Personal/nominative first person singular	36	19.15%
Pronoun (me)	Personal/accusative	8	4.25%
Pronoun (you)	Personal/nominative	9	4.79%
Pronoun (we)	Personal/nominative first person plural	48	25.53%
Pronoun (us)	Personal/accusative first person plural	4	2.13%
Pronoun (my)	Personal/possessive	13	6.92%
Pronoun (they)	Personal/subjective third person plural	14	7.45%
Pronoun (their)	Personal/possessive	8	4.25%
Pronoun (our)	Personal/possessive	30	15.96%
Pronoun (them)	Personal/accusative third person plural	9	4.79%
Pronoun (your)	Personal/possessive	6	3.19%
Pronoun (myself)	Personal/reflexive	2	1.06%
Pronoun (themselves)	Personal/reflexive	1	0.53%
Total		202	100%

Here, the table shows that the first person singular pronoun “I” represents 19.15%. The accusative first person pronoun “me” is uttered 4.25% and the personal pronoun “you” 4.79%. The first person plural pronoun “we” has the highest frequency, with 25.53% while the first person objective pronoun “us” 2%. The possessive pronoun “my” has 6.92%, while the subjective third person pronoun “they” 7.45% and accusative “them”

4.79% respectively. The possessive pronouns “their” “your” have a frequency of 4.25% and 3.19%, while first person personal pronoun “our” occurs 15.96%. The reflexive pronouns “myself”, “themselves” have the lowest frequency of 1.06 and 0.53%.The predominant use of the first person plural pronoun “we” shows togetherness, that means of us being good (positive self presentation) and the use of the pronoun “they” being bad (negative-other representation).

The following table shows a quantitative analysis of the use of pronouns in Jonathan’s speeches:

Samples from Jonathan on Rhetorical Devices: Pronouns

Table 4.2.2xxxiv (b)

Utterance	Rhetorical Devices	Implicature
“you will have a date... we will investigate...we will not stop...until we get you and we are now... I will not bore you...”	Jonathan uses pronoun [we] to show togetherness with the audience. And pronoun (you) to distant himself.	The use of the pronouns in this expression implies that Jonathan believes himself and his party can stop the bombings that are going on in the country. The culprits will be brought to book.

In terms of rhetorical devices used in the campaign speech of Jonathan personal pronouns are extensively repeated. For instance, in this excerpt first person plural pronoun ‘We’ is used three (3) times, the nominative ‘you’ is used three (3) times. The following table shows the distribution of pronouns used in the speech of Jonathan.

Figure 4.2: Statistical Distribution of Pronouns in President Jonathan's Speech

Lexical choice	Type	Frequency of occurrence	Percentage
Pronoun (we)	Personal/nominative first person plural	63	52.5%
Pronoun (you)	Personal/nominative	15	12.5%
Pronoun (their)	Personal/possessive	1	0.83%
Pronoun (ourselves)	Personal/reflexive	1	0.83%
Pronoun (our)	Personal/possessive	14	11.67%
Pronoun (I)	Personal/nominative first person singular	18	15%
Pronoun (me)	Personal/accusative	1	0.83%
Pronoun (my)	Personal/possessive	3	2.5%
Pronoun (us)	Personal/accusative first personal plural	2	1.67%
Pronoun (your)	Personal/possessive	1	0.83%The
Pronoun (they)	Personal/subjective third person plural	1	0.83%
Total		137	100%

The table reveals that the nominative pronoun “we” has the highest frequency, with 52.5% of the entire pronouns identified in the sample analysis. The second person pronoun “you” 12.5%, whereas the reflexive pronoun “ourselves” and the objective first person pronoun “me”, the possessive pronoun “their “your”, and the third person pronoun “they” all have the lowest frequency with 0.83% while the possession pronoun “our” represents 11.67%. Also, the first person pronoun “I” is spoken 15% and the first person possessive pronoun “my” shows 2.5% while the first person objective pronoun “us” constitutes 1.67%. The predominant use of the first person plural pronoun “we”/ “our”

prominently mark a sense of common interest with members of his party, and to make the speaker sound humble by including the audience.

Thus, politicians use pronouns to refer to categories and groups in which they can choose to place themselves or not. The choice is based on personal interest that is for their political agenda, constructing their identity and presenting themselves in a positive light. The audience can choose to be a part of these categories or not. The politicians shift identity through pronoun choice to enable them appeal to their different hearers which helps broaden their ability to persuade the electorate to win their votes.

4.2.3 Structure of Language use and Identity Construction

The following areas will be investigated under identity construction.

Active and passive voice

Text is either constructed in active voice or passive voice. This depends on the ideological orientation and identity the speaker / writer wishes to foreground or “background.” In other words, the quality of the action the speaker wishes to voice, or silent. Passivisation is achieved when the speaker explicitly hides the subject of the doer of an action and focuses on the action itself that is’ the verb. This however, suggests the ideological stance and identity of the speaker. The use of the subject and finite structure makes the doer of the subject of an action prominent and is topicalised.

Samples from Buhari on Structure of Language use and Identity Construction

Table 4.2.3ia

Utterance	Identity Construction	Implicature
“I <u>would say, with all humility that</u> , I dutifully accepted all the challenges and responsibility of head of state and government.”	In this expression, Buhari uses declarative mood to convey to the listeners his image, that of a meek lowly and modest individual.	The implication of political discourse practice of the expression here is to control the emotions of the audience.

The proposition is structured in subject and finite form, which is suggestive of the fact that the expression is an indication of a declarative mood system. In declarative mood the speaker presents the proposition as definite, that is, free from any doubt. Through the use of declarative mood, as explained above, the speaker constructs for himself an image of a trustworthy and reliable person. Again the manner in which the inclusion of an adverbial phrase “with all humility” in the utterance constructs a positive identity of the speaker. This will allow the audience to perceive the speaker as humble, respectful and courteous as Beard (2000:41) observes “politicians often claim humility and service to the people as their motive for wanting power”. Hence, the presidential aspirant may realise the importance of this and therefore, incorporates it in his speech.

Similarly, in the same utterance, the speaker utilises subject and finite but with the inclusion of a lexical modal ‘dutifully’. Hence, the modal explicitly presents the attitude of the aspirant towards the challenges and responsibility of the head of state and government. This we can infer that it is not unconnected with his past experience in government as military head of state.

Samples from Buhari of identity construction using Theme and Rheme

Table 4.2.3ib

Utterance	Theme	Rheme
"I <u>would say, with all humility that</u> , I dutifully accepted all the challenges and responsibility of head of state and government."	I would say with all humility that dutifully...	Accepted all the challenges and responsibility of head of state and government.

In this utterance, the first constituent is "I would say with all humility that I dutifully" which represents the Theme. In systemic functional linguistics (SFL), Theme is the idea represented by the constituent at starting point of the structure, whereas the Rheme is the last part of the utterance which in this Table is "accepted all the challenges and responsibility of head of state and government". Hence, the combination of the use of textual "would say" and interpersonal "with all humility", along with the topical "I" Themes construct the identity of the speaker as humble and high-minded. This is because without the addition of the modifiers "would say", "with all humility" and dutifully" the utterance would still be grammatical/meaningful.

Naming and Framing

Naming and Framing are linguistic resources used for identity construction. They indicate the perception of the speaker or writer about what they write or talk about. The name given to an object or entity signifies what one thinks of it. Bloor and Bloor (2007:101) state that framing is an inevitable process of selective influence over the individual perception of the meanings attributed to words or phrases.

Samples from Buhari on Structure of Language use and Identity Construction

Table 4.2.3iia

Utterance	Identity Construction	Implicature
“I was also guided by an agreement with my colleagues and members of my executive council-which always enabled me to try <u>to avoid impropriety, dishonesty, corruption and other forms of abuse of office and power.</u> ”	The speaker employs framing here to create a bad image of the ruling party, PDP but consciously presents himself as one who is in unison with others.	The political implication in the expression is the influence on minds of the listeners to consider their stand having presented to them these facts.

Buhari recounts his experience as the head of state, government and reiterates his perception of government in which he frames any impropriety, dishonesty, corruption etc. as abuse of office and power. He believes that if a leader is upright that at any time he could stand before his people, holds his head high and is ready to face any interrogation. This explains why the speaker is campaigning for the post of the president.

Samples from Buhari on Identity Construction using Theme and Rheme

Table 4.2.3: iib

Utterance	Theme	Rheme
I was also guided by an agreement with my colleagues and members of my executive council...	I	was also guided by an agreement with my colleagues and members of my executive council

In table 4.2.3iib “I” is the Theme representing the first constituent in the sentence structure. In other words, it is a starting point of the utterance while “was also guided by an agreement with my colleagues and members of my executive council,” is the Rheme. The use of pronoun “I” is the only Theme that projects the identity of the speaker since

the first constituent of the utterance is the Given “I” which is both known to the speaker (Buhari) and the hearers (electorate).

Samples from Buhari on Structure of Language use and Identity Construction

Table 4.2.3iiia

Utterance	Identity Construction	Implicature
“I consider <u>myself to be on a rescue mission.</u> <u>Never before have we seen such bad leadership</u> in our national life.”	Buhari makes use of framing to portray the quality of a liberator from the difficult and evil conditions of the ruling party.	This utterance for political purpose implicates a problem that is in dire need of a solution and certainly Buhari and his party CPC are the most appropriate channel for the condition at hand.

Buhari here frames politics as “a rescue mission.” Grammatically, ‘a rescue mission’ is a noun phrase, and nouns as we know name. Consciously, the speaker arouses the emotion of the electorate to high hope as he constructs himself the image of a savior in a somewhat hopeless situation. It is suggestive of some form of promise to the electorate, the promise of a deliverer. He equally uses an explicit lexis, ‘bad’ to qualify the noun ‘leadership.’ This is a clear example of framing where a conscious negative image of incumbent government is projected.

Samples from Buhari on Identity Construction using Theme and Rheme

Table 4.2.3. iiib

Utterance	Theme	Rheme
I consider myself to be on a rescue mission	I	consider myself to be on a rescue mission

The utterance on Table 4.2.3.iiib is analysed in terms of the thematic structure (Theme and Rheme). The Theme here is the personal pronoun “I” which foregrounds the speaker as the only item within the Theme constituent. An utterance as this can be analysed in

terms of its “markedness” and unmarkedness while the structure S+V+O is unmarked, the reversal of the structure will be seen as marked. In other words the utterance can be nominalised as in this expression, “consideration of oneself on a rescue mission”. In relation to the way identity is constructed in this utterance, Buhari, identifies himself with the use of the pronoun “I” and goes further to say good thing about himself that “I consider myself to be on a rescue mission” which is positive- self presentation and negative-other.

Samples from Buhari on Structure of Language use and Identity Construction

Table 4.2.3iva

Utterance	Identity Construction	Implicature
“The country’s life is <u>literally falling apart</u> on all fronts of security, in education in the economy, in health care system and youth employment. Many <u>critical observers</u> have begun to list Nigeria among the <u>failed states</u> of the 21 st century.”	Buhari indirectly constructs his own image and directly that of the opponent and the country through framing. He has lost hope for the country and that virtually everything has collapsed.	It is apparent from the speakers opinions here that it implies the mobilization of the electorate against the bad incumbent government and to support and accept him, as the only capable person for the job.

In this utterance, the speaker uses deliberate negative identity construction of the ruling government not only through his cohesion but also the framing mechanism. In other words, ‘literally falling,’ ‘critical observers,’ ‘failed state’ are all evaluative semantics and are abstract which may be difficult to place one’s finger on. Here, Buhari is only expressing his opinion, and thereby unconsciously constructing his own identity as a pessimist. Perhaps his intention may not be to construct his own identity in this way, rather to persuade the audience to win their votes. The identity construction through framing also continues in the succeeding paragraph where the speaker also says, “we are internationally recognized for corruption, inefficiency ... and infrastructural decay.” This expression is used here to qualify the situation described with so much sensation that is

intended to awaken sentiment in order to capture the imagination of the electorate to persuade them in voting for him.

Samples from Buhari on Identity Construction using Theme and Rheme

Table 4.2.3.ivb

Utterance	Theme	Rheme
The country's life is literally falling apart on all fronts...	The country's life	is literally falling apart on all fronts...

The speaker here fronts “the country’s life” as what is mutually understood by the speaker and the hearer (Given) and the new is the remaining part of the utterance. In systemic functional linguistics (SFL) this device is labeled Theme and Rheme. In explaining the identity construction underlining this utterance, it will be seen that the speaker is making a declarative statement and presenting it as an incontrovertible fact with the use of the copula verb “is”.

Samples from Buhari on Structure of Language use and Identity Construction

Table 4.2.3va

Utterance	Identity Construction	Implicature
“... <u>incidents</u> of <u>kidnapping</u> degenerated to the embarrassing dimension of <u>an incorporated evil business</u> ”.	The speaker attempts to frame the happenings in the country which are terrible, he identifies the opponent as nefarious.	This implies that the ruling party created the problem and made it a legal commercial enterprise to discourage his supporters from voting for PDP and encourage them to favour him.

Similarly, here, Buhari perceives the opponent’s led government that is Goodluck, as consciously allowing what he sees as “occasional incidents of kidnapping” to what he names “an incorporated evil business”. Framing presents facts as in this expression that

implicates the situation at hand needs urgent solution and this lies with the speaker and his party.

Samples from Buhari on Identity Construction using Theme and Rheme

Table 4.2.3vb

Utterance	Theme	Rheme
Incidents of kidnapping degenerated to the embarrassing dimension of an incorporated evil business.	Incidents of kidnapping	degenerated to the embarrassing dimension of an incorporated evil business

In Table 4.2.3.vb “incidents of kidnapping” occupies the theme position while “degenerated to the embarrassing dimension of an incorporated evil business” takes the Rheme position. Similarly, here we have a multiple Theme that is the textual “incidents of” and the topical “kidnapping”. The identity construction in this regard can be foregrounded through the speaker’s use of metaphor of “evil business” to evaluate and construct the state of affairs in which incidents of kidnapping is occurring, (with this Buhari distances himself from the occurrence).

Samples from Buhari on Structure of Language use and Identity Construction

Table 4.2.3via

Utterance	Identity Construction	Implicature
“ <u>Shamefully</u> , <u>these people</u> are openly canvassing a desire to rule Nigeria for sixty or 200 years! Nigerians <u>must reject</u> these <u>‘political Zoo keepers’</u> and stop them in their tracks. And stop them now. During the last	He uses framing and naming in the grouping of particular words to show distinctively negative characteristics of the PDP, and to discredit the government.	These statements are to present the opponent in bad light and damage their reputation thereby manipulating the audience to achieve the purpose of winning votes.

twelve years they have almost turned Nigeria into the <u>proverbial animal farm</u> where <u>sycophants</u> dominate both the airwaves and print media.”		
--	--	--

In this utterance the speaker uses framing and naming for negative identity construction to paint the opponent in a bad light. This is evident in the choice of lexical items which have collocational effect of negative identity construction. In other words these lexical choices co –occur in the utterance to give a bad impression. For example, ‘shamefully, sycophants’ and ‘political zoo keepers.’ The effect of naming a social actor, ‘sycophant or political zoo keeper’ is an abusive expression and obviously a negative identity construction, a desperation to demean the opponent abused which the speaker consciously orchestrated to manipulate the minds of his audience and convince them that he is a better candidate to vote for.

Samples from Buhari on Identity Construction using Theme and Rheme

Table 4.2.3vib

Utterance	Theme	Rheme
Shamefully, these people are openly canvassing a desire to rule Nigeria for sixty or 200 years!	Shamefully	these are openly canvassing a desire to rule Nigeria for sixty or 200 years!

Here, we have a multiple theme comprising interpersonal textual and topical “shamefully these people”. Shamefully (interpersonal theme), these (textual theme), people (topical theme), forming first point of the utterance. The theme is employed to construct negative identity and character of the ruling party (PDP). Thus, the Rheme “are openly canvassing, a desire to rule Nigeria for sixty or 200 years” is labeled “shamefully” in other words

Buhari views to rule Nigeria for 60 or 200 years by the ruling party PDP does not only construct the identity of the opponent but also suggests his own posture.

Samples from Buhari on Structure of Language use and Identity Construction

Table 4.2.3viia

Utterance	Identity Construction	Implicature
“The young people of this country <u>deserve much better deal than what they have been getting.</u> <u>Unemployment,</u> <u>deprivation,</u> <u>poverty,</u> <u>hopelessness and insecurity</u> are part and parcel of our young men and women today.”	The speaker employs lexical relations to frame the ruling party through exaggeration in order to run down the opponent.	The political implication here is for mind control by the speakers ideology to give hope to the youth and as well as for his own advantage.

Also, Buhari in this expression utilises lexical cohesion and collocation to frame the opponent and represent them as bad politicians who perhaps failed to tackle the challenges of youth development. Instead what is prevalent as the speaker indicates are ‘unemployment,’ ‘deprivation,’ ‘poverty,’ ‘hopelessness’ and ‘insecurity.’ This is corroborated in the succeeding sentence “... that politics and democracy must be willing to provide answers to such fundamental societal issues as youth employment.” This expression also shows some exaggeration by the speaker in order to appeal to the emotions of the audience, the youth.

Samples from Buhari on Identity Construction using Theme and Rheme

Table 4.2.3viib

Utterance	Theme	Rheme
The young people of this country deserve much better deal than what they have been getting.	the young people of this country	deserve much better deal than what they have been getting

In this utterance, we also have a multiple Theme – “The young people of this country” and the remaining part of the utterance is the Rheme. Here the speaker constructs the identity of the opponent in bad light while suggesting a better deal for the youth. This indirectly is pointing to the fact the incumbent government has not been given the youth what they deserve.

Samples from Buhari on Structure of Language use and Identity Construction

Table 4.2.3viiiia

Utterance	Identity Construction	Implicature
“We vote out of office <u>the bunch of visionless politicians who have squandered all the chances they had...</u> ”	Buhari here could not hide the petty jealousy and rivalry by calling the opponent names ordering the audience to reject them.	The implication is to condition the mind of the electorate to believe his view and achieve political victory.

In sum, various linguistic mechanisms are employed not only to construct a bad image of the ruling party PDP but also consciously woven together to set the audience against PDP presidential flag bearer. Here, Buhari exploits derogatory expression to frame the opponent in an unacceptable image. He carefully does this to brainwash the listeners thinking process. This is meant to appeal to their hearts and to gain their support.

Samples from Buhari on Identity Construction using Theme and Rheme

Table 4.2.3. viiib

Utterance	Theme	Rheme
We must vote out of office/the bunch of visionless politicians	we	must vote out of office the bunch of visionless politicians

The Theme in this utterance is the inclusive pronoun “we” which represents the identity of the speaker as a member of in-group and the Rheme aspect “must vote out of office the bunch of visionless politicians” constructs the identity of the out-group where they are appraised as “bunch of visionless politicians”. However, in our appraisal analysis, adjectives, nouns and adverbs are deliberately employed to inscribe an implicitly or explicitly negative or positive quality on people, places or state of affairs.

Samples from Jonathan on Structure of Language use and Identity Construction

Table 4.2.3ixa

Utterance	Identity Construction	Implicature
“We <u>promise</u> you one thing, that <u>we will</u> run a government that <u>will unite</u> Nigeria. <u>We will not separate</u> this country;”	Jonathan exploits subject-finite structure here to construct his identity together with that of his party as patriotic leaders.	The effect here is to cajole the listeners to have a change of mind and vote for PDP.

As has been exemplified earlier, subject finite structure often foregrounds the doer of an action. It makes the subject powerful by suggesting that the proposition is free from any doubt. It usually indicates the mood system in the declarative. For example, Jonathan in this expression constructs his identity together with his party PDP to be in a position as in “we promise you one thing.” The subject ‘we’ comes before the finite ‘promise’ and indicates the informative mood of the text. The speaker is appealing to the electorate to be rest assured that his government is going to keep the country indivisible. According to

Bloor and Bloor (2004) when a speaker uses subject and finite structure he is definite about the proposition. This language structure pattern is spread through the entire speech.

Samples from Jonathan on Identity Construction using Theme and Rheme

Table 4.2.3 ixb

Utterance	Theme	Rheme
We promise you one thing that we will run a government that will unite Nigeria.	we	Promise you one thing that we will run a government that will unite Nigeria.

In this utterance there are multiple embedded clauses, analyzing this in terms of Theme and Rheme we have “we” as the Theme and the rest of the embedded clauses are the Rheme. Constructing the identity of the speaker, the use of “we” as the theme identifies the speaker as a member of the in-group and perhaps other political detractors as the out-group member. This polarity foregrounds the ideological square of the powerful group and the powerless. In other words Jonathan constructs the image of a powerful group for himself and his party.

Samples from Jonathan on Structure of Language use and Identity Construction

Table 4.2.3xa

Utterance	Identity Construction	Implicature
“ <u>We will not</u> preach a <u>gospel of division</u> . We will not preach a <u>gospel of destruction</u> . <u>We will</u> preach a <u>gospel of unity</u> .”	The speaker presents his government as an agent of peace through the use of metaphor and intertextuality. He vividly paints for himself the picture of a preacher, a very religious personality.	Jonathan brings in religion here to evoke the emotion of the listeners, so as to convince them of the authority he possess as the incumbent president to make things happen.

Here, we have metaphor and inter-textuality utilized to construct the identity of a man of God as indicated in the utterance where a politician constructs for himself the identity of a pastor. Here again, we have discourse of religion featuring in political discourse giving what Fairclough (1992) terms interdiscursivity, that is, constitutive intertextuality. We can see the epistemic modal ‘will’ used to emphasise the certainty in the attitude of not preaching division and destruction. It also shows the exertion of power enacted by persuasion to influence the minds of the audience to believe in the speakers ability. van Dijk(1993) states that “power involves control namely by... one group over... other groups.”

Samples from Jonathan on Identity Construction using Theme and Rheme

Table 4.2.3xb

Utterance	Theme	Rheme
We will not preach a gospel of division	We	will not preach a gospel of division

Samples from Jonathan on Structure of Language use and Identity Construction

Table 4.2.3xia

Utterance	Identity Construction	Implicature
“You <u>cannot create wealth artificially; wealth is not created in a vacuum.</u> For you to create wealth <u>there are certain reasons, there are certain things, we cannot</u> continue to import kerosene and talk about creating wealth in this country.”	He employs the role of a teacher and presents his argument logically on a subject of relevant aspect of this economic situation.	The point in this expression is to present these facts in a way that implicates a problem in dare need of a solution.

In this expression, Jonathan because of his background as a lecturer is didactic in his presentation and therefore constructs for himself the identity of a teacher. He sees himself as an informed speaker whose duty is to educate the public about different societal issues. This, however, explains why on the onset he assumes the role of a pastor who teaches, educates and informs. This identity is clearly fore-grounded in the entire Jonathan's 2011 campaign speech.

Samples from Jonathan on Structure of Language use and Identity Construction

Table 4.2.3xiia

Utterance	Identity Construction	Implicature
“ <u>Already</u> you know that the survey process was going on but it was abandoned when we were thinking that probably we may not get crude oil.”	He employs hedging to construct his identity, through the conspicuous use of modality to save his face.	Jonathan carefully articulates reasons to disengage the minds of the audience from a bad impression they have of his government on this particular issue and intends to arouse sentiment.

Here, the use of identity construction can be accounted for through the concept of ‘face’ by Brown and Levinson (1987) where face is divided into positive and negative. Also, the speaker uses the adverb ‘already’ as a pre-modifier of the verb ‘know’ perhaps for face threatening. Conversely, he immediately employs grammatical metaphor “we were thinking” along with epistemic modals “probably” and “may” to justify the abandonment of the project and also to save his face (hedging) that is to avoid blame.

Samples from Jonathan on Identity Construction using Theme and Rheme

Table 4.2.3. xiib

Utterance	Theme	Rheme
“ <u>Already</u> you know that the survey process was going on but it was abandoned when we were thinking that probably we may not get crude oil.”	Already you	know that the survey process was going on

Lexical collocation

Lexical collocation is used not only to construct the identity of the speaker but also to situate the text within the genre of administration. Collocation as we know is the possibility of words or lexical items to hang together. For example, Jonathan in this sentence “For anybody in terrorism or bombings we would pursue you and catch you.”, “terrorism” and “bombings are collocates, “pursue” and “catch” are also collocates. In other words they belong to the same semantic relations. In this way, the interrelatedness of the lexical choices of the speaker suggests the kind of person he is. That is, it constructs the identity of someone powerful for the speaker.

Samples from Jonathan on Structure of Language use and Identity Construction

Table 4.3.3xiiia

Utterance	Identity Construction	Implicature
“We will fight for justice, we will fight for all Nigerians to access power. We will fight for qualitative and competitive education. We will fight for health care reforms. We will fight to create jobs for all Nigerians. We will fight corruption. We will fight to protect all citizens. We will fight for your rights”	The speaker exploits several lexises to construct his status and point of view.	The political implication is to showcase his leadership capabilities and strength. Relative to the opponent to the electorate in order to obtain their vote.

As in the previous analysis lexicalization is abundantly used to construct the identity of the Nigerian President. Here in the utterance the identity of a president is highly lexicalized or what van Dijk (1998) refers to as over completeness while Fowler et al (1997) refer to it as over lexicalization where several lexes that express the same thing are repeatedly used. For example, it will suffice it for the speaker to say “we will fight for your rights” but he uses different lexical items to express the same thing in order to construct the identity of a powerful social actor for himself. Perhaps, the audience might be unaware of the power he wields so he reiterates the same expression severally.

4.2.4 Manipulation of Language to Serve Ideological Interests

Our concern in the ideological interests is to analyse the manner in which the speakers’ opinions, and attitudes are embedded in their language choice. This is because any use of words that indicate the writer’s/ speaker’s opinion is ideological van Dijk (1998) and mostly these words are adverbs, adjectives and sometimes nouns.

Samples from Buhari on Manipulation of Language to Serve Ideological Interests

Table 4.2.4i

Utterance	Ideology	Presupposition
“ <u>My friends, ladies and gentlemen, my name is Muhammadu Buhari, the former military Head of State.</u> ”	Buhari here deliberately introduces himself in this manner to suit his interest	This utterance presupposes that the speaker projects self and no other. Also, to show that he had rule Nigeria in the past with the linguistic choice former.

Naturally, there is a pattern in speech making which includes identification of personalities present at the event. Here, the speaker clearly avoids protocol and begins with positive presentation, “my friends” before “ladies and gentlemen.” This is perhaps a way of attracting the attention of his audience. As Foucault (1975) says not all ways of talking about a topic are given equal value, however. Buhari in this place fails to give protocol its value that is the manner of beginning an official and political speech. Hence, the speaker’s deliberate refusal to follow the norm of political speech presentation is for ideological reason.

Samples from Buhari on Manipulation of Language to Serve Ideological Interests

Excerpt 4.2.4ii

Utterance	Ideology	Presupposition
“ <u>I acknowledge the hand of God on me when I found myself serving as the country’s head of State in the aftermath of a military coup.</u> ”	The speaker presents himself to the audience as a unique and special person who is destined to rule.	This expression presupposes that he was not part of the coup but divine providence placed him as the number one in the country.

The inclusion of the prepositional phrase “in the aftermath of a military coup” is ideologically significant. This is because syntactically without its inclusion, the sentence is complete and the message understandable. Perhaps the speaker includes this so as to

avoid face threatening. As the opposition can point an accusing finger at the speaker that he seized power and not that the people gave him. Also, Buhari gives credence to God to precede his political objectives so as to convince the electorate that he is unique and peculiar and he has a record of divine intervention and history can repeat itself if given the opportunity in the 2011 general elections as president. Furthermore, the evocation of religion in relating to his attainment to power as “the hand of God” is to prevent him from sounding boastful. It shows that he completely understands the role of religion in Nigerian politics and to appeal to the religious sentiments of the audience and to associate the political cause with religious feelings.

Samples from Buhari on Manipulation of Language to serve Ideological Interests

Table 4.2.4iii

Utterance	Ideology	Presupposition
“I would say <u>with all humility</u> <u>that, I dutifully accepted</u> all challenges and responsibilities of head of state and government.”	Buhari explicitly informs the electorate that he is a man of integrity that is a good presentation of his good qualities.	The expression arouses the awareness of the public to the speakers role in the past and that he is capable of doing better if elected.

In this utterance, the adverbial phrases “with all humility and the adverbial clause “that I dutifully accepted...” are ideological. Hence, lexical modals such as “humility and dutifully” are abstract nouns used ideologically to indicate the speaker’s perception. Here, Buhari perceives the challenges and responsibilities of governance as a call to duty which should be accepted with humility. Thus, the speaker uses this to manipulate the hearers by representing self in a good image. Similarly, the word “constantly” is another epistemic modal which attitudinally portrays the speaker’s behaviour towards everyone and every group in the country where Buhari states in the following sentence. “My conscience constantly guided me to treat everyone and every group with fairness and equity.”

Another point of ideological interest in Buhari’s speech is in the area where he employs an explicitly negative adjective to qualify the leadership of the ruling party, PDP as portrayed in the following expression:

Samples from Buhari on Manipulation of Language to Serve Ideological Interests

Table 4.2.4iv

Utterance	Ideology	Presupposition
“ <u>Never before</u> have we seen such <u>bad</u> leadership in our national life. The <u>country’s life is li terally falling apart on all fronts.</u> ”	Here the speaker with disgust asserts his personal belief on the PDP government in a negative way.	This utterance presupposes that the opponent has ruined the country the speaker coerces the audience to accept him as the solution to this problem.

The adjective “bad” in this utterance is ideologically used to label the Peoples Democratic Party (PDP), led government as corrupt, incompetent and inept from the speaker’s own perception. Hence the idea is to control and sway the audience’s opinion away from the incumbent government.

Buhari also claims that the life of the country is literally falling apart on all fronts. This is also ideological because no part of the country is clearly sinking. But he uses this expression to magnify the situation on ground so as to direct the minds of the audience towards viewing the present state of the country negatively.

Furthermore, Buhari in the next sentence describes “Nigeria among the failed states of the 21st century” where he claims that “many critical observers” see Nigeria as a failed state. As critical analysts we have to be conscious of our expressions because Buhari does not give account of those critical analysts. So, it is observed that this is his view. Conversely, however, the term “failed state” is usually an abstract description. Hence, there are several factors and indices to consider before a state can be clearly described as “failed state.” On the whole, here the speaker emphasizes on negative other present that

is, the bad actions of the “other” as van Dijk (1993, 1998) clarifies “we are good and they are bad.

Samples from Buhari on Manipulation of Language to serve Ideological Interests

Table 4.2.4v

Utterance	Ideology	Presupposition
“Many critical observers... list Nigeria as among failed states. We are <u>internationally recognized</u> for corruption, inefficiency, business uncertainty, and infrastructural decay.”	The speaker chooses his words to exaggerate in a bad light how widely spread the evil deeds of the ruling party have gone.	Buhari sensitizes the listeners to the gross atrocities carried out by the PDP administration. The audience should have a rethink to vote into power his party CPC for change/advancement.

The presidential candidate of the CPC, here is aware of the implication of stating that Nigeria is “internationally recognized for all the vices mentioned in the expression rather than the option of recognized or locally recognized which will not carry much weight.

In addition, the whole paragraph is abstract and lacks potency in the sense that his claims in the paragraph are things that can be verified but instead he uses abstract and unverifiable expressions, such as “literal and critical” to appeal to the minds of the listeners. For example “literally and critical are abstract words.

Samples from Buhari on Manipulation of Language to Serve Ideological Interests

Table 4.2.4vi

Utterance	Ideology	Presupposition
“ <u>For 12 years the PDP government has failed to tackle all these problems</u> in spite of the resources at their disposal.”	In this expression Buhari names the ruling party (PDP) for the country’s bad condition.	The use of this evocation suggests that the PDP have mismanaged resources and could not solve the problems of the country. It presupposes the audience should change the minds towards electing the same failed government.

Furthermore, here, Buhari's ideological construction clearly foregrounds what van Dijk (1998), describes as ideological square. Here, negative-other presentation is carried out by the speaker where he states that "for 12 years the PDP government has failed to tackle all these problems in spite of the resources at their disposal." The use of present perfect tense in the expression "has failed to tackle" suggests on the one hand the negative emotional feelings of the speaker that the ruling party PDP refused without any excuses to fix the country's problems, and encourages his sympathizers to reject them on the other.

In the succeeding sentence "we can and we must reverse these trends ," the use of modal verbs "can and "must" are consciously used to express capability and obligation to change the trend of events. The use of these epistemic and deontic modals constructs for the speaker a positive identity of a social actor who has the qualities to turn things around. In the same vein the inclusion pronoun "we" is evident of the ideological square embedded in the expression. For example, "We" versus "They" as in "We are good: They are bad." Hence, "we can and we must reverse these trends."

Also, Buhari dwells on the ideological difference between the Congress for Progressive Change (CPC) and Peoples Democratic Party (PDP). That is, between what he and his party represent (change) and the opponent (maladministration). Thus, in the following utterance:

Samples from Buhari on Manipulation of Language to serve Ideological Interests

Table 4. 2.4vii

Utterance	Ideology	Presupposition
"The first step is for <u>Nigerians to vote PDP out. They are finished! They have passed their</u>	Here, with a strong sense of urgency and a mandatory tone calls on the public to reject the	This implies that the speaker and his supporters are duty bound to carryout decisive actions on the opponent. The speaker distances

“sell by date,”	opponent PDP.	himself from the negative action on PDP.
-----------------	---------------	--

Buhari employs negative other presentation to hoodwink his supporters into voting PDP out of the government. Also the infinitive clause “Nigerians to vote PDP out” has “Nigerians” as the subject but which group if Nigerians is he asking to vote PDP out, since some Nigerians are supporters of the PDP. The speaker is confident in the reality of the negative presentation of the ruling party to the target audience. This presupposes a closed chapter for the regime of the PDP.

Another ideological proclivity is the speaker’s description of the country as something that can be owned by an individual or group of individuals where he rhetorically asks using the possessive pronoun “ours” in the phrase, “where was the government when this great country of ours....” Therefore, possessivisation is an ideological mechanism that politicians use in campaign speeches.

Similarly, Buhari’s representation of CPC in good image is carried on to cover all facets of life as indicated in the following utterance:

Samples from Buhari on Manipulation of Language to Serve Ideological Interests

Excerpt 4.2.4viii

Utterance	Ideology	Presupposition
“The CPC movement is <u>poised to restore confidence</u> in <u>our</u> people. <u>We</u> are providing the <u>platform</u> that would <u>enable</u> the country breakout of the present stranglehold...to <u>rescue</u> <u>Nigeria</u> and <u>reposition</u> it for greater economic development and social well being.”	The speaker brainwashes the electorate as he promises them a complete turn around from their predicaments.	It is an attempt to distinguish between CPC which will be under his firm leadership from the present administration PDP. Buhari seems to distance himself from failure and to correct the failure of the PDP.

Here, for instance, the use of the conscious positive evaluative adjective, “poised to restore confidence” is to construct a positive identity for his party and thereby portraying the other party, PDP in a bad light. Also, he continues his positive image construction by stating that “we” that is the party and himself will create an enabling environment to rescue Nigeria and reposition it for economic growth as van Dijk (2002), Chilton (2004), Fairclough (1995) share that linguistic representations determine the way in which we think about particular... situations as such function as a principle of action influencing social practice.

Another crucial ideological import noticed in this speech is the use of presupposition. For example Buhari describes the action of the government in which all manner of killings continue unabated as “irresponsible.” In Buhari’s words, “no responsible government would allow religious killings, ritual killings, bombings, armed robbery, kidnapping, to continue unchallenged within its jurisdiction.”

Presuppositions are the set of previous knowledge and background information which interlocutors share (Adegbija 1982:23). Hence, the use of polarity “no” in “no responsible,” suggests that the opposite exists. It is a kind of intertextuality where text bears semblance of the other (Bloor and Bloor 2004:47).

Similarly Buhari uses negative other presentation and positive self as a way of presenting the problem of the national security as he describes the police reforms as “cosmetic” and qualifies that one which will come from the CPC government as “consultative.” That is, representing his party positively in providing solution to the security challenges facing the country as in “best modern practices” and negative others as in “replacing the ongoing cosmetic police reforms.”

On the issue of youth employment, Buhari extensively utilizes number game as in the following utterance what van Dijk (2004) terms rhetoric-cum-argumentation, ideologically to influence the audience to refuse to accept PDP led government.

Samples from Buhari on Manipulation of Language to Serve Ideological Interests

Table 4.2.4ix

Utterance	Ideology	Presupposition
“ <u>About</u> eighty- four million Nigerians are young people under the age of 18. They represent sixty percent of the entire population. According to a recent World bank report, <u>about 50 million</u> Nigerian youths are unemployed.”	Here, Buhari knows the importance of number and the impact it would have on the target audience as he employs this contrastingly to show the magnitude of the jobless youth.	The speaker presupposes that the PDP do not have the interest of the youth becoming settled and established. This is to motivate or manipulate the minds of the target audience.

Here, the speaker brings out a whooping number (about 50 million) of unemployed Nigerian youths. In spite of the fact that the statistics is an estimated number which is difficult for anyone to place his finger on its facts. This is evident in the evaluative lexis “about.” However, the intention of the speaker is to ideologically represent the opponent in a bad image. Buhari further claims that the figure “represents a serious indictment” of the government.

No doubt, Buhari’s view of PDP’s approach to youth development is utterly negative to the point that he sees no positive contribution, particularly in the area of youth employment as suggested in this utterance.

Samples from Buhari on Manipulation of Language to Serve Ideological Interests

Table 4.2.4x

Utterance	Ideology	Presupposition
“ <u>Not only</u> have <u>they</u> <u>never</u> included youth employment in their list of priorities, but has <u>never</u> been tackled with the seriousness it deserves.”	The speaker further uses negative connotations here to represent how unconcerned the ruling party (PDP) was to the issue of employment.	The expression ideologically implies that the speaker and his party CPC have the blue print to solving the issues of joblessness that the PDP at no time had.

The speaker employs the adverbs “not” “only” “never” ideologically to emphasize the degree of a failed policy of the ruling party. He uses the pronoun “they” showing responsibility at a distance and explicitly excluding his party CPC and himself from the unfulfilled promises of the ruling party.

Buhari, de-emphasizes positive presentation about the ruling party (PDP). He wants his audience to believe that the government did not have any place for the youth. His strategy aims to influence them to believe that he is capable of improving the quality and life style of the youth of Nigeria and ridding them of challenges in the following sentences; “Unemployment, deprivation, poverty, hopelessness, and insecurity are part and parcel of our young men and women”. The speaker deliberately structured the list of challenges clearly to emphasize negative things about the opponent.

It is indubitable that Buhari is aware that the youth constitutes the larger number of eligible voters and perhaps may have used the above excerpt to reawaken their consciousness and thereby win their votes.

Samples from Buhari on Manipulation of Language to Serve Ideological Interests

Table 4.2.4xi

Utterance	Ideology	Presupposition
“It is <u>my firm belief that politics and democracy must be willing to provide answers</u> to such fundamental societal issues as youth employment. <u>I implore</u> the youth to vote en masse for CPC and we <u>will look after you</u> .”	Here, ideologically through persuasion, Buhari strategically informs the audience what is demanded of a democratically elected government with regard to the youth occupation in his bid for power.	In order to attain his political power, he condemns the ruling party who have not delivered the dividends of democracy. By this notion he entreats the youth to choose his party for their protection/ wellbeing.

This expression shows ultimately what the speaker is aiming at, having represented himself and his party (CPC) good and the other(PDP) bad; he indicates his motive by calling upon the youth to vote massively for his party as they will experience change and the government will take responsibility of their well being, as in “we will look after you”. As van Dijk (1998) maintains that the ideological square functions to polarize in - and - out groups in order to present the “we” group in a favourable light and “they” group infavourably.

Subsequently, Buhari reassures them that his government will provide enough job opportunities for the youth as he unveils the party’s manifesto as evident in the following utterance.

Samples from Buhari on Manipulation of Language to Serve Ideological Interests

Table 4.2.4xii

Utterance	Ideology	Presupposition
“The <u>possible CPC government I may lead</u> will pursue a <u>policy that will liberate</u> the bottled-up energy in the private sector... <u>Our government</u>	He employs lexical choices as in: “liberate, pursue, and lead” in the active voice to implement the polarization by	It presupposes that the speaker will come to power and is capable of solving the age long power problem. His government will handle issues with

shall establish a professionally managed Youth Entrepreneurship and Employment Agency...”	emphasizing his party’s good properties “our government”.	expertise.
---	---	------------

The speaker uses courtesy as in “I may lead” with the modal auxiliary verb “may” which is ideological. He sees himself as the right person to bring to an end the problem of power. It presupposes also that unlike the ruling party who plunged the sector in-operational, his government will employ expertise for all issues at stake. Also, in the area of education reforms sector as in the following utterance;

Samples from Buhari on Manipulation of Language to Serve Ideological Interests

Table 4.2.4xiii

Utterance	Ideology	Presupposition
“ <u>Our</u> education system does not need any <u>cosmetic reforms</u> . 6-3-3-4 or 6-6-4 sounds to me like <u>the formation of a football team</u> . It cannot be tinkered with or amended any further... The Nigerian Education system needs <u>a root – and branch reform</u> .”	The speaker views the opponent’s efforts on education as bad. The efforts are not productive but this is his own opinion.	It presupposes that the country’s education system should not have been tempered with but he says this for his political interest and adds “...needs a root and branch reform”.

Buhari in an attempt to portray the incumbent government in a bad or negative picture rejects the government policy on education reforms and tags it as mere cosmetic. He claims that the country’s current education system is in order and cannot be improved upon. Ironically, he wishes to carry out “a root and branch reform.” This epitomizes the deception, confusion, and abstraction of political expression or speech which Orwell (1946) points out in his “Politics and the English Language.” In this work, Orwell argues that political speech writers must rid themselves of these habits and think more clearly

about what they say because thinking clearly “is a necessary step toward political regeneration.”

On the path of strengthening democratic institutions and fighting corruption, Buhari’s speech seems not to proffer solutions as one would have expected. That is giving corrective measures to the problems facing democracy in Nigeria. Instead, the speaker takes the voters for granted and manipulates them through political language as in the expression below.

Samples from Buhari on Manipulation of Language to Serve Ideological Interests

Table 4.2.4xiv

Utterance	Ideology	Presupposition
“The biggest challenge to democracy in Nigeria today is represented by the <u>weakness of our collective democratic institutions compared to the <u>boundless powers of a few individuals.</u></u> Even the constitution which <u>we hold so dearly and regard with the highest esteem...</u> <u>if we the people</u> are not <u>ready to defend it...</u> <u>uphold and defend it.</u> many citizens <u>would rather die</u> than have a constitutional <u>right denied them...</u> ”	He employs abundant lexical items in a way to emphasize his opinion on democracy in the country.	The expression presupposes that democracy has not succeeded in Nigeria. The reason is the present government in power which must be resisted this time by all means.

In this expression, Buhari’s choice of words such as “hold so dearly,” “ready to defend it,” “uphold and defend it,” “would rather die,” “denied them,” are quite inciting both in terms of their literal meaning and their ideological conception. This is not only because of the educational level of his sympathizers but also their social background. Also, considering the following social variables: age, the educational level, and the size of the

audience one would not have expected the speaker to steer his audience with the expressions stated above. Unfortunately, he continues in the same manner in the succeeding excerpt.

Samples from Buhari on Manipulation of Language to Serve Ideological Interests

Table 4.2.4xv

Utterance	Ideology	Presupposition
“...In the upcoming 2011 election <u>our civic duty as citizens</u> would be accomplished if after we cast our votes, <u>we still stick around to defend the votes</u> and <u>ensure that they count</u> and <u>they are counted</u> .”	The speaker uses the personal pronoun “we” inclusively and “our” to identify with members of his party to take up the task of preventing electoral practices.	Here, it presupposes that the electorate are responsible for the outcome of the election in favour of the speaker and his party CPC to attain power.

Here, Buhari’s expression is a representation of his military background as an officer who sees death as nothing in the course of defending what one believes. The speaker ideologically extends the civic duty of an electorate on election day to include sticking around to defend the votes, ensuring that their votes count and are counted which in real sense are duties of clearly designated officials and security agents.

He further expresses this in his local language so that the teeming youth will be propelled to act. For example: “a kasa” (cast your votes), “a tsare” (defend your votes), “a raka” (follow the votes), “a jira” (wait), “idan za a taba, ku hana” (if your votes will be tampered with, defend it).

In terms of the internal politics, Buhari uses historical account to refresh our memories and situate the discourse in its appropriate context by stating the obvious, particularly among linguists that the country is made up of over 250 spoken languages and dialects (Fafunwa 1997, Adegbija 2004). Here, Buhari portrays the complex multi-lingual nature

of the country; as expressed in the following sentences. “Nigeria is a country made up of... over 250 million spoken languages and dialects....This Nigeria is still the same country where we use to sing; though tribes and tongues may differ in brotherhood we stand!”. Similarly, the speaker constructs for himself the identity of a religious man where he says, “it has pleased Almighty God to bring many ethnic nationalities under a common destiny called Nigeria.” Lexis such as “Almighty,” “God” and “destiny” are religious registers and collocations that belong to the same semantic field. This represents the ideological orientation of Buhari in relation to religion. Euphemistically, he sums up his point by bringing out a line from the old national anthem: “though tribes and tongues may differ in brotherhood we stand!”

Samples from Buhari on Manipulation of Language to Serve Ideological Interests

Table 4.2.4xvi

Utterance	Ideology	Presupposition
“Our political project is to provide leadership for one strong united Nigeria. <u>We</u> stand for equity for all, and <u>we</u> stand for <u>the sanctity of every human life... We are going to stop this madness.</u> ”	Buhari unveils one of his party’s principles of governance as an inherent ideology “we” good and “they” bad.	The speaker wants the audience to believe that the PDP government does not have the oneness of the country as their priority. His strategy aims to achieve his personal goals of change of leadership.

In the preceding excerpt, Buhari takes advantage of events to present the CPC agenda to his electorate. He does that by constructing for himself and the party a positive image and ends up by giving negative others in particular the PDP, where he states that they, that is, his party “are going to stop this madness.” This entails that all that the PDP has been doing for the past 12 years is “madness.”

In addition, the speaker uses the metaphor of journey to appeal to his supporters and other political actors, to perceive governance as a journey as in the following expression;

Samples from Buhari on Manipulation of Language to Serve Ideological Interests

Table 4.2.4xvii

Utterance	Ideology	Presupposition
“I want to use this platform to seek everybody’s understanding that <u>our national journey</u> to advanced form of federalism must be viewed, not as short race, but as a marathon...”	He employs journey metaphor to motivate the audience to visualize the system of government of the country and to perceive a problem. This is purposely for political power.	The expression presupposes that at present the PDP system of administration lacks professionalism and determination.

Buhari in this utterance uses the metaphor of journey to appeal to his sympathizers and other political actors to perceive governance as a journey. In conceptual metaphor the characteristics of an object or domain is mapped on to the other or taken to the other domain (Lakoff and Johnson, 1980). This portends that Buhari wants the government he will run to be seen as a journey that requires patience, perseverance, determination, and focus etc. The journey is a movement from one place to another; therefore his government is going to be a takeoff from one destination to another. Here, he is suggesting that we should expect a departure from our old way of doing things, as expressed in the utterance.

Jonathan’s speech is also a typical example of the ideological use of pronouns in political discourse. As Beard (2000:46) points out that pronoun reference is always important in putting over a piece of political persuasion.

Samples from Jonathan on Manipulation of Language to Serve Ideological Interests

Table 4.2.4xviii

Utterance	Ideology	Presupposition
“ <u>We promise</u> you one thing... we will not separate... we will not	The expression is used to construct favourable identity of the speaker	It presupposes that the political adversary is oriented towards doing the reverse.

Formatted: Centered, Tab stops: Not at 0.19

preach... we cannot continue...we should not just... <u>we have been working...</u> <u>we believe...</u> ”	and the political party which is embedded in van Dijk (1998) ideological square.	
--	--	--

Here, the use of the first person plural ‘we’ functions in a twofold; One, indicates difference in the attitude, manner and character of the speaker in which he does not want to infringe on the hearers/listeners right or personalize the issues being discussed. This is referred to as face work in Brown and Levinson’s (1987) positive/negative face. Two; the use of inclusive ‘we’ also evinces the power that the speaker wields over the hearer/listener. Politicians also use ‘we’ to talk on behalf of their party; to deflect individual responsibility; to include or exclude hearers from group membership and to involve a general collective response or attitude to a matter. This makes ‘we’ very useful for political purposes as interpretation of the discourse referent is dependent on the context of use and inferences drawn on the basis of knowledge shared between the speaker and hearer (Wales 1996).

Similarly, the use of simple sentences in Jonathans’ speech constructs the ideological nature of his simplicity of language. This sentence pattern seems to portray Jonathan as a humble person, as it is reflected in his lexical choice. For example, throughout the text, one could hardly find the use of unfamiliar or grandiose words.

Also, the speaker shifts to the first person singular “I”, when he wants to take personal responsibility. ~~As~~ in the following utterance.

Samples from Jonathan on Manipulation of Language to Serve Ideological Interests

Table 4.2.4xix

Utterance	Ideology	Presupposition
“ <u>I</u> can <u>assure</u> you... <u>I</u> will do everything in my	The ideological import found in the utterance is	The speaker is conscious of his actions.

power... I could end the long queues... I assure you on infrastructure... I want our schools to deliver...”	that the use of the pronoun “I” is to make some degree of responsibility.	
---	---	--

Here, Jonathan uses the first person singular persuasively to give the impression of personal interest in the affairs of the nation and to show to the audience that he has the ability and power as the incumbent president to do the things mentioned.

Samples from Jonathan on Manipulation of Language to Serve Ideological Interests

Table 4.2.4xx

Utterance	Ideology	Presupposition
“I <u>can</u> assure you that we <u>will aggressively</u> approach this much in the downstream”	The use of modal verbs “can” and “will” in both its deontic and epistemic forms clearly account for feeling and attitude of the speaker	It presupposes that the speaker wields power especially with the use of attitudinal adverbs “aggressively”.

Here, Jonathan not only uses the first person singular “I” persuasively to give the impression of personal interest in securing the environment from destruction in some parts of the country but also emphatically takes responsibility of making his promise attainable. The ideology of the expression is also in the use of these modal verbs “can” and “will” respectively which account for his attitude and the adverb “aggressively” which shows the confidence he has as the incumbent president of the country he is in charge of the affairs of the country.

Samples from Jonathan on Manipulation of Language to Serve Ideological Interests

Table 4.2.4xxi

Utterance	Ideology	Presupposition
"... it was abandoned <u>when we were thinking</u> that <u>probably we may not</u> get crude oil".	It is a grammatical metaphor which often expresses the feeling and attitude of the speaker. The utterance is ideologically loaded with expressions such as "thinking", "probably", "may".	It presupposes that the project was abandoned for a reason.

The speaker in this utterance consciously makes his choices of these vocabulary the present participle verb "thinking", the adverb "probably" and the modal auxiliary verb "may" ideologically with a view to convincing and appealing to the electorate to see the reason for their (PDP) past inability to accomplish the task in the oil sector. These words listed above share the same semantic connotation in this context that is, the speaker and his party were not certain, sure of accessing crude oil. Thus, Jonathan is saving face/protecting face but in his usual simple declarative sentence structure pattern. The speaker is being diplomatic or tactful to avoid blame hence, projecting the positive value of himself and his party. The presupposition is that the speakers inaction and his party was not with the deliberate ultimate aim of persuasion

Samples from Jonathan to Manipulate Language to Serve Ideological Interests

Table 4.2.4xxii

Utterance	Ideology	Presupposition
" <u>we believe</u> that even if we do not get crude oil, <u>we will</u> get gas... <u>we believe</u> that <u>we will</u> get gas.	The use of "believe" in the utterance is not function as a lexical verb but also as lexical modal verb (modality) indicating the	This presupposes that the project is a win-win sort that is, the project is worthwhile.

	feeling of the speaker. The utterance is also ideologically permeated with obligatory modal verb “will”.	
--	--	--

The speaker here, re-emphasises his stand as in the earlier utterance that his intention and that of his party was in good faith. This is in a bid to present the “we” group in a favourable light (van Dijk 1998) “mitigating our bad properties/actions”. The use of the first person, plural pronoun “we” instead of first person singular “I” allows the speaker to subtly alter the personal responsibility for the act of abandoning the project but makes it a collective responsibility. Also, it is suggesting a sincere attitude by repeating particularly within mental process the verb “believe” and the obligatory modal “will” to persuade the electorate and Nigerians to accept the proposition.

Samples from Jonathan on Manipulation of Language to Serve Ideological Interests

Table 4.2.4xxiii

Utterance	Ideology	Presupposition
“... <u>we would pursue</u> you and catch you”.	The verb “pursue” is not only used attitudinally to suggest the feeling of the speaker but to indicate that the people he referred to are culprits.	The speaker has power to get offenders.

Here, the speaker assures the electorate of his commitment to provide solution to the security challenges especially through pinning down all miscreants. He speaks emphatically to establish the goal of his party as he uses the modal “would” with the verbs “pursue” and “catch”, which reinforces the obligation and necessity of the action (a task that must be done). Jonathan employs the plural pronoun ‘we’ to identify with members of his party PDP whose administration has the solution to the problem. Hence

the use of the pronoun “we” repeatedly is a persuasive device; it helps invite identification and solidarity with the “we’-group.

4.5 Comparison between both Speeches

Speeches that are presented orally and the ones that are written to be read out do not share the same features. Thus, there is a sharp difference between the two presidential campaign speeches investigated. This can be explained through what Fairclough & Fairclough (2012) observed in their work on critical analysis of political discourse as action and representation. These two processes often characterise political discourse. While Jonathan’s speech focuses on actions that have been taken or will be taken, for example, “...we are going to intervene in the petrochemical...”, “I will insist on reviving the Ajaokuta steel company”, “complete the dredging...” “support...food production” etc. this is because of the fact that he is in government, Buhari’s speech dwells on representation via identity construction. Here, Buhari often engaged in positive self presentation and negative other presentation. For example, “I will with all humility”, “I dutifully accepted” “my actions ...guided by a clear conscience” to provide leadership for ...strong nation” etc. (positive self presentation).” Never before have we seen such bad leadership”. “no responsible government...”. We are internationally recognized for corruption...” “shamefully, these people...” “political zoo keepers”etc.(negative other presentation).

Also, looking at the sentence pattern of these speeches, there is a clear difference between the sentence structures utilised by the two presidential candidates. While Buhari (sample I) appears to employ the clause complex pattern where the clause constituents range between subject, finite, complement and adjunct as in; “I submit that, in the affairs of man, it is only God that can determine history and ordain destiny”, ‘I can stand before

Nigerians and hold my head high knowing that...”, Jonathan (sample II) seems to use simple clause pattern where the elements are basically subject, verb and object, as in the expression: “we will not separate this country,” “ we will not preach a gospel of destruction, “we will preach”.

Closely related to the observation earlier made is the choice of lexical items used in both speeches. Jonathan utilises simple and everyday use of words such as “preach” “destiny” “unite” “man” “separate” etc, as opposed to Buhari where the lexical choices are a bit professional, for example, “platoon-commander”, “commander-in-chief” “military coup” etc. Also, there is an extensive use of communicative devices and rhetorical tropes in both speeches for example rhetorical devices such as repetition/parallelism were used frequently in Buhari’s speech as in “...an uncertain future in an uncertain world”, “to secure Nigeria and to manage it better” also similarly, spread throughout Jonathan’s speech, such as “we will fight for justice. We will fight for all...” “how to create wealth not how to create disaster” . This is because politicians always want the audience to focus on key salient features and the parallel patterns of discourse are seen as a best choice “to draw attention to a particular part of their message and make it stand out from the rest of the speech. Hence, in both cases the speakers emphasised their key views and persuade the audience to sympathise with their views, and make their speech more memorable. Similarly, in examining other rhetorical devices such as metaphor, simile, symbolism, and personification, the speakers share similar use of these but, Buhari employed conceptual metaphor as indicated in tables 4:2.2xxiii, xxiv to present self positively while Jonathan used simile to show that he is in charge. However, both Buhari’s and Jonathan’s Speeches revealed extensive use of personal pronouns, particularly the predominant use of the first person plural pronoun “we” and the first person singular pronoun “I” with “we” having the highest frequency in both with 53% in Buhari and 52.5% in Jonathan

followed by “I” with 19.15% in Buhari and 15% in Jonathan as indicated in figure 4.1 and 4.2 respectively. In both candidates the choice was based on personal interest.

Buhari utilises framing and naming more as linguistic properties for identity construction as in table 4.2.3vi He employed an explicitly negative, attitudinal appraisal of the opposition party through the modal adverb “shamefully” while Jonathan focused mainly on developmental issues He foregrounds that he was in charge, constructing his identity positively that he was powerful using the modal “will” and “must” to demonstrate political will/commitment. Jonathan tried to reiterate his commitment to keep the country united and particularly also tried to sell himself to the electorate as the right person to restore peace in the country; as in “we will not separate this country” he consistently reassured the audience of his goodwill and ideological deviation from that of character defamation or image that is prevalent in the speech of the opponent.

4.6 Summary of Key Findings

The study found out that power relations exist between the speaker and the audience on the one hand and between him and the opponent on the other hand. In order to reflect that power relations exists between Buhari and the audience; this is exemplified in tables 4.2.1iii and 4.2.1iv where he expects the electorate will assume responsibility to make change happen in governance. Also, Jonathan in tables 4.2.1vi and 4.2.1ix uses high modality to evoke power and show to his opponent that he has unrestricted power as the incumbent president.

From our analysis, it is evident that the discourse structure of campaign speeches is such that politicians first of all carryout their image construction before they address national issues. For example, in table 4.2.3iii, Buhari awakens the consciousness of the audience as he constructs himself the image of a rescuer that he has the ability to fix the problem of

bad leadership in the country, perhaps because of his military background. In the same vein, Jonathan in table 4.2.3xiii constructs for himself the image of a powerful social actor. Our analysis established that politicians particularly these presidential aspirants used language indexically to construct for themselves favorable image. See tables 4.2.4iii, 4.2.4xvi, 4.2.4xviii and 4.2.4xx.

The use of inter-textuality was prevalent in the campaign speeches where the mechanism was used to portray the background of the two aspirants. This is evident in Buhari's utterance in tables 4.2.2xxiii, where he brings in military terms in political campaign, like "on a rescue mission", "rescue Nigeria" an indication of his leadership position in the military. Similarly, Jonathan's expression in tables 4.2.3x and 4.2.3xi presents his background as a teacher who takes on the position of a preacher to convince the electorate of his high level of capability.

Buhari's choice of words showed professionalism and restriction which is a product of his military background while Goodluck's choice of words depicted classroom presentation. For example, Buhari in tables 4.2.2vii, 4.2.2viii and 4.2.2xv "to stop them in their tracks... stop them now", "Enough of PDP!" "...we must reverse these trends", issues a command in addressing the electorate who are civilians and not the soldiers he used to give orders to, while Jonathan's expressions in tables 4.2.3ix, 4.2.3x and 4.2.3xi revealed his teaching background thus, demonstrating the art of preaching for persuasion to educate the audience on different issues such as "we promise you one thing... we will run a government that will unite Nigeria", "we will not preach a gospel of division", "you cannot create wealth artificially". Hence, these presidential candidates consistently used different rhetoric devices in their campaign speeches to persuade and appeal to the audience to attain political power.

From the analyses, it was discovered that both speakers extensively used repetition and parallelism via compound sentence to create readability and to motivate the audience and for emphasis. For instance, in tables 4.2.2vi, "to secure Nigeria better and to manage it better", 4.2.2xiv, "our occasion today is not about the past rather it is an engagement...", 4.2.2ix, "we will run...we will preach...and make sure that..." and 4.2.2xx, "we should not just... "we should...".

The study revealed abundant use of pronouns in the speeches of Jonathan and Buhari particularly the predominant use of the first person singular pronoun "I" (assertive) and plural pronoun "we" (inclusive). Politicians employ more of "we" in their campaign speeches in order to project a sense of collectivity and to make them sound humble by including the audience. Both speakers used these pronouns "I" and "we" repeatedly, particularly, the second person plural pronoun "we" as a persuasive linguistic device as revealed in tables 4.2.4iii, 4.2.4xvi, 4.2.4xviii, 4.2.4xxii.

4.7 Discussion of Findings

This study has examined the campaign speeches of Muhammadu Buhari, Congress for Progressive Change (CPC) and Goodluck Jonathan, Peoples Democratic Party (PDP) in the 2011 presidential election. The study through the analysis of the aspirant's choice of words and syntactic patterning revealed their ideologies and conception of power and politics. This is in line with the programmatic agenda of CDA which reveals the ideological layers in the text and the ways in which power relations are constructed, maintained, and sustained. Both presidential candidates viewed politics from the perspective of Miller (1991) that sees politics as process involving elements of persuasion and bargaining together with the mechanism for reaching a final decision. In other words, campaign speeches have features of persuasion, bargaining, and manipulation which are

evident in Jonathan and Buhari's campaign speeches of 2011 presidential election. For example, Buhari's utterances in tables 4.2.1x, "Enough of PDP!", "The CPC Movement is... to restore confidence" and 4.2.3.iv, "The country's life is literally falling apart on all fronts..." and Jonathan's in tables 4.2.2.x, "We will fight for justice. We will fight for your right's", 4.2.4.xviii "... we promise you one thing... we will not separate this country".

Also, from the analysis, lexical items are carefully selected and combined to reflect the context or the field in which the discourse is taking place. This paradigmatic and syntagmatic relations suggest the ideological preoccupation of campaign speeches. For instance, in our data analysis, it was discovered that Jonathan's choice and combination of words depicted that of a teacher; simple and familiar, such as: "we promise you", "we will preach a gospel", "we will not preach a gospel", "you cannot create wealth", "wealth is not created", etc. while Buhari showed professionalism and restriction in his choice and combination of words as in, "rank of platoon commander to commander in chief", "...in the aftermath of a military coup", "... member of my executive council", "... be on a rescue mission".

Similarly, the findings revealed that in manipulating and persuading the electorate in order to get the seat of power, the presidential candidates employed the use of some rhetorical devices/ expressions figuratively to create fresh meaning other than the aesthetic value they give to creative works as identified in this study such as repetition, parallelism, metaphor, rhetorical questions, code-switching, pronouns, etc. as in tables 4.2.2.iii, 4.2.2.vii, 4.2.2.viii, 4.2.2.xxiv, 4.2.2.xxxiii also, figure 4.1 and 4.2. Buhari and Jonathan extensively used repetition and parallelism which are for emphasis to motivate the audience and to make important information standout. They used similar types of

parallelism via compound sentence. Hence, the rhetorical devices elicit support from the audience and convince listeners that the speakers can restore Nigeria to greatness. For Buhari the use of the rhetorical devices helped him to establish a distinguishing separation between the ruling party PDP and his party CPC. See sample one, Buhari, tables 4.2.2xiii, 4.2.2xiv “our occasion today is not about the past rather...reflects on the future” and sample two, Jonathan tables 4.2.2.xxii “not just the Chad basin area but also in the Anambra basin”.

Also, metaphor was used as revealed in the investigation which makes comparison between two unlike elements. Buhari used conceptual metaphor to bring in manifest intertextuality into political discourse using mostly military terms in campaign speech. For example, “rescue mission”, “military”, “state security service”, etc. and mapping the characteristics of a football team onto education system as in tables 4.2.2xxiii, 4.2.2.xxiv and 4.2.2.xxvi and 4.2.2.xxvi.

One of the major characteristics of campaign speech is the extensive use of pronouns which were replicated in the speeches of the two presidential candidates, particularly the predominant use of the first person singular “I” (assertive) and plural pronoun ‘we’ (inclusive). Though the frequency of their usage varies as in table 4.1 and 4.2 where ‘I’ has a frequency of 19.15% in Buhari’s speech and 15% in Jonathan’s, and “we” has a frequency of 25.53% in Buhari’s speech and 52.5% in Jonathan’s.

In summation, politicians employ more of the pronoun, “we” in their campaign speeches in order to project a sense of collectivity and to make them sound humble by including the audience. Ideologically Jonathan tends to engage diplomacy through his extensive use of inclusive “we” as against Buhari who seemed to be less tactful with his ample use of

assertive “I” especially at the onset of his speech, for example, “... I thank the Almighty God.” “I acknowledge the hand of God...” “When I found myself...” “I submit that...”.

In addition, the discourse structure of campaign speeches is such that politicians first of all carry out their image construction before they address national issues. For example, in our data Buhari and Jonathan started their campaign speeches via identity construction. Buhari had problem with identity construction because of his military background which was evident in his choice of words. He therefore recalled his past to disabuse the minds of the audience that he is a servant not the autocratic leader the military are known for. He wants them to accept him as a politician and not a military general he was known for.

This study found out that figurative expressions of the speakers show power relations between the speakers and the audience which is where some social actors are powerful and others powerless and are ideologically based. In this case, it seems that politics is the business of the educated, the elites, and the powerful.

CHAPTER FIVE

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

5.0 Preamble

This chapter summarizes and concludes the study. It suggests areas for further research and states the study's contribution to knowledge.

5.1 Summary

The study has carried out a critical analysis of political discourse, focusing on the campaign speeches of Goodluck Ebele Jonathan and Muhammadu Buhari in the 2011 presidential election with a view to revealing the parties' identity, ideological orientations, and the implications these have on the electorate. This was accounted for through the following mechanisms: power relations, rhetorical devices, identity construction, and ideological interests.

The study considered the background to the study, statement of the problem, aims and objectives of the study, the justification for the study and scope of the study. The related literature review looked at the conceptual and topical issues such as; meaning of language, language and communication, language and politics, politics and political campaigns in Nigeria, discourse, power and ideology, political discourse and critical discourse analysis. Here, the study reviewed the works of some authors that are relevant to this study and an attempt was made to locate the gap in these works. The survey method was adopted for this study and data that were obtained from the CD's and written speeches that were downloaded from the internet were transcribed. The study adopted qualitative textual analysis as its analytical procedure. The findings confirmed the relevance of critical

discourse analysis to the politician's exploitation of ideological contents in political speeches.

5.2 Conclusion

The study has reechoed the fact that political campaign speech is an aspect of the situational use of language that is, language use in context where certain lexical choices and patterns almost always feature. Thus, the study has examined campaign speeches as a subset of political discourse, using critical discourse methodological approach. It sets out from the hypothetical view that political language is ideologically charged and value laden such that what is said cannot be taken at its face value. Consequently, the data obtained for this study which are the campaign speeches have proved that the hypothesis has basis. Hence, the succeeding analysis and findings had shown that conscious and sometimes unconscious choice of vocabulary and grammar in political utterances represent the ideological position of the speaker as well as his power relations with the audience. This study has also revealed even though there are differences in the pattern of the campaign speeches, there are also marked similarities particularly with regard to their extensive use of rhetorical devices. It has also opined that the pattern of language used in campaign speeches by politicians is to manipulate the electorate and suggest the aspirants' standpoint as well as their political manifestos. For instance, the ideology of change separated Buhari from his opponent Jonathan as the incumbent president. It therefore observed that for any rigorous analysis to be carried out in campaign speeches attention should be given to two matters: matter of language and matter of politics which are ultimately ideological.

Hence, campaign speeches by politicians are ideological and often invested with the tendencies to confuse, persuade, dominate and control the minds of the electorate.

5.3 Suggestions for Further Studies

The study is a political discourse analysis or a text linguistic analysis of political language where different segments of linguistic properties are investigated. Basically, the focus of the research is campaign speeches, thus further studies can dwell on:

- a. “A corpus linguistic analysis of post election utterances”, where focus is onto negative lexis as against positive lexis to determine the way politicians instigate the electorate to generate post election crises.
- b. A critical discourse analysis of pronominal choice in inaugural speeches of Nigerian presidents.
- c. A corpus linguistic analysis of repetition in the campaign speeches of the presidential candidates.
- d. Modals in Nigerian presidential campaign speeches.

5.4 Contributions to Knowledge

This study no doubt has increased the frontier of knowledge in political discourse as reference can be made to the study by future researchers in critical discourse analysis.

Although, it has been very difficult to draw a line between the two ideologically separated political parties in Nigeria, which is not to say that an ideological divide does not exist. However, the study has been able to foreground the ideological leaning of the political parties under investigation. In other words while CPC aligns to the socialist ideology that is claiming to concentrate on the masses, PDP orients towards the capitalist, protecting the wealthy.

The study has been able to create awareness in the electorate that campaign speeches are not only meant to showcase the product of what the party has for the electorate but part of political strategies to manipulate, control, and direct the electorate. It has furnished readers with the opportunity to identify, compare, and contrast the language used in the campaign speeches of the two presidential candidates.

Also, from the analysis, the study has clarified how linguistic properties such as parallelism, framing, implicature, presupposition, intertextuality, and pronouns reflect the ideological preoccupation of campaign speeches. It has reawakened the consciousness of the politicians on how to use language in a better way to avoid crises and total breakdown of law and order in the country.

Finally, the study has been able to reflect the interconnectivity between pragmatics and critical discourse analysis in the areas of language use and socio-cultural fields.

Formatted: Left, Tab stops: 0", Left

REFERENCES

- Abaya, A.S. (2008) A Pragmatic Analysis of Nigeria Military Coup Announcements, Unpublished Ph.D Thesis, Department of English and Literary Studies, ABU, Zaria.
- Abaya, A.S. (2009) Language and Politics: An Introductory Insight. *Journal of Educational Research and Development*. Vol.(4) No 3. ABU, Zaria
- Abaya, A.S. (2011) *A Pragmatic Analysis of Nigeria Military Coup Discourse*, VDM Verlag Dr Muller Ambh & co. Kg Saarbrucken (Germany). Published PhD. Thesis, ABU, Zaria.
- Abdullahi-Idiagbon, M.A. (2010) Language Use in Selected Nigerian Presidential Election Campaign Speeches: A Critical Discourse Analysis Perspective in *Journal of the Nigeria English Studies Association*, Vol.13 (2).
- Ahmed, Y. (2012) A Critical Discourse Analysis of Negation in selected Nigerian and United States of America Presidential Speeches, Unpublished Thesis, Department of English and Literary Studies, ABU, Zaria
- Akmajian, A., Demers R. A., Farmer, A.K., and Harrish, R. M.(2008). *Linguistics: An Introduction to Language and Communication* 5th (ed.), New Delhi: Prentice-Hall of India.
- Akodu, E. F. (2009), A Pragmatic Analysis of Ambiguity in Political Discourse in Selected Nigerian Newspaper (1999-2005), Unpublished Ph.D Thesis, ABU, Zaria.
- Al- Harbi A. M. (2009) Jargonizing and Abstracting the War on Terror: The Self and Other Representations in *The Linguistic Journal*, Taif University, Saudi Arabia.
- Al- Harbi A. M (2013) *Journal of Language, Teaching and Research*, Vol.4, pp858-868, July 2013.
- Ali M. (1975), *The Political Sociology of The English Language*, The Netherlands: Monton and Co.

- Amodu, E.J. (2010). A Content Analysis of Presupposition and Overstatement in the Language of Selected Advertisements of Nigerian Print Media, Unpublished Ph.D, Thesis, ABU, Zaria.
- Andaolotu, O. (2011), *Buhari CPC and Political Liberalism: Sahara Reporters*, Retrieved 2011-04- 23
- Andersen, R. (1988), *The Power and the Word*. London: Paladin Grafton Books
- Anifowoshe I. O. (2006), A Pragmatic Study of Political Reportage in the Guardian and Nigerian Newspapers, Unpublished M.A Thesis, ABU, Zaria.
- Anifowoshe, R. & Enemuo, F. (1991), (ed.) *Elements of Politics*. Lagos: Malthouse Press Ltd.
- Appadorai, A. (2003), *The Substance of Politics*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Aremu, M.A. (2010), A Critical Discourse Analysis of President Jonathan's National Broadcast of April, 2011 in *Papers in English and Linguistics* (PEL) Vol.15 pgs. 71-85
- Asher,R.E. (1994), *The Encyclopedia of Language and Linguistics*, London: Pergamon Press.
- Austin, J.L. (1962), *How To Do Things With Words*, New York: Oxford University.
- Ayeomoni, M. (2005), "A Linguistic-Stylistic Investigation of The Language of The Nigerian Political Elite", *Nebula* 2.2 pp. 153-168.
- Ayoola, (2001) Style in Nigerian Political Speeches in *Studies in English Language Journal*, Department of English, OAU, Ile-Ife, Vol 5: pp117-128.
- Ayoola, (2005): "Investigating Nigerian Political Discourse: A Study of President Obasanjo's July 26, 2005 Address to the National Assembly" in *Journal of English and Linguistics*. Vol.6: pp. 1-13
- Ayoola, K. (2010) The Presentation of Ideological Perspectives on Niger-Delta Discourse in Nigerian Newspapers in *Journal of the Nigerian Studies Association* (JNESA). Vol. 13(2): pp. 15-32.

- Ball, A.R, and Peters, B.G. (2000), *Modern Politics and Government*. United Kingdom: Chatham House.
- Balogun, S. (2015), A Linguistic Stylistic Study of Parallelism in Inaugural Speeches of Presidents Barack Obama and Goodluck Jonathan, Unpublished M.A. Thesis, ABU, Zaria
- Bayley, P. (Ed.) (2004) Cross-Cultural Perspective on Parliamentary Discourse: *Discourse Approaches to Politics and Culture*. Amsterdam, John Benjamins
- Bayode, I. F. (2013) An Investigation of Ideological Embedding in Newspaper Editorials. A Study of the Guardian and Daily, Unpublished Ph.D Thesis, Department of English and Literary Studies, ABU, Zaria
- Beard, A. (2000): *The Language of Politics*. London: Routledge.
- Blommaert, J.and Bulcaen, C. (Eds.) (1998), *Political Linguistics*: Amsterdam , Philadelphia. John Benjamins.
- Bloor, T. and Bloor, M. (2004): *The Functional Analysis Of English*. (2nd ed). London: Hodder Education.
- _____ (2007): *The Practice of Critical Discourse Analysis: An Introduction*. London: Hodder Education.
- Blum-kulka, S. (1980) “Learning To Say What You Mean In A Second Language”. Symposium on Discourses. *Paper Presented at University of Wisconsin*, Milwaukee.
- Breen, M. and Candlin C. N. (1980), *The Essential of a Communicative Curriculum*: In *Language Teaching Applied Linguistics*.
- Brown, T. and Yule. G. (1983), *Discourse Analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Busari, S. (2012) Goodluck Jonathan: Nigeria’s Embattled President. *Article Published in Daily Trust*; Tuesday, Jan. 24, 2012.

- Charteris – Black (2005), *Politicians and Rhetoric: The Persuasive Power of Metaphor*. New York: Houndmills.
- Chilton, P. (2004) *Analysing Political Discourse, Theory and Practice*. London: Routledge
- Chilton, P. and Schaffer, C. (eds), (2002) *Politics as Text and Talk. Analytical Approaches to Political Discourse*. (pp 204-236) Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Chouliaraki, L. and Fairclough N. (1999), *Discourse in Late Modernity Rethinking Critical Discourse Analysis*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Clyne, M. (1975), *Intercultural Communication Breakdown And Communication Conflicts: Towards A Linguistic Model And Its Exemplification*. London: Routledge
- Corcoran, P. E. (1979), *Political Language and Rhetoric*. England: University of Queensland.
- Crystal, D. and Davy, D. (1969), *Investigating English Style*. London: Macmillan.
- Damron, M. et al (1998) “Doublespeak” <http://www.damronplanet.com/doublespeak/Index.Ragmatics>.” *Language Communication*.7.3p: 221-239 htm 1.nov.21 2005.
- David, L.S. (ed.), *International Encyclopedia of The Social Sciences*. Vol.12 (Macmillian Company, The Free Press, 1968:579)
- Detter, M. (1970), *Themes Of Mass Communication*. New York: David Mckay Company Inc.
- De Wet, J.C. (2010), *The Art of Persuasive Communication- A Process*. Claremont: Juta & Company Ltd.
- Easton, D. (1960), *The Political System*. New York: Willey
- Edelman, M. (1977), *Political Language: Words that Succeed and Policies that Fail*. Ohio: Academic Press.
- Egwogu, C.B. (2002) *Strategies for Teaching Spoken English in Nigerian Schools: Paper Published in Language , Meaning and Society Ed. Babatunde, S.T. and Adeyanju, D. S. Illorin: Haytec.*

- Fairclough, N. (1989), *Language and Power*. London: Longman.
- _____ (1992), *Discourse and Social Change*. Cambridge: The Cambridge Polity Press.
- _____ (1995), *Critical Discourse Analysis*. Boston: The Critical Study of Language. London: Longman.
- _____ (2003), *Analyzing Discourse and Text*. Textual Analysis for Social Research. London: Routledge.
- Fairclough, I. and Fairclough, N. (2012), *Political Discourse Analysis*. A Method for Advanced Students, London: Routledge.
- Firth, R. (1964), *The Tongues of Men and Speech*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Fowler et al (1979), *Language and Control*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- Fowler, R. (1986), *Linguistic Criticism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Fraser, B. (2010): *Hedging in Political Discourse*. The Bush 2007 Press Conferences in Okulska, Urszula O, and Piotr C. (eds.) *Perspectives in Politics and Discourse*, Benjamin, pp. 201 – 213.
- Geis, M.L. (1987), *The Language of Politics*. New York: Spring-Verlag.
- _____ (1997), *The Language of Politics*. New York: Sprinder.
- Goatly, A. (2000), *Critical Writing*. London: Routledge.
- Hague, R. and Harrop, M. (2001 *Reading and*), *Comparative Government and Politics: An Introduction*. New York: Palgrave Publishers Ltd.
- Haley, a. (1963), *Strategies Of Psycolotherapy*. New York: Grune And Stratton.
- Halliday, M.A.K. and Mathiessen C. (2004). *An Introduction to Functional Grammar*, (3rd edition). Great Britian: Hodder Education.

- Hershell, K. (2001) 'Howard's Way: Naturalising the New Reciprocity Between the Citizens and the State' in Mehout, A. & Raptey (ed) *How To Analyze Talk in International Settings: A Case Book of Methods*.
- Hodge, R. and Gunther, K. (1993) *Language as Ideology*: Second Edition. London. Routledge.
- Hudson, E. (1978). *The Jargon of The Professions*. New York: Longman
- Iornem, D. (1995), *Campaigns: Techniques Of Communication, Advertising and Marketing*. Kaduna: J.V.C. Press.
- Idiagbon, A. (2010), Language Use in Selected Nigerian Presidential Elections Campaign Speeches: A Critical Discourse Analysis Perspective: *Journal of The Nigerian English Studies Association (JNESA)* 13:2.
- Jones, J. and Peccei, S.J. (2004), *What is Language and What does it do?* Language and Politics. Language, society and Power. Pp1-15, 36-53.
- Jones, J. and Wareing, S. (1999), *Language and Politics in Language Society and Power* (ed), Linda Thomas and Shan Wareing. London: Routledge.
- Jones, J. and Peccei, S.J.(2004), *What is Language and What does it do?* Language and Politics. Language, Society and Power. Pp1-15, 36-53. *An Introduction To Functional Grammar*: London, Edward Arnold.
- Joshua, A.A. (2002), The New Political Discourse in Nigeria: Political Coinages As Indexical Markers. *Journal of Intellectual, Scientific and Cultural Intrest*. Univ. of Illorin. Vol. 11. No 1.
- Kamalu, I. and Agangan R. (2010), A Critical Analysis of Goodluck Jonathan's Declaration of Interest in the PDP Presidential Primaries. Paper Published.
- Kessel, J. H. (1988), *Presidential Campaign Politics*. Chicago: The Dorsey Press.
- Kress, G. (1985), *The Linguistic Expressions of Social Meaning: Discourse, Genre, Text*. Geelong, Vic: Deakin University Press.

- Kress, G. & Hodge (1979), *Language as Ideology*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- Kulo, L. (2009), *Linguistic Features in Political Speeches*. Department of Geelong, Vic: Deakin University Press.
- Lakoff, G. (2000), “*Political Language*”, edu/news/media/releases/lakoff.shtml.
- Lawan, M. (2015), *A Critical Discourse Analysis of Metaphoric Language Use in President Goodluck Johnathan and Barrack Obama's Acceptance and Inaugural Speeches*. M.A thesis Unpublished, Department of English and Literary Studies, ABU, Zaria
- Leckie-Tarry, H. (ed.) Birch D. (1995), *Language and Context: A Functional Linguistic Theory of Register*. London: Printer
- Leech, (1974.), *Semantics*. England: Penguin Books. Ltd.
- Leech, G.N. and Short, M.H.(1984), *Style in Fiction: A Linguistic Introduction to English Fiction Prose*. New York: Longman.
- Lyons, J. (1977), *Semantics*. Cambridge: CPU.
- Makoji S. E. (2002), *Language of Politics, A Case Study of The Lawmakers and Legislative Mandate*. Unpublished Project A.B.U Zaria.
- Matic, D. (2012), *Ideological Discourse Structures in political Speeches*. Kumunikaija: Kultura Online, damiela-matic@feEb.hr.
- Mazawaje, S. K. (1993), “Language and Politics: The Nigeria Experience”, “The Democrat” Monday, September 27, 1993, p.7
- Mcglory, P. (1978), *Error Analysis and Interlanguage*, Oxford: Oxford Univ. Press.
- Mehan, H. and John, W. (1988) “MEND: A Nurturing Voice in the Nuclear Arms Debate.” *Social Problems*, Vol. 35, No. 4, pp. 363-383.
- Mey, L.J. (2001) *Pragmatics: An Introduction* (2nd ed). Oxford, Blackwell.
- Miller, D. (1991), ‘*Politics*’ in *Blackwell Encyclopedia of Political Thought*, Oxford, Blackwell.

- _____ (2002), 'Democracy and Language (AB) Use; Implication For National Development' NAL Annual Lecture, Univ. of Jos.
- _____ (2002), 'Democracy and Language (AB) Use; Implication For National Development' in Steve Ogude (ed) *Towards An African Renaissance*, NAL, Vol 12.
- _____ (2012: 14), *Daily Trust Newspaper* Vol.28 No 28 Abuja: Media Trust Nig. Ltd.
- Muntigl, P (2002), "Politicization and Depoliticization: eds., *Politics As Text And Talk: Analytical Approaches To Political Discourse*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- O'Barr and O'Barr, (1976), *Language and Politics*, (ed) The Hague; Mouton and Co.
- Odumuh, T.O (2007), *Language as a Tool for Effective Management: It's Role In National Development And Transformation*. Paper Unpublished.
- Ogbodo, F. M. O. (2011), *A Simplified Approach to Government*: Akure, Emerald Print Company.
- Olujide, J. O., Adeyemi, S. L and Gbadayan, R. A. (2010), Nigerian Electorates Perception of Political Advertising and Election Camapign: *Research Journal of Social Sciences*, 1 (5): 52-60. *Insinet Publication*.
- Omozuwa, V. E. and Ezejideaku E. U.(2009). A Stylistic Analysis of the Language of Political Campaigns in Nigeria: Evidence from the 2007 General Elections: *Journal of the Nigerian English Studies Association. (JNESA)* 13:2
- Orwell, G. (1945), '*Politics and The English Language*'. [http://orwell/politics and english.html](http://orwell/politics%20and%20english.html).
- _____ (1946), '*Politics and The English Language*' [http://eses:umich.edu.renshauz//orwell/politics and english.html](http://eses:umich.edu.renshauz//orwell/politics%20and%20english.html).
- Oyeleye, A (2004), *Language and Discourse in Society*, Ibadan, Hope Publication.
- Palmer, F. R. (1996), *Semantics*. Cambridge Unversity Press.
- Pei, M. (1978), *Weasel Words: The Art of Saying What You Don't Mean*. London: Harper and Row.

- Reay, M. (1976), *'Boundaries Strategies and Power Relations: Political Anthropology and Language'* in O'Barr and O'Barr. Hague: Mouton
- Richard, C. Platt, J., Platt, H. (1992), *The Longman Dictionary of Language Teaching & Applied Linguistics* New Edition, London: Longman.
- Rodenrick, W. (1980), *Advertising: What It Is and How To Do It*. Routledge.
- Sandell, R.(1977), *Linguistic Style and Persuasion*. London: Academic Press.
- Sani, S. (2011), *Political Language And Hausa Lexical Expansion*. Kano: Benchmark Publishers Ltd.
- Sapir, E. (2004), *Language*. Harcourt Brace: R. World Inc. The Heretical Press. (1996) *Applied Propaganda.com/primes/orwell/patee.htm/nov.21,2005*.
- Shapiro, M. (1988) , *The Politics of Representation*. Madison, WI:University of Wisconsin Press.
- Sheyholislami J. (2001), *Critical Discourse Analysis*. <http://www.carleton.ca/jshehol/cda.htm>
- Silverman, D. (2000), *'Analysing Talk and Text'*, in N.K. Denzin and Y.S. Lincoln (eds.), *Handbook of Qualitative Research* (2nd edn). London: Sage.
- Sulaiman, H. and Anumudu, K.U. (2017), *Intertextuality in President Obasanjo's "Before it is Too Late"*. *Journal of the Linguistic Association of Nigeria*, Vol. 20 No. 2, (2017).
- Szanto, G. H. (1978), *Theatre And Propaganda*. Austin: University of Texas Press: Palmgrove.
- Thorne, S. (1997), *Mastering Advanced English Language*. Chicago: Palmgrove.
- Van Dijk, T. A. (1988), *News as Discourse*. New Jersey: Erlbaum.
- _____ (1991), *Racism and the Press*. London: Routledge.
- _____ (1993) , *The Principles of Critical Discourse Analysis: Discourse and Society*. Vol 4, No. 2, 249-283
- _____ (1995), *Aims of Critical Discourse Analysis*. *Japanese Discourse*. 1:17-27.

- _____ (1998), *Ideology: A Multidisciplinary Study*. London: Sage
- _____ (2000), *Critical Discourse Analysis*. [http://www. Discourse in Society.org/teun.htm](http://www.DiscourseinSociety.org/teun.htm)
- _____ (2006), *Discourse and Manipulation*. *Discourse & Society*. 17 (3):359-383
- Van Leeuwen, M. (2008), *The Style of Political Speeches: Problems in Existing Methods*. Netherlands: Leiden University
- Wareing, S. and Thomas, L. (1999), *Language, Society and Power: An Introduction*, London, Routledge.
- Weber, M. (1962), *The Theory of Social and Economic Organisation*, New York. A.M. Henderson and Talcott Parson.
- Wodak, R (1989) (ed.), *Language, Power and Ideology: Studies in Political Discourse*. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- _____ (2006), *Politics and Language: Overview* in K. Brown (ed.), *Encyclopedia of Linguistics*, 707-719, Oxford.
- _____ (2006), *Critical Linguistics and Critical Discourse Analysis* in Jan-Ola Ostman, Jef Verschueren (eds), *Handbook of Pragmatics 2006*. [http://eprints./ancs.ac.uk/1596/](http://eprints.ancs.ac.uk/1596/).
- Wright, B. (1974), *Language and Society*, London: Arnold Press.
- Wright, J. (1983), *Advertising*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

APPENDIX I

PRESIDENTIAL CAMPAIGN SPEECH OF MUHAMMADU BUHARI (CPC)

My friends, ladies and gentlemen, my name is Muhammadu Buhari, the former military Head of State. And I thank the Almighty God who gave me the unique opportunity to serve this nation from the humble rank of Platoon Commander to Commander-in-Chief, at the revered rank of a general in the Nigerian army. I acknowledge the hand of God on me, when I found myself serving as the Country's Head of State in the aftermath of a military coup. I submit that, in the affairs of man, it is only God that can determine history and ordain destiny. In my own case, it is destiny that threw me up to serve as the Head of State of this great country at that particular moment of our national history. I would say, with all humility that, I dutifully accepted all the challenges and responsibilities of head of state and government. Whatever role I played, whether as leader or member of government, all my decisions and actions were always guided by a clear conscience; I was also guided by an agreement with my colleagues and members of my Executive council — which always enabled me to try to avoid impropriety, dishonesty, corruption and other forms of abuse of office and power. My conscience constantly guided me to treat everyone and every group in the country with fairness and equity. That is why I can stand before Nigerians here today, and hold my head high — knowing that I am ever ready to face any scrutiny or answer any question regarding my past performance as a public figure. I am always ready to give account of my past records to the Nigerian people. 1-However, it is my firm belief that our occasion today is not about the past — rather it is an engagement that reflects on the future of our Country. We are today facing an uncertain future in an uncertain world. It is vital Nigerians make the right choice about who would look after them in the next four years. I am standing here today as the Presidential candidate of Congress for Progressive Change (CPC). I consider myself to be on a rescue mission. Never before have we seen such bad leadership in our national life. The country's life is literally falling apart on all fronts on security, in education, on the economy, in healthcare system, and youth employment. Many critical observers have begun to list Nigeria among the failed states of the 21st century. We are internationally recognized for corruption, inefficiency, business uncertainty and infrastructural decay. For 12 years the PiP government has failed to tackle all these problems in spite of the resources at their disposal. We can and we must reverse these trends. The first step is for Nigerians to vote PDP out. They are finished! They have passed their "sell — by date" Given the current state of affairs in the country, Nigerians have the legitimate right to ask the following questions:

Where was the government when this great country of ours took a nose-dive on many critical sectors?

Why does this government run from pillar to post, looking helpless, as it beats about the bush on the fundamental issue of resolving electric power supply challenge of the country? Why should our economy be left to operate on individual power Generating sets? Furthermore, if their aspiration to govern Nigeria for the next 60-years or 200 years is pure, why are they unable to guarantee something as fundamental and basic as security of life and property? Where was the PDP-led government when what started as occasional incidents of kidnapping degenerated to the embarrassing dimension of an incorporated evil business?

Does it matter to this administration that insecurity has compelled many potential foreign investors to drop Nigeria from their list?

Should we continue to vote the same people who have presided over the decline in quality of life in Nigeria for the last twelve years?

Shamefully, these people are openly canvassing a desire to rule Nigeria for sixty or 200 years! Nigerians must reject these 'political zoo keepers' and stop them in their tracks. And stop them now. During the last twelve years, they have almost transformed Nigeria into the proverbial animal farm where sycophants dominate both the airwaves and print media.

Enough of PDP! Enough of them! The CPC movement is poised to restore confidence in our people. We are providing the platform that would enable the country break out of the present stranglehold. We in the CPC see and share the plight of the suffering citizens. We in the CPC here today offer a political platform whose imperative is to rescue Nigeria and reposition it for greater economic development and social well being. As such the first order of business for the CPC-led government would be to secure Nigeria better and to manage it better. The priority will be to end the feeling of insecurity in the country.

National Security

Security of life and property is the number one duty of any government. No responsible government would allow religious killings, ritual killings, bombing, armed robbery, kidnapping, to continue unchallenged within its jurisdiction. The immediate task at hand must be to secure Nigeria better and manage it better. I therefore pledge to you that if I am elected to be your president in the upcoming 2011 election, I would secure Nigeria better and manage it better. Our administration will pursue an exemplary shift that will introduce far reaching and consultative reforms of Nigerian security agencies in line with the best modern practices. We shall replace the on-going cosmetic police reforms with a consultative reform of the police force and other security agencies. Unfortunately, Police Reforms in Nigeria have become the bywords for bogus budgets and contracts which hardly have any impact the way police officers do their jobs, neither has they ever trickled down to improve the physical working environment at the police stations around the country. If you vote for me, our administration will bring in smart and intelligent policing that would have the fundamental human rights of citizens at heart. We would build a robust intelligent infrastructure for the security agents in the country. Our Nation's Security must be predicated on the principle of proactive intelligence designed to prevent crimes or security threats before they take place. And quickly quell them when they occur. That is why we must pay special attention to •funding and improvement of our intelligence infrastructures.

Youth Employment

About eighty-four million Nigerians are young people under the age of 18. They represent sixty percent of the entire population. According to a recent World Bank Report, about 50 million Nigerian youths are unemployed. This figure represents a serious indictment of successive administrations at all levels of governance. Not only have they never included Youth

employment in their list of priorities in the last twelve years, but the issue of Youth employment has never been tackled with the seriousness it deserves.

The young people of this country deserve much better deal than what they have been getting. Unemployment, deprivation, poverty, hopelessness and insecurity are part and parcel of our young men and women today. It is my firm belief that politics and democracy must be willing to provide answers to such fundamental societal issues as youth employment. I implore the youth to vote an masse for CPC and we will look after you.

The possible CPC Government I may lead will pursue a policy that will liberate the bottled-up energy in the private sector so as to enable them deliver job creation opportunities in the country. We only need to consider the number of employment positions created in Nigeria's textile industry in the past. The private sector must be empowered through improved power, fuel, fair taxation regime and incentives to employ young people.

Our government shall establish a professionally managed Youth Entrepreneurship and Employment Agency (YEEA) to enable enterprising and innovative young Nigerian graduates to make their foray into the business world. Much the same way their counterparts in the developed nations are empowered. Then, and only then would our young people think of baking the national cake rather than how to share it.

The unbridled depletion of the nation's foreign reserve by 43-percent within the last eighteen months – from \$62.2billion to \$35.24billion, is not only worrisome, but a confirmation of the fact that Nigeria truly runs the most expensive, extravagant, ineffective and unproductive government in the world! Yet the young and old and everybody but PDP cronies are the worse for it.

Education Sector Reforms

Our education system does not need any cosmetic reforms 6-3-3-4 or 6-6-4 sounds to me like the formation of a football team. It cannot be tinkered with or amended any further along this path. The Nigerian Education system needs a root – and branch reform. Education shall be a right to all Nigerians but for a nation to develop it must get its education priorities right. Nigeria cannot become the great nation of our dream without the necessary brain power and human resources. We have no chance of becoming great if we continue to maintain an education system whereby only 20-percent of candidates pass SSCE/GCE examinations.

We are building more and more universities yet the present ones are inadequately funded to undertake learning, teaching and research. Mediocrity multiplied only produces mass mediocrity. Our aim, when in government is to adequately fund the system to produce quality education for development. Some Nigerians have wondered why we chose the pen as part of CPC logo. Truth is, the pen symbolizes our commitment to quality education and by extension knowledge, development and progress.

Economic Development and Growth

Our national economy which largely depends on crude oil exportation to earn income can only be likened to flying on a single engine aircraft with a single point of failure. The Nigeria oil money represents great foreign exchange earning potential. However, countries like Indonesia, Norway, and UAE that discovered oil have used their oil revenue to build a diversified economy. Agriculture used to represent 80-percent of the Nigerian economy until oil was discovered in the country. Today, agriculture represents 45-percent of our economy — even at that, the impact of agriculture is hardly felt in the economy as commercial agriculture is almost non-existent, with no agricultural firm quoted in the nation's stock exchange.

We need to encourage commercial agriculture through a well-orchestrated policy for food security and economic growth beyond the current politics of fertilizer distribution! We shall also help small farmers with petty holdings in the form of inputs and access to small scale credit.

Strengthening Democratic Institutions and Fighting Corruption

The biggest challenge to democracy in Nigeria today is represented by the weakness of our collective democratic institutions compared to the boundless powers of a few individuals. Even the constitution which we hold so dearly and

regard with the highest esteem — it would amount to a useless collection of papers if we the people are not ready to defend it. The constitution derives its aura and respect because all the courts in the land are there to uphold and defend it. And many citizens would rather die than have a constitutional right denied them. Similarly, the votes which we are going to cast in the upcoming election may amount to a worthless exercise if we are not going to defend them and ensure that they count.

Therefore, in the upcoming 2011 election our civic duty as citizens would be accomplished if after we cast our votes, we still stick around to defend the votes and ensure that they count and they are counted.

“a kasa” “a tsare” “a raka” “ajira” “idan zaa taba ku hana”. The 2011 election outing is the appropriate occasion to correct past electoral mistakes and review democratic scorecard of the political class. I therefore beg Nigerians to seize the moment and vote out of office the bunch of visionless politicians who have squandered all the chances they had to make Nigeria a great nation in their 12 years Occupation of Nigeria.

Guarantee Equity and Protection for All

Nigeria is a country made up of hundreds of ethnic groups with over 250 spoken languages and dialects. Because it has pleased Almighty God to bring many ethnic nationalities under a common destiny called Nigeria, we owe it to ourselves to evolve institutional ways to get along. This Nigeria is still the same country where we use to sing: “though tribes and tongues may differ in brotherhood we stand!” We the CPC aspire to a Nigeria where every ethnic group would have equal access to equity regardless of the size of communities, religious orientation or historical antecedents. We are committed to making every ethnic group to have a strong sense of

belonging to our common destiny. Where there is neglect in the country, CPC shall bring a renewed government commitment and presence. Our political project is to provide leadership for one strong united Nigeria. We stand for equity for all, and we stand for the sanctity of every human life. We view any form of killing as unpatriotic and un-Nigerian. CPC condemns the frequent incidents of bloodshed going on in Plateau and I3orno States. Our sympathy and prayers go to the families who have lost their relatives in the crisis. We pray God to grant these families the fortitude to endure such a loss. We in the CPC are committed to promoting equity, peace and security among the different groups that make up the Nigeria nation. We are going to stop this madness. Enough is enough!

If you elect me as the president of Nigeria, our administration shall act swiftly to address the unique environmental hazard exposure of the Niger Delta. I want assure Nigerians that we would do whatever it takes to end gas flaring in the area within the first half of our tenure. Additionally, our government will embark on massive environmental reclamation projects to give the area a developmental model that would mirror the creeks of Amsterdam with attendant provision for potable water supply and electricity for the citizens in the area. I do not make idle promises. I mean what I say.

I want to use this platform to seek everybody's understanding that our national journey to advanced form of federalism must be viewed, not as short race, but as a marathon which requires moderation and level-headedness from political actors in the country. The Federal character provision in our 1999 constitution rejects a situation whereby a particular ethnic group holds a disproportionately large number of government posts and uses them to advance its position to the detriment of others.

Having explored some of the key priority areas of CPC led administration; I want to leave you with few final thoughts. Number One: I have chosen the CPC platform for my presidential ambitions because CPC is a political party that would not rely on brute force to capture power or snatch ballot boxes and take over cities or states by violent and fraudulent means. Because CPC trusts the ability of Nigerians to make right choices, we prefer to respectfully ask Nigerians to trust us with their votes. We strongly believe that a political party which wishes to lead must first listen to those it will lead. The electoral process is one way to have the people express themselves. Therefore, in the upcoming 2011 election – we are asking you to Vote for CPC all through. 'CPC Zalla'! 'CPC Zalla'!! 'CPC Zalla'!!! CPC all the Way!!! Number Two: Liberty, freedom and democracy come at a price. We must have the tenacity to stay the ground and put forth a sustained collective resistance to fend off the razzmatazz of our political adversaries who because they are bankrupt of ideas use force and intimidation. But remember, I cannot achieve that alone. We need your support and we need your participation. Number Three: The 2011 election is a unique opportunity for the nation to change its course and embrace a new beginning. It represents the best hope for the future generation. The CPC platform is a platform that has embraced integrity as part of its trademark. Respectfully, I want to assure you that we are committed to realizing the positive policies that would ignite our national economy and spin it for the general welfare of Nigerian people.

To the Organized Private Sector (OPS) represented by NACCIMA, NECA and MAN, as well as other similarly oriented private sector businesses. I appreciate the infrastructure challenges which you contend with in your daily activities — including electric power supply, transportation network to drive your supply chain, security for your staff and property and above all corruption in government. We are also aware of the raging issues of Multiple Taxation and Overlapping Regulation in many sectors of the economy. We want to assure you that help is on the way. If elected, we will zealously pursue the urgent establishment of private sector friendly environment.

We would take on the challenge of electric power supply in the country in a way and manner that would show early results across the country. We realize that the growth potential of Nigerian economy may not be fully achieved without addressing these infrastructural challenges in the system. Our aim is to place Nigeria on the map of the fastest developing economies of the world; our commitment to making progress on this matter is total. Therefore, I ask you to support us morally as well as financially in the upcoming 2011 election. Fellow Nigerians, I have observed the present administration trying so hard to rebrand Nigeria through a paid advertisement that contains some feel-good slogans.

But I am rather persuaded that once we use the opportunity offered us by the upcoming 2011 election to reclaim Nigeria and put our house in order, rebranding of Nigeria will automatically follow. For that reason, I need your help and I need your vote. We will automatically re-brand Nigeria by tackling power, corruption, infrastructure and the economy. Finally fellow Nigerians, I firmly believe that, a better and brighter future awaits Nigeria. Never before have we come so close to ushering in a new beginning for this great nation. However, for the Nigeria of our dream and aspiration to materialize sooner, I ask you to vote for CPC, because, a vote for CPC is a vote for accountability, for peace, for equity, for prosperity, for transparency and for change.

It will also end the long running season of unmitigated corruption and looting of public treasury at all levels of governance in the country. It will end the suffocation of Nigeria.

I received the information that Nasarawa state government has threatened to dethrone any traditional ruler that receives me. I thank the people for their massive support. I promise to fulfill their hopes and aspirations if I am elected president. You shall be presented with the golden opportunity of electing a governor who will respect our traditional institution in a few weeks. I implore you to use your vote wisely.

I stand with the few people for better, for worse. I stand by my shoulder with my followers and I will take the bad with the smooth. I will never abandon them no matter how long and how hard the road is. I am doing this not for myself alone but for my followers who have hope in me and my colleagues and our programs for change that will save Nigeria. I shall continue on this oath no matter the outcome of the coming elections.

It's for the love of my country that has confirmed my being here. That is why I am giving my goal and remaining in it. In the end I have decided to dedicate the remaining of my life to fighting for this case.

I believe that democratic power truly belongs to the People. And we trust that Nigerian people can make good judgment on whom to entrust such power with. Long live the people of Nigeria! Long live CPC!! Long live The Federal Republic of Nigeria!!! Thank you and God bless us all!!!

Thank you.

General Muhammadu Buhari, GCFR

APPENDIX II

PRESIDENTIAL CAMPAIGN SPEECH OF GOODLUCK (PDP)

We promise you one thing that we will run a government that will unite Nigeria. We will not separate this country. We will not preach a gospel of division. We will not preach a gospel of destruction. We will preach a gospel of unity and make sure that we will work with all Nigerians irrespective of their ethnic nationality, religion and language because of one thing, destiny has put this nation together and we must relate with ourselves as equal partners, and work together.

The challenge facing leaders together is how to create wealth not how to create disaster in the country but how to create wealth in this country so that our teeming youth population would have jobs. You cannot create wealth artificially. Wealth is not created in a vacuum. For you to create wealth there are certain reasons, there are certain things. We cannot continue to import kerosene and talk about creating wealth in this country. We cannot continue to talk about importing fertilizer and you say you are creating wealth in this country. That's why we are intervening in the next four years we are going to intervene in, the petrochemical sector to make sure that all our fertilizer needs are produced in Nigeria. We should not just produce fertilizer but we should export fertilizer. We cannot just be expelling gas we should add value to those gas by converting our gas to petrochemical products and export because the upstream sector activities of the oil industry don't create jobs, it is the downstream sector activities that create jobs. That's why in the next four years our target is to emphasize so much in the downstream sector.

We have been working with the governors to solve the current erosion problems in the south-east. We have a special package for that. The minister of finance has been working on that. I can assure you that we will aggressively approach this much in the downstream. We have been working with the governors to solve the current erosion problems in the south-east, we have a special package for that the minister of finance has been working on that. I can assure you that we will aggressively approach this erosion that cuts across the whole of the south-east.

And let me also assure you that those from Gombe and those parts that the Chad inland basin flows into Adamawa, Bauchi, Gombe that we will commence effective survey again. Already you know that the survey process was going on but it was abandoned when we were thinking that probably we may not get crude oil. As at that time gas was not very attractive to government that's why we flare gas in the Niger delta but now gas is as important to government as crude oil, in fact, gas is even a more environmental friendly source of hydrocarbon and people rather go for gas. You can also convert gas to liquid for all purposes so we believe that even if we do not get crude oil, we will get gas in commercial quantity. We believe that we will have major petrochemicals that will employ massive youth in this part, not just the Chad basin area but also in the Anambra basin.

In order to have productive people there must be an improvement in the agricultural sector in particular and the economy in general. I will do everything within my power to improve the sector, especially in the northern part of the country where more than half of the population is agrarian.

We know we have our security challenge now and the trend in the world would go. For anybody in terrorism or bombings, we would pursue you and catch you. This administration will not sweep any dime under the carpet, not matter how big or small. There will be no sacred cows. We will not stop investigation until we get you. We are also working for more superior methods of detecting crime. I am promising you that we would soon put all these behind us. We will fight for justice. We will fight for all Nigerians to access power. We will fight for qualitative and competitive education. We will fight for healthcare reforms. We will fight to create jobs, for all Nigerians. We will fight corruption. We will fight to protect all citizens. We will fight for your rights”.

I have discovered that by sheer will power I could end the long queues and price fluctuations in our petrol stations. Today our refineries are working saving us huge amounts of funds spent on importation of petroleum products.

We will revive the textile companies, fund agriculture and textile industries to reduce unemployment in the state. I assure you on infrastructure, especially the power infrastructure and the roads.

In the north-central, I will insist on reviving the Ajaokuta steel company, complete the dredging of the river Niger and support the states capacity in food production. We are committed to boosting the economy. We are committed to transforming the economy of the state. We promise Nigerians that, before the end of the first quarter of the year, power will stabilize. We are not saying that we are going to solve the problem totally, but it will stabilize gradually.

We will address the security situation in the state without discriminating against anybody. We will transform the country through qualitative education, stable power supply and improved developmental projects in the next four years.

If we must create jobs for our youth and create wealth, Nigeria must concentrate on farming and industrialization. That is why we are doing everything to revive these industries. Money is being made available for industrialization and for farmers to access.

We will run an accessible government and will not discriminate against anybody on the basis of tribe or religion. We will strive to stabilize the energy sector, while revolutionizing agriculture. We must work hard to create wealth because, if we do not, in the next few years we will create a huge population of destitute in the country.

Before this time, people will set up bombs, people will die, houses burnt and the issue will be swept under the carpet.

This administration will investigate to the root of it all and whoever is involved, big as iroko trees or small as the grass, will go in for it.

Those who are encouraging people to bomb should continue but you will have a date with history because we will investigate and we will not stop investigating until we get you and we are now looking for more superior methods of detecting crimes which I will not bore you with because they are security issues.

As for the state of the nation's economy, unfortunately, in Nigeria, those who played a vital role in burying our economy are the citizens who are coming to talk about economy but it is no time for that now.

For the nation to reduce poverty among its people it needs to have steady power supply. I will do everything within my powers to revive the power sector. Our country has generated in the past ten years the Goodluck power well plant it has generated much interest and excitement among investors both locally and internationally improving remark in the power sector participation in the generation and distribution of power in the country like it happened in the telecommunication industry.

To resuscitate the sources of energy Goodluck has invested huge sum in the rehabilitation of coal mines in the south east in the solar wind project electricity short from power outages will soon be a thing of the past. In 3 years we will achieve the dream of 16000 mega watt. Nigeria is about to experience more power to the people. It's more than just a promise it's a promise in action. Its fulfillment you'll see because Goodluck always makes good of his promise.

I am Goodluck Ebele Azikiwe Jonathan, my goal is the total transformation of Nigeria, and I want to ensure that Nigeria is a true home for all its citizens. A country where there is adequate power supply, a secure environment for business and leisure, and where the infrastructure is comparable to anywhere in the world.

I want our schools to deliver the best education to our children; our institutions must work in the interest of the people.

I want a country where no one will go to bed hungry.

Vote me in for the next four years and together we will achieve the Nigeria of our dream. I promise, I will not let you down.

More schools to give our children a future. Every year, over one million students write university entrance exams, but there are spaces for just 150,000 in the public universities. We got into this situation today because, even though our population was growing, we do not plan for the students of the future.

Dr. Goodluck Jonathan has established eight more federal universities across the federation for the sake of tomorrow.

I was not born rich. I had no shoes. I am Goodluck Jonathan. I am one of you. No enemies to fight. If I can make it you can make it. I can make it. We can make it. I never imagined I will be where I am today. I am Goodluck Jonathan. Your time has come. I assure of a better tomorrow. Vote the umbrella. Vote PDP. Place your thumbprint besides the umbrella. Make your vote count. PDP: power to the people, power to the people PDP.

In my early days in school, I had no shoes, no bag. I carried my books in my hand but never despaired, no car to take me to school, but I never despaired. There were days I had only one meal, but I never despaired... fellow Nigerians if I could make it, you too can make it.

I don't need to be a lion, I don't need to operate like Pharaoh of Egypt, I don't need to be an army general, but I can change this country without those traits. My goal is the total transformation of Nigeria and I want to ensure Nigeria is a true home for all its citizens. I want a country where no one goes to bed hungry.

President Goodluck Ebele Jonathan