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Abstract

Political speeches are delivered at public symposia, rallies, campaigns, debates, on radio, television, newspaper, interviews etc. Such speeches may be delivered before elections - these are referred to as pre-election speeches; speeches are also delivered immediately after elections and are called “post-election speeches”; while some are delivered when there is need to address some social, economic or political issues. The 2015 general election which held in Nigeria, in which General Muhammadu Buhari, the presidential candidate for the All Progressive Congress (APC) defeated the incumbent President Goodluck Jonathan of the Peoples’ Democratic Party (PDP) is a remarkable event. This paper critically analyses two post-election speeches of General Muhammadu Buhari after he emerged winner of the election. The first is his acceptance speech as the president-elect on April 1, 2015 and the second, his inaugural speech after his swearing-in on May 29, 2015. The two speeches were downloaded from the internet. This study aims at examining the rhetorics in the language use of the speaker and the trend of the speeches. The study has relied on Fairclough and Dijk’s models for Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) and Halliday’s Systemic Functional Grammar for analysis of data. The choice of these models is based on the fact that they are very appropriate for analysis of public speeches. The findings demonstrate that the use of language of the speaker centres on current happenings and pervading feelings in the society. It is also revealed that his propositions and views are based on his previous experiences as a minister, a military head of state and a long-term participant in the political arena of the nation.

Introduction

Language is a code system used for human communication. It is made up of sounds or graphic symbols, which users or speakers have accepted to use as units of communication. Sapir (1921) defines language as a purely human and non-instinctive method of communicating ideas, emotions and desires by means of voluntarily produced symbols. According to Lyons, languages are the principle systems of communication used by particular groups of human beings within the particular society (linguistic community) of which they are members, (1970). According to
Fairclough (1995), language is a part of society, and not somehow external to it. He further explains that language is a social process. This implies that language use in the different ways is not only socially determined by the relationships; but also has social effects by helping to maintain or indeed, change these relationships. Halliday distinguishes three metafunctions of language which are commonly interconnected: Firstly, the ideational function, through which language tends to structure experience, and it reflects and influences dialectical relationship with social structure; secondly, interpersonal function, which constitutes relationship between the participants; and thirdly, the textual function, which constitutes coherence and cohesion in text, (1978:142).

Politics is concerned with power: the power to make decisions, to control resources, to control other people’s behavior, and to control their values. In any communication, politicians choose their words carefully because they believe in the power of language to influence thought and also in linguistic relativity. Politics unquestionably is a struggle for power, and language is the most effective tool to exercise power. As such, the language of politics is often complex. Critical discourse analysis, which is a complex and multidisciplinary domain of study, is therefore considered an appropriate model for the analysis of the speeches selected for this study.

CDA has been largely influenced by several scientific branches, one of which is Halliday’s Systemic Functional and Social Semiotic Linguistics (Bloommaert and Bulcaen 2000). This study is therefore based on Fairclough (1995) and Dijk’s (1995) models for Critical Discourse Analysis and Halliday’s (1994) Systemic Functional Grammar. The two speeches selected for analysis are General MuhammaduBuhari’s acceptance speech on April 1, 2015 and his inaugural speech on May 29, 2015. The analysis in this study focuses on the implicit linguistic strategies used in the selected speeches to influence the audiences. The aim is to examine how language is used by the speaker to construe reality, mirror social problems, depict power interplay, convey ideologies and relate history.

**Methodology**

The texts selected for this study are two post-election speeches of General MuhammaduBuhari after he emerged winner of the 2015 general election which held in Nigeria. The first is his acceptance speech as the president-elect on April 1, 2015 and the second, his inaugural speech after his swearing-in on May 29, 2015. The speeches, which were downloaded from the internet, will be subjected to vocabulary, grammatical and textual analysis. The analysis is
guided by Fairclough (1995) and Dijk’s (1995) models for Critical Discourse Analysis and Halliday’s (1994) Systemic Functional Grammar. Selected statements are cited for analysis to clarify the linguistic, social, economic, historical and political relevance of the speeches.

**Theoretical Framework**

**Critical Discourse Analysis**

The origin of Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) can be traced back to the 1940s, when the Frankfurt school of thought developed its critical theory (Agger, 1992). It was only in the 1970s that its current focus on language and discourse was modified as critical linguistics (CL) and spearheaded by Fowler et al. (1979). Fairclough’s book *Language and Power (1989)* is actually considered to be the starting point of CDA which pointed out its principles, (Bloommaert and Bulcaen, 2000). It focuses on the roles of language in the production of power relations which are belittled (Fairclough, 1989). Van Dijk and Ruth Wodak also played important roles in the development of CDA into the field of research that it is today. Dijk (1995) asserts that CDA may be considered as a reaction against the social and uncritical paradigms of the 1960s and the early 1970s. Kress (1990:84-97) gives an account of the theoretical foundations and sources of CL. He indicates that the term CL was quite self consciously adopted from its social political counterpart, as a label by the group of scholars working at the University of East Anglia in the 1970s.

By the 1990s, the label CDA came to be used more consistently in describing this particular approach to linguistic analysis. Kress (1990) explains how CDA emerged as a distinct theory of language which is radically different from other kinds of linguistics. As stated by Dijk (1993), CDA needs to meet certain criteria in order to be relevant. In his words,

> Critical discourse analysis can only make a significant and specific contribution to critical social or political analyses if it is able to provide an account of the role of language, language use, discourse or communicative events in the (re) production of dominance and inequality.

According to Dijk (1995), CDA is not a field, direction, specialization or sub-discipline of discourse analysis or any other form of analysis such as conversational analysis, narrative analysis or ethnography. He describes CDA as:

> A type of discourse analytical research that primarily studies the way social power, abuse, dominance and
inequality are enacted, reproduced and resisted by text and talk in the social and political context (Dijk, 2001).

He explains that CDA is a theoretical framework that divulges the relations between discourse, social cognition and society. In summary, CDA is different from every other forms of discourse in that it is critical. It does not limit itself to analysing the close formal properties of the text; rather, it contextualises a text in its wider social, economic, historical, cognitive and political context. It critically examines how the text relates to other texts, how it is constituted by the existing social practices and how it is constitutive of other new social practices.

Critical Discourse Analysis is a multi-disciplinary approach that integrates ethical principles into issues. It aims at not only the demonstration of how textual features are used in certain patterns but also includes social, historical and cognitive contexts that surround the creation of a text. It therefore offers a more comprehensive understanding of discourse as it attempts to situate it in both its social and cultural contexts. Janks (1997) in explaining critical discourse analysis says:

Critical discourse analysis stems from a critical theory of language which sees the use of language as a form of social practice. All social practices are tied to specific historical contexts and are the means by which existing social relations are reproduced or contested and different interests are served. It is the questions pertaining to interests - How is the text positioned? Whose interests are served by this positioning? Whose interests are negated? What are the consequences of this positioning? - that relate discourse to relations of power. Where analysis seeks to understand how discourse is implicated in relations of power, it is called critical discourse analysis.

The object of Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) is public speech, such as advertisements, newspaper reports, political propaganda, official documents, laws and regulations and so on (Wang 2010). Fairclough (1995) developed a CDA model which is guided by ten questions and these questions can be grouped into three categories - vocabulary, grammar, and textual structures. The questions are itemized below:

1. What experiential value do words have? - Are there words which are ideological contested? Is there rewording or over-wording? What ideologically significant meanings (synonymy, hyponymy, antonymy) are there between words?
2. What relational values do words have? - Are there euphemistic expressions?
3. What expressive values do words have?
4. What metaphors are used?

5. What experiential values do grammatical features have? - What types of process and participant predominate? Are nominalization used? Are sentences positives or negatives?

6. What relational values do grammatical features have? - What modes (declarative, grammatical questions, imperative) are used?

7. What expressive values do grammatical features have? - Are there important features of expressive modality?

8. How are simple sentences linked together? - What logical connectors are used? Are there complex sentences characterised by coordinators or subordinators?

9. What interactional conventions are used? - Are there ways in which one participant controls the turns of others?

10. What larger scale structure does the text have?

The analysis in this study will provide answers to some of the above questions.

**Systemic Functional Grammar**

Halliday, who is the proponent of systemic functional grammar, puts forward a theory that can reveal how the form of language is determined by the functions and the grammatical patterns by configurations of the functions. Systemic theory interprets meaning as choice and a language or semiotic system as networks of interlocking options in line with Firth's category of the system as a functional paradigm and with his poly-systemic principle (Halliday 1985).

All languages have resources for construing experience (the ideational component), resources for enacting humans' diverse and complex social relations (the interpersonal component), and resources for enabling these two kinds of meanings to come together in coherent text (the textual function) (Halliday 1977, Halliday and Hassan 1985). Each of the grammatical systems proposed by Halliday is related to these metafunctions. For instance, the grammatical system of 'mood' is considered to be centrally related to the expression of interpersonal meanings, 'process type' to the expression of experiential meanings, and 'theme' to the expression of textual meanings.

In systemic linguistics, the set of terms that show how the clause can be broken down into functional constituents are referred to as ‘participants’, ‘process’ and ‘circumstances’. The participant constituent can be further described in terms of various participant roles – actor,
agent, goal, carrier, sayer. A participant can be a person, a place or an object and is realised in a clause by a nominal group with either a noun or pronoun at the head (the ‘thing’ element). There are four broad groups which reflect the structure of premodification in a nominal group - the deictic, numerative, epithet and classifier (which usually should be ordered as mentioned).

Processes in English are expressions of happening, doing, being, saying and thinking. A process is realised in grammar by means of a verbal group (either a word – a verb or a group of words with a verb as the head). A process can be material, verbal, behavioural, existential, relational or projecting. The distinction between these process types is not arbitrary but reflects the purposes which language serves. The distinction results from the way a particular verb is functioning in a particular clause. A particular verb for instance can function as a material, a projecting or a relational process depending on its relationship with the other elements in the clause or clause complex. According to Halliday (1994), material, relational and mental processes are the three primary ones in language use since they add up to about 90%. The circumstance in English is realised by the adverbial group and the prepositional phrase. The function of circumstances is to illuminate the process in some ways. Among other things, they may locate the process in time or space; suggest how the process occurs, or offer information about the cause of the process.

**Background to the Analysed Speeches**

General Muhammadu Buhari was born on December 17, 1942 in Katsina, Katsina State, Nigeria. He has served as the military ruler of Nigeria from December 31, 1983 to August 27, 1985. In 1983, Generals Muhammadu Buhari and Tunde Idiagbon were selected to lead the country by middle and high-ranking military officers after a military coup d'etat that overthrew civilian President Shehu Shagari. Buhari was himself overthrown in a coup led by General Ibrahim Babangida on August 27, 1985.

In 2003, Buhari contested the Presidential election as the candidate of the All Nigeria Peoples’ Party (ANPP) but did not win. He was nominated as the consensus candidate of the ANPP on December 18, 2006. He did not win the 2007 election because he had a main challenger, Umaru Yar’Adua, of the ruling People’s Democratic Party, who was also from Katsina State. In March 2010, Buhari left the ANPP for the Congress for Progressive Change (CPC), a party that he founded. According to him, he supported the formation of the CPC as a solution to the debilitating, ethical and ideological conflicts in his former party, the ANPP.
Buhari was the CPC Presidential candidate in the April 16, 2011 general election, running against incumbent President Goodluck Jonathan of the PDP, Mallam Nuhu Ribadu of the Action Congress of Nigeria (ACN), and Ibrahim Shekarau of the ANPP. They were the major contenders among 20 contestants. Buhari contested on an anti-corruption platform and pledged to remove immunity protections granted top political officials if elected. He got 12,214,853 votes, coming second to the incumbent President Goodluck Jonathan of the PDP, who polled 22,495,187 votes and was declared the winner.

Undaunted by his defeat in the previous elections, Buhari through his party, the CPC formed an alliance with four other political parties - christened the APC - and won the presidential ticket of the APC for the 2015 general elections. Consequently, he emerged the winner of the presidential election, defeating the incumbent President Goodluck Jonathan, thus marking the first time in Nigeria's history that an incumbent president was defeated in an election by the candidate of the opposition. Buhari was declared president-elect on Tuesday, March 31, 2015 by the Chairman of the Independent National Electoral Commission (INEC), Professor Attahiru Jega, and was sworn in on May 29, 2015. The two speeches selected for this study are his acceptance speech as the president-elect on April 1, and his inaugural speech after the swearing-in on May 29, 2015.

Analysis of Selected Speeches

The selected speeches are analysed using Fairclough and Djik’s CDA models and Hallidays’s systemic functional grammar. The speeches are examined in terms of their social, economic, historical and political relevance. The Acceptance Speech has a total of 1,668 words and 88 sentences while the Inaugural Address is made up of 1,909 words and 94 sentences.

Vocabulary Analysis of the Speeches

The analysis here involves the examination of the experiential and relational values of the words used in the speeches. The analysis is based on the first four questions raised by Fairclough (1995) in his CDA model involving an appraisal of the use of synonymy, hyponymy, overwording, metaphors and euphemism in the speeches.

Synonymy

We must not succumb to hopelessness and defeatism (Speech 2)
However, no matter how well organized the governments of the federation are they cannot succeed without the support, understanding and cooperation of labour unions, organized private sector, the press and civil society organizations.  

(Speech 2)

The underlined words in each of the above expressions are synonyms used for the purpose of emphasis.

**Antonym**

Our long night has passed and the daylight of new democratic governance has broken across the land  

(Speech 1)

I belong to everybody and I belong to nobody  

(Speech 2)

In the first statement above, the president with the use of antonyms refers to the past experiences of the nation as ‘long night’ and the hopeful situation ahead as ‘daylight’. In the second statement, he affirms his intention to be fair in his undertakings as the president, without any prejudice.

**Hyponymy**

Our nation wrestles many challenges including insecurity, corruption, economic decline.  

(Speech 1)

At home we face enormous challenge. Insecurity, pervasive corruption, the hitherto unending and seemingly impossible fuel and power shortages are the immediate concerns.  

(Speech 2)

I also wish to assure the wider international community of our readiness to cooperate and help to combat threats of cross-border terrorism, sea piracy, refugees and boat people, financial crime, cyber crime, climate change, the spread of communicable diseases and other challenges of the 21st century.  

(Speech 2)

The word ‘challenge’ has been used by the president in both speeches to point to the various problems confronting the nation. Such problems were further listed to include insecurity,
corruption, fuel and power shortages, cross-border terrorism, sea piracy, financial crime, cyber crime, climate change, the spread of communicable diseases and others.

**Over-wording**

Some words were repeatedly used to highlight and reinforce ideas. Such words include pronouns, verbs and other categories. Below are some examples.

I am immensely grateful to God for this day and for this hour. I feel truly honoured and humbled  

*(Speech 1)*

Today, history has been made, and change has finally come *(Speech 1)*

You shall be able to go to bed knowing that you are safe and that your constitutional rights remain in safe hands. You shall be able to voice your opinion without fear of reprisal or victimization  

*(Speech 1)*

We all live under one name as one nation: we are all Nigerians. *(Speech 1)*

Here, I want to thank my party for selecting me as its candidate. I thank our party leaders and members for the steadfast contributions they made to bring our dream to fruition. I thank INEC, the police and all other government agencies for performing their tasks in a proper manner and for refusing to be induced to undermine the election and the democratic process…. I also wish to thank religious leaders, traditional leaders, the media, labor unions, Civil Society organisations, organised private sector, youths and students for their roles in this election. (Speech 1)

I thank those who tirelessly carried the campaign on the social media. At the same time, I thank our other countrymen and women who did not vote for us but contributed to make our democratic culture truly competitive, strong and definitive. I thank all of you. *(Speech 2)*

The purpose for which the speaker uses these underlined words and phrases repeatedly is to reiterate and emphasize his points.
**Metaphor**

The sampled speeches contain some metaphorical statements. Examples are cited in table 1 below and their connotations are given to explain the relevance of their usage.

**Table 1: Metaphors in the Sample Speeches**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speech</th>
<th>Metaphorical expression/term</th>
<th>Connotation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>…change has finally come</td>
<td>‘change’ is used metaphorically</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Our long night has passed and the daylight of new democratic governance has broken</td>
<td>‘night’ is used to signify gloom and ‘daylight’ is used to signify change and enjoyment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>We must forget our old battles and past grievances</td>
<td>‘old battles’ used as metaphor for struggle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>We all live under one name as one nation</td>
<td>‘one name’ signifies unity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>This is how an honourable nation treats its servants</td>
<td>Servant here indicates rulers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dream</td>
<td>Refers to the hope of winning the election</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>player in the global fight against terrorism and in other matters of collective concern</td>
<td>‘player’ and ‘fight’ are used figuratively</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I seek your voice</td>
<td>‘voice’ is metaphorical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>„„ this nation has suffered greatly in the recent past, and its staying power has been tested to its limits by crises</td>
<td>‘power’ signifies sovereignty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>we shall strongly battle another form of evil</td>
<td>‘battle’ is used figuratively</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Monument</td>
<td>Used figuratively</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>who did not vote for us</td>
<td>Signifies opponents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Heirs</td>
<td>Used figuratively</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>An eccentric and unorthodox preacher with a tiny following was given posthumous fame and following by his extra judicial murder at the hands of the police</td>
<td>The expression is figurative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Darkness</td>
<td>Indicates power shortage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>reservoir of goodwill</td>
<td>‘reservoir’ is used figuratively</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nigeria therefore has a window of opportunity</td>
<td>‘window’ is used figuratively</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Grammatical Analysis of the Speeches

This analysis focuses on identification of the types of process and participants in the speeches, the use of nominalization, the structure and types of sentences, what modes and modality prevail in the speeches.

Pronouns

The pronouns used by the speaker affirm his ideological standpoint. The account of personal pronouns used in the two speeches is presented in the table below.

Table 2: Personal Pronouns in the Sample Speeches

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personal Pronoun</th>
<th>Speech</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First person</td>
<td>I (me)</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>We (us)</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second person</td>
<td>You (you)</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third person</td>
<td>He (him)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>She (her)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>It (it)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>They (them)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Possessive pronoun</td>
<td>My (mine)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Our (ours)</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Your (yours)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>His (his)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Her (hers)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Its (its)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Their (their)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2 shows that the first person pronouns occur most. The use of first person plural ‘we/us’ and the possessives ‘our/ours’ is for the purpose of shortening the distance between the speaker and the audience. Through the use of these pronouns, the speaker makes the listeners feel part of his opinions. This helps to convey his attitudes and judgments about prevailing issues and portrays self-mention.
**Active and Passive Sentences**

Active sentences dominate the two speeches. Few passive sentences are also used by the speaker to reveal facts, inform and enlighten the audience.

For instance:

Today, history has been made… \( \text{(Speech 1)} \)

Some unfortunate issues about my eligibility have been raised during the campaign \( \text{(Speech 1)} \)

Progress has been made in recent weeks by our security forces …. The command centre will be relocated to Maiduguri and remain until Boko Haram is completely subdued \( \text{(Speech 2)} \)

No single cause can be identified to explain Nigerian’s poor economic performance over the years than the power situation \( \text{(Speech 2)} \)

**Negative and Positive Sentences**

Positive sentences are used by the speaker to portray issues the way they are in real life situation, relate facts and express opinions, while negative sentences are used to express views which are in opposition to reality.

**Negative Sentences**

There shall no longer be a ruling party again \( \text{(Speech 1)} \)

This will not be a government democratic only in form \( \text{(Speech 1)} \)

I repeat that corruption will not be tolerated by this administration; and it shall no longer be allowed to stand as if it is a respected monument in this nation \( \text{(Speech 1)} \)

… we shall never take you for granted \( \text{(Speech 1)} \)

We shall not stop, stand or idle \( \text{(Speech 1)} \)

Your vote was not wasted. This is not the first time Nigerians have cast their votes for us, and this is not the first time they have been counted \( \text{(Speech 1)} \)

Our journey has not been easy but thanks to the determination of our people and strong support from friends abroad…. \( \text{(Speech 2)} \)

I will not have kept my own trust with the Nigerian people if I allow others abuse theirs under my watch. \( \text{(Speech 2)} \)
Boko Haram is not only the security issue bedeviling our country. (*Speech 2*)

No single cause can be identified to explain Nigerian’s poor economic performance over the years than the power situation. (*Speech 2*)

I cannot recall when Nigeria enjoyed so much goodwill abroad as now (*Speech 2*)

**Positive Sentences**

We shall faithfully serve you (*Speech 1*)

Millions of you have worked for this day (*Speech 1*)

we shall strongly battle another form of evil that is even worse than terrorism - the evil of corruption (*Speech 1*)

A few people have privately voiced fears that on coming back to office I shall go after them (*Speech 2*)

We can fix our problems (*Speech 2*)

For now the Armed Forces will be fully charged with prosecuting the fight against Boko Haram. We shall overhaul the rules of engagement to avoid human rights violations in operations. We shall improve operational and legal mechanisms so that disciplinary steps are taken against proven human right violations by the Armed Forces. (*Speech 2*)

**Declarative Sentences**

Declarative sentences are informative and follow the SVOCA pattern according to Fairclough’s model.

APC will be your governing party (*Speech 1*) SVO

We send our sincere condolences to the families and friends of those who lost their lives. (*Speech 1*) SVOC

I pledge myself and our in-coming administration to just and principled governance. (*Speech 1*) SVOC

Corruption attacks and seeks to destroy our national institutions and character. (*Speech 1*) SVCO

I am immensely grateful to God who has preserved us to witness this day and this occasion. (*Speech 2*) SVCA
Having just a few minutes ago sworn on the Holy Book, I intend to keep my oath and serve as President to all Nigerians.  

(Speech 2)   CSVO

At home we face enormous challenges. 

(Speech 2)   ASVO

I appeal to employers and workers alike to unite in raising productivity so that everybody will have the opportunity to share in increased prosperity. 

(Speech 2)   SVOCA

Clause patterning is said to be a variable model of the language user’s experience. The types of processes involved in the clauses are also ideological because they create significant choices that are of interest to the speaker.

**Imperative Sentences**

In the following imperative sentences, the speaker seeks the cooperation of the audience by appealing to them to do certain things.

Let us take a moment of silence to honour all of those whose sacrifices have brought us to this fine and historic hour.  

(Speech 1)

Let us put the past, especially the recent past, behind us. We must forget our old battles and past grievances - and learn to forge ahead.  

(Speech 1)

We have an opportunity. Let us take it.  

(Speech 2)

**Modality**

Modality helps to demonstrate promises and commitments in political speeches. The modal verbs used by the speaker in the sample speeches can be categorized under expressive modality, that is, the modal verbs used are those which according to Fairclough (1989, p.126), have to do with the speaker’s authority with respect to the truth or probability of the representation of reality. Typically, inaugural and victory speeches which are post election speeches are dominated by expressives.

My team and I shall faithfully serve you. There shall no longer be a ruling party again: APC will be your governing party. We shall faithfully serve you.
We shall never rule over the people as if they were subservient to government. (Speech 1)

You shall be able to voice your opinion without fear of reprisal or victimisation. (Speech 1)

We shall correct that which does not work and improve that which does. We shall not stop, stand or idle. We shall, if necessary crawl, walk and run to do the job you have elected us to do. (Speech 1)

We will govern for you and in your interests. (Speech 1)

I would like to thank President Goodluck Jonathan for his display of statesmanship in setting a precedent for us that has now made our people proud to be Nigerians wherever they are. (Speech 2)

I would like to thank the millions of our supporters who believed in us even when the cause seemed hopeless. (Speech 2)

This government will do all it can to rescue them alive. (Speech 2)

We shall overhaul the rules of engagement to avoid human rights violations in operations. We shall improve operational and legal mechanisms so that disciplinary steps are taken against proven human right violations by the Armed Forces. (Speech 2)

We will not allow this to go on. (Speech 2)

From the analysis, it is observed that present and future tenses prevail in the two speeches.

**Logical Connectors**

Logical connectors are used by the speaker to express addition, condition, and contrast. They include: and, also, if, however, but etc. as seen in the following examples.

And it is with a very heavy heart that I report many deaths and injuries amidst the jubilations yesterday. (Addition) (Speech 1)

If I had judged myself incapable of governing I would never have sought to impose myself on it. (Condition) (Speech 1)

But despite the rancour of the elections, I extend a hand of friendship and conciliation to President Jonathan and his team. (Contrast) (Speech 1)
I also wish to thank religious leaders, traditional leaders, the media, labor unions, Civil Society organisations, organised private sector, youths and students for their roles in this election. (Addition) (Speech 1)

However, no matter how well organized the governments of the federation are they cannot succeed without the support, understanding and cooperation of labour unions, organized private sector, the press and civil society organizations. (Contrast) (Speech 2)

Complex Sentences

Although simple sentences dominate the two speeches, few complex sentences are used. Coordinators and subordinators used as connectors in the sentences include: ‘and’, ‘so that’, and ‘but’ as seen in the examples below:

I thank INEC, the police and all other government agencies for performing their tasks in a proper manner and for refusing to be induced to undermine the election and the democratic process. (Speech 1)

While we pledge to begin doing our best without delay, we would like to appeal to them to appreciate the gravity of our situation, so that we become more realistic in our expectations. (Speech 1)

This is not the first time Nigerians have cast their votes for us, and this is not the first time they have been counted; but this is the first time that the votes have been allowed to count. (Speech 1)

The amnesty programme in the Niger Delta is due to end in December, but the Government intends to invest heavily in the projects, and programmes currently in place. (Speech 2)

Conclusion

The use of language of the speaker in the two speeches analysed centres on current happenings and pervading feelings in the society. The simplicity of language and the choice of words take into consideration the different categories of people which make up the audience. The use of more material processes (of doing) than other types and the selection of modal verbs helps to arouse understanding and acceptance. Also, the prevalence of the first person personal pronouns, simple present and future tenses in the speeches contribute to the affirmation of the
speaker’s ideological standpoints. The subject of the two speeches is extensive – touches on issues such as history, recent crises in the nation and global issues. The findings reveal that the speaker’s propositions and views are based on these happenings as well as his previous experiences as a minister, a military head of state and a long-term participant in the political arena of the nation.
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