

## A Critical Discourse Analysis of Rhetorical Devices in the Campaign Speeches of Presidential Candidate Muhammadu Buhari and President Goodluck Jonathan in the 2011 Elections in Nigeria

<sup>1</sup>Isa, Saratu Shuaibu, <sup>2</sup>Abaya, Angulu Samson

Department of English and Literary Studies  
Ahmadu Bello University, Zaria

### Abstract

*The pursuit, gain for and exercise of power is characterized by crafty use of language. Persuading and convincing 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 use by the politician. The paper is a critical discourse analysis of President Muhammadu Buhari's and President Goodluck Jonathan's use of rhetorical devices in the 2011 presidential election in Nigeria. Adapting 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, the paper aims at revealing the meaning and ideological concepts to have persuasive effect on the electorates to control and garner support behind a political campaign speech. Data for the study were speeches purposively selected and obtained from National Television Authority (NTA) Abuja. 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 analyzed using critical discourse analysis (CDA). The following rhetorical strategies were analyzed: Repetition, Rhetorical Questions, Metaphor/Simile, Parallelism, and Pronouns. In the analysis of data, the result shows that both speakers used rhetorical devices to persuade and appeal to the audience to attain political power.*

**Keywords:** Critical Discourse Analysis, Rhetoric, Power and Ideology; and Campaign Speeches.

### Introduction

This paper focuses on language as the main system of social interaction and one that makes all other activities probable. In politics, language is used in much a crafty way than in everyday use of language. Hence, the paper attempts to examine campaign speeches of presidential candidates in the 2011 elections in Nigeria, using the framework of critical discourse analysis (henceforth CDA) to analyze the linguistic strategies and discourse structures employed by the contestants to control and garner support from the electorate.

Basically, the paper adapts the methodology framework used by most outstanding theoreticians in CDA (Fairclough, 1989, 1992, and 1995, 2001, 2003; van Dijk, 1988, 1991, 1993, 1995, 1998 and 2000, Chilton 2004). This approach to political discourse aims at investigating the pattern of language in campaign speeches with the view to determining the extent to which language works for politicians

in controlling and wooing the electorate. Appreciating the interdisciplinary nature of CDA, Fairclough conceptualizes 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). He also sees CDA as the study of discourse that does not only see language as a form of social practice but also focuses on the idea that social and political dominion is reproduced by 'text and talk' (Fairclough 1989). According to van Dijk (1988), CDA is concerned with analyzing 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 favor 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 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.

### **Bio sketch of Presidents Buhari and Jonathan**

Many presidential aspirants publicly declared their intentions to contest for the president of the Federal Republic of Nigeria in the 2011 presidential elections but this paper takes on the campaign speeches of two; Goodluck Ebele Jonathan, People's Democratic Party (PDP), and Muhammadu Buhari, Congress for Progressive Change (CPC) for Critical Discourse Analysis. These two parties are considered popular and strong in Nigeria, with widespread supporters from the thirty-six states and the Federal Capital Territory (FCT) of Nigeria, 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.

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 becoming 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 People's 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.

Dr GoodluckEbele 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 People's 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 looks more of capitalist in their ideological orientation as opposed to CPC's neo- socialist stance.

It is against this background that this study interrogates the use of rhetorical devices in the campaign speeches delivered by two presidential candidates of two ideologically opposed political parties in the Nigeria presidential election in 2011 which aimed at positive self-presentation and negative other-presentation in order to explain to what extent the speakers' partisan ideologies are reflected in their linguistic choices.

### **Focus of the Paper**

The focus of this paper is to investigate the pattern of language use in campaign speeches of Buhari and Jonathan in the 2011 presidential elections with a view to determining the extent to which language works in political dispensation. In particular, the paper investigates the speeches produced by these two; Muhammadu Buhari and Goodluck Jonathan. Special attention is paid to the use of rhetorical devices, which are often conveyed through deliberate choice of words. In doing this, the objective of the paper is to identify the rhetorical devices that permeate the campaign speeches and their functions.

### **Literature Review**

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



others 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 analyzing the pattern of language use in campaign speeches 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 as the theoretical framework to establish that coup speeches are a variant of political language. Whereas, Abaya (2011) and this paper are both researches on political language, the former employs a pragmatic analytical frame work and the present paper 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 paper 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, Kulo (2009), Kamalu and Agangan (2010), Abaya (2011) and Matic (2012) particularly relate to language or language and communication studies, this paper offers insight into two domains- political discourse and marketing (advertisement). Thus, giving clues as to why campaign speech is written the way it is.

#### **An Overview of Critical Discourse Analysis**

Critical Discourse Analysis forth with CDA is a branch of Applied Linguistics. Critical Linguistics was developed by a group of linguist 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). Following Halliday, these critical linguistic practitioners view language in use as simultaneously performing three functions: ideational, interpersonal, and textual functions. 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 context in which it occurs. Halliday's view of language as a "social act" is central to many of CDA.

CDA is a field that is concerned with studying and analysing written and spoken texts



in order to reveal the discursive sources of power, dominance, inequality, and bias (van Dijk, 1998a). CDA examines how these discursive sources are maintained and reproduced within specific social and, political and historical contexts. Similarly, Fairclough (1993:135) defines CDA as discourse analysis which aims to systematically explore often, opaque relationships of causality and determination between discursive practices, events and texts and, 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 for securing power and hegemony.

### **Rhetoric as a Form of Persuasion**

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 adapted 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 categorized 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 defense 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, propagandists use rhetorical devices to provoke thought on the part of the audience; to make the audience change their minds 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.

### **Power and Ideology in Political Campaigns**

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 emphasizes 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 utilized 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 society,” Hall (1996: 26).

**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.

**Methodology**

The methodology adopted for this study is survey method 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) were transcribed and the written speeches that were downloaded from the internet were used to validate the audio recorded speeches.

**Data Presentation and Analysis**

**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.

**Samples of Repetition from Buhari’s Speech**

**Table 3.3.1**

Utterance	Rhetorical Devices	Implicature
“We are today facing an uncertain future in an uncertain world.”	Buhari uses repetition to denote the situation of the country on ground that it	The speaker inherently shows that the country’s situation is precarious and somewhat



	cannot be determined or it is capricious.	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 of Repetition from Buhari’s Speech

Table 3.3.2

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 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 of Repetition from Jonathan’s Speech

Table 3.3.3

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 of Repetition from Jonathan’s Speech**

**Table 3.3.4**

Utterance	Rhetorical Devices	Implicature
<p>“<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.”</p>	<p>The passiveness of repetition features to unveil Jonathan’s campaign promises</p>	<p>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.</p>

Jonathan in this utterance uses 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 logical 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 on Rhetorical Questions from Buhari’s Speech**

**Table 3.3.5**

Utterance	Rhetorical Devices	Implicature
<p>“Where was the government when this great <u>country of ourstook</u> <u>a nose dive on many</u> critical sectors?”</p>	<p>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,</p>	<p>Here, by extension that Goodluck’s government has lost control of the economic and administrative direction.</p>



	<p>“This great country of ours took a nose dive...” This means that a fresh meaning is given to the expression “take a nose dive”.</p>	
--	--	--

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 on Rhetorical Questions from Buhari’s Speech

Table 3.3.6

Utterance	Rhetorical Devices	Implicature
<p>“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>”</p>	<p>Buhari stresses in the rhetorical questions that the ruling party goes from one tough situation to the other without any solution.</p>	<p>It implies that the government (PDP) cannot rule the country again.</p>

### 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 of Parallelism from Buhari’s on Rhetorical Devices

Table 3.3.7

Utterance	Rhetorical Devices	Implicature
<p>“... To stop them in their tracks. And stop them now.”</p>	<p>In this parallel structure. The expression denotes the authority Buhari has to enforce end to the PDP.</p>	<p>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</p>

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.

**Table 3.3.8**

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 of Parallelism from Jonathan's Speech**

**Table 3.3.9**

Utterance	Rhetorical Devices	Implicature
"The challenge facing leaders together is <u>how to create wealth</u> not <u>how to create disaster</u> in the country".	Jonathan employs parallelism here to clearly inform the audience the difficult task leaders are intimidated within the Nigeria.	The utterance infers that he has come to override the impediment to the prosperity 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).

**Sample of Parallelism from Jonathan's Speech**

**Table 3.3.10**

Utterance	Rhetorical Devices	Implicature
"We should not just <u>produce fertilizer</u> but we <u>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 key to unlock the doors to boost the economy through sustainable agriculture.

In this compound sentence which is of equal status 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 of Metaphor from Buhari’s Speech**

**Table 3.3.11**

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 of Simile from Jonathan’s Speech**

**Table 3.3.12**

Utterance	Rhetorical Devices	Implicature
“...but <u>gas is as important to government 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.

**Pronouns**

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.



**Figure 3.12: Statistical Distribution of Pronouns in President Muhammadu’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%
<b>Total</b>		<b>202</b>	<b>100%</b>

Here, the table shows that the first person singular pronoun “I” represents 19.15%. The objective first person pronoun “me” is uttered 4.25% and the 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 first person pronoun “my” is has 6.92%, while the third person pronoun “they” 7.45% “them” 4.79% respectively. The possessive pronoun “their”

“your” have a frequency of 4.25% and 3.19%, while first person pronoun “our” occurs 15.96%. The reflexive pronoun “myself”, “themselves” have the lowest frequency of 1.06 and 0.53%.

The predominant use of the first person plural pronoun “we” highlights collectivity, of us being good and the use of the pronoun “they” shows negative-other representation.

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

**Figure 3.13: 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%
Pronoun (they)	Personal/subjective third person plural	1	0.83%
<b>Total</b>		<b>137</b>	<b>100%</b>

The table reveals that the 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%, and 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 pronoun “our” represents 11.67%. The first person pronoun “I” is uttered 15% and the first person possessive pronoun “my” represent 2.5%. The first person objective pronoun “us” represents 1.67%. The predominant use of the first person plural pronoun “we”/ “our” highlight a sense of collectivity, and to make him 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.

### Findings

This study has examined the use of rhetorical devices in the campaign speeches of Muhammadu Buhari and Goodluck Jonathan 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.

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 and pronouns. Buhari and Jonathan extensively used repetition and parallelism which are for emphasis to motivate the audience and to make important information stand out. 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 established a distinguishing separation between the ruling party PDP and his party CPC.

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..." etc.

### Conclusion

The conclusion to be drawn from this study is that the use of rhetorical strategies between the two contestants showed how they presented their arguments and views in the campaign speeches in order to showcase their ideologies. For instance, the ideology of change separated Buhari from his opponent, Jonathan, as the incumbent president. 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. However, campaign speeches need to be investigated in two folds: politics and language.

Thus, the study has examined campaign speeches as a branch of political discourse, using critical discourse analysis' methodological approach. It set 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. Hence, choice of words in political utterances represents the ideological position of the speaker as well as his power relations with the audience. Therefore, the study concludes that campaign speeches by politicians are ideological and often invested with the propensity to obfuscate the manifestation of political power which motive is to persuade, dominate, and control the minds of the electorate.

### REFERENCES

- Abaya, A.S. (2009) Language and Politics: An Introductory Insight. *Journal of Educational Research and Development*. Vol.( 4) No 3. Zaria A.B.U
- Abaya, A.S. (2011) *A Pragmatic Analysis of Nigerian Military Coup Discourse: example from Nigerian military coup speeches*. VDM Verlag Dr Muller Ambh & co. Kg Saarbrucken (Germany).
- Abdullahi-Idiagbon, M.S. (2010), Language Use in Selected Nigerian Presidential Election Campaign Speeches: A Critical Discourse Analysis *Prespective Journal of the Nigerian English Studies Association*, Vol. 13. No. 2.
- Ajadi, G.A (1990) 'D.O Fagunwa's Narratives: A Rhetorical Analysis, *The Literary Griot*, vol 2 No 2
- Akodu, E. F. (2009), *A Pragmatic Analysis of Ambiguity in Political Discourse in Selected Nigerian Newspaper*. (1999-2005) Unpublished Ph.d Thesis. Zaria. Abu.
- Al- Harbi A. M (2013), *Journal of Language, Teaching and Research*, vol 4, pp858-868 July 2013.
- Amodu, E.J. (2010). *A Content Analysis of Presupposition and Overstatement in the Language of Selected Advertisement of Nigerian Print Media*. an Unpublished Ph.d, Thesis, Zaria A.B.U.
- Andaolotu, O. (2011), *Buhari CPC and Political Liberalism Sahara Reporters*. Retrieved 2011- 04- 23
- Aremu, (2010) Ayoola, (2005): "Investigating Nigerian Political Discourse: A Study of President Obasanjo's July 26, 2005 Address to the National Assembly" *Papers in English and Linguistics*. 6:1-13
- Aremu, M.A. 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
- Bayode, F. (2013), *An Investigation of Ideological Embedding in Newspaper Editorials*. A Study of the Guardian and Daily,
- Beard, A. (2000): *The Language of Politics*. London: Routledge.



- Blommaert, J.& Bulcaen, C. (Eds.) (1998),*Political Linguistics*: Amsterdam & Philadelphia. John Benjamin.
- Bloor, T. & Bloor, M. (2004): *The Functional Analysis Of English*. 2<sup>nd</sup> edition. Great Britian: Holder Arnold.
- Bloor, T. & Bloor, M. (2007): *The Practice of Critical Discourse Analysis: An Introduction*. Great Britain: Hudder Education.
- Blum-kulka, S. (1980) “*Learning To Say What You Mean In A Second Language*”. Paper Presented At University Of Wisconsin Milwaukee Symposium On Discourses.
- Breen, M. and Candlin C. N. (1980),*The Essential Of A Communicative Curricuium In Language Teaching Applied Linguistics*.
- Brown, T. & 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.
- Chilton, P. (2004),*Analysing Political Discourse, Theory and Practice*. London: Routledge
- Chilton, P. and Scaffner, C. (eds), (2002),*Politics as Text and Talk*. Analytical Approaches to Political Discourse. (pp 204-236) Amsterdan: Benjamins.
- Fairclough, N. (1992),*Discourse and Social Change*. Cambridge: The Cambridge Polity 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.
- 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 Interst in the PDP Presidential Primaries*. Paper Published.
- Silverman, d. (2010) ‘*Analysing Talk and Text*’, in N.K. Denzin and Y.S. Lincoln (eds.), *Handbook of Qualitative Research* (2<sup>nd</sup> edn). London: Sage.
- Van Dijk T. A. (1998) *Ideology: A Multidisciplinary Study*. London:Sage.