An Exposé on the Ideologies of Nigerian Political Leaders: The Case of Goodluck Jonathan

By

KelvinFrancis Olisaemeka Obitube
Department of Linguistics, Igbo and Other Nigerian Languages,
University of Nigeria, Nsukka
kelvinfrancis.obitube@unn.edu.ng

Ndubuisi Ahamefula
Department of Linguistics, Igbo and Nigerian Languages
University of Nigeria, Nsukka
ndubuisi.ahamefula@unn.edu.ng

Ogechukwu Uzoagba
Department of Linguistics, Igbo and Nigerian Languages
University of Nigeria, Nsukka
ogechukwu.uzoagba@unn.edu.ng
&
Chinedu Ezebube
Department of Linguistics, Igbo and Nigerian Languages
University of Nigeria, Nsukka
chinedu.ezebube@unn.edu.ng

Abstract

This paper studies Dr. Goodluck Jonathan's Independence Day speeches to evaluate the effectiveness of discourse analysis in revealing socio-psychological/ideological characteristics of Nigerian political leaders. It is a qualitative research which uses discourse analysis to study his 2012, 2013 and 2014 Nigerian Independence Day speeches. The study reveals that Dr. Jonathan employs 'I/me', which slowly increases in frequency of usage as years passed, Also, his use of 'we/us' shows how intervening factors influence his willingness or unwillingness to allocate collective responsibility to himself and his administration, and further to the citizens as situations worsen, rather than absorbing the entire blame. Also, he often avoids using 'my, you(r), they/them, their', 'this/these or those because

they reflect separatism or class/status differentiation. Again, he prefers declaratives to make his speeches viewed as authentic and to portray a confident personality. Observations, therefore, reveal that the Dr. Jonathan is slow in realising the extent of his power to unilaterally influence salient matters as the President and Commander-In-Chief of the Armed Forces of Nigeria. It recommends constant use of DA for revealing the ideologies of Nigeria's political leaders so as to make better political choices.

Key words: Independence Day speech, **discourse analysis**, **ideologies**, **politics**, **Nigeria**, **citizens**,

1. Introduction

As the world advances, political leaders of identified population of people cultivate an ever-increasing habit of tactically and aggressively manipulating people's opinions in their favour through speeches. One covert truth embedded within these frantic efforts to control public opinion(s), however, is that ideologies/socio-psychological characteristics of these political leaders are unconsciously bared to keen readers or listeners, especially linguists who pay better and keen attention to revealing hidden components in these speeches. This revelation is achieved with the use of the discourse analytical tool by discourse analysts.

Within the Nigerian political context, not much effort has been made to explore discourse analysis (DA) for achieving this purpose. Many political leaders in the country have delivered several speeches with which they succeeded in wowing the audience and leaving them guessing their personality and ideology/socio-psychological characteristics. However, in 2014, a ground-breaking research was conducted by this author which revealed the effectiveness of DA in accounting for the ideology of former Nigerian President and Commander-In-Chief of the Armed Forces- Dr. Goodluck Jonathan. This paper, therefore, presents the effectiveness of DA in analysing the Independence Day speeches delivered by the then President which helped to reveal his ideologies that formed the basis on which the researcher predicted his challenges in the forth-coming Presidential elections that witnessed his failures at the polls in 2015. The objective of this research is, therefore, to:

- expose the ideologies/socio-psychological characteristics of President Goodluck
Jonathan, as reflected in his Independence Day speeches.

Based on this objective, the following research question is adopted:

- What are the ideologies/socio-psychological characteristics of President Goodluck Jonathan, as reflected in his Independence Day speeches?

This study is highly significant. It will draw people's attention to a more intrinsic component of political speeches- a speaker's ideologies embedded within his/her expressions. This will give the addressee(s), better knowledge to better shape their relationship with the addresser(s). It will also reveal the potential of DA to accurately predict the course of events relating to a given speech based on the ideologies of the speaker(s) upon whom rests the fate of event(s). Again, the ability of language to reveal speakers' ideologies is an aspect of linguistic studies that needs more focus. Consequently, this work will add to existing works of literature on the topic.

2. Literature review

2.1. Theoretical studies

Discourse includes particular ways of speaking and all the things that accompany speech to make the spoken word and the speaker understandable (Fairclough, 2001; Gee, 2005). Warburton (2016) states that the work of Fairclough (2001) draws on Foucault to explore the ways in which consent is manufactured through dominant discourses (Fairclough uses the term "ideology"), noting that while discourses do not create the physical being of a mathematics teacher, they define what we understand as *mathematics teacher*, *mathematics student*, and *mathematics*, etc., thereby creating and recreating terms in categories as we use them, and shaping the physical manifestations of these terms. Upon these words, we will explore theories relevant to this study.

According to Fang, Grunberg, Litman and Wang (2017), DA is a process of analysing the meaning of a text by examining multiple component sentences together, rather than each sentence on its own. By examining multiple component sentences together rather than each sentence on its own, DA makes is possible to

bring together, all possible utterances of an individual on a given matter; thus, capturing all the ideas held by this given individual, which largely represent the person's ideologies/socio-psychological characteristics.

Kelley (2016:1), accounts for the views of Reed (1996), who sees DA as a linguistic field involving the study of spoken and written language thus;

> Discourse analysis has been variously defined. To start with the broadest definition (and work down to something more specific), Jeffrey T. Reed says that discourse analysis "at its broadest level refers to the study and interpretation of both spoken and written communication of humans." He says that it is "analysis that takes seriously the role of the speaker, the text and the listener in the communicative event."

He, equally presents the idea of Porter (1995), stating, "Thinking about communication in light of these three elements (also referred to here as "sender," "message," and "receiver,") illuminates the one major characteristic of the discipline, namely concern for the roles of syntax, semantics, and pragmatics in human language" Kelley (2016:4), further notes, "George H. Guthrie provides one that captures the idea: "discourse analysis may be defined as 'a process of investigation by which one examines the form and function of all the parts and levels of a written discourse, with the aim of better understanding both the parts and the whole of that discourse.'"

Then, for Kelley (2016), precisely, DA is an approach to studying language that is informed by modern linguistics, and concerned with the descriptive analysis of actual human communications. Buttressing his point, this author notes that DA attempts to analyse actual human language in terms of whole discourses and understands human language in terms of syntax, semantics, and pragmatics (syntax talking about how words are strung together to form sentences; semantics dealing with the meaning of expressions; and pragmatics emphasising the meaning provided by expressions at given context[s] of their production).

Furthermore, Kelley (2016) states that in contrast with traditional grammars, DA is especially characterised by examining language use above the sentence level, and concerned with interpreting all the parts of a discourse in light of the whole,

and the whole in light of its parts, or in other words, both "top-down" and "bottom-up" interpretations. This means that a successful comprehension of an entire speech can be achieved by using DA to analyse its constituent parts; and in like manner, DA can equally help to achieve a better comprehension of the ideas of a given part of a speech by analysing an entire speech.

DA, however, is not the same with critical discourse analysis hence (CDA). According to Obitube (2014), CDA was first developed by the Lancaster school of linguistics with Norman Fairclough as its most prominent figure. Fairclough and Holes (1995) notes that CDA is an interdisciplinary approach to studying discourse which views language as a form of social practice and focuses on the ways social and political dominations are reproduced in text and talk. In the words of Van Dijk (2007:352), "CDA is 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. With such dissident research, CDA analysts take explicit position, and thus want to understand, expose, and ultimately resist social inequality."

Another theory relevant to the study of discourse is conversation analysis (CA) which was developed in the late 1960s and early 1970s. CA is a theory for analysing both verbal and non-verbal expressions which occur in daily social interaction. Methodologically, CA collects data from recorded conversations, which may be video or audio. The collected data are transcribed with utmost precision and then analysed in order to find basic recurring characteristics of patterns existing in the given interaction, from which deductions and findings are made or established about the given discourse. However, CA and DA are not the same, just as CA and CDA are not the same. Van Dijk, (1999), points out that CDA shares many basic criteria and aims with CA as both have a special interest in naturally occurring text or talk, acknowledge the context-dependency of discourse, recognise the relevance of an interactional dimension of language, attend to sequential phenomena in text or talk and, in general, examine order and organisation of expression, meaning and action at several levels of analysis.

Furthermore, Van Dijk (1999) states that both CA and CDA are relevant for analysing the social dimension of discourse, namely socially situated interactions,

and more global, societal structures, respectively. Both CA and CDA have developed as directions of research interested in doing social analysis by doing discourse-analysis. In contrast to other approaches in the humanities and the social sciences such as quantitative content analysis, survey research or experimental testing in the laboratory, both CA and CDA advocate a detailed study of the structures of text and talk and their interactional and social functions. However, he concludes that in his view regrettably, both CDA and CA generally ignore the cognitive basis of discourse and interaction, which makes DA a standout theory to encompass wider variety of discourse issues.

2.2. Empirical studies

Nwankwere (2012) studied the possible influences of affective expressions on government officials in Nigeria. She adopted the theoretical framework of DA. By identifying affective expressions in speeches made by individual(s) while addressing their political leaders such as 'Nna m/Nna anyị úkwú' meaning 'My/Our Lord/Master'(Igbo), 'Ị na-eweta ọ́kụ̀'(Igbo) meaning 'You make things happen', and 'Opelenge' (Yoruba) meaning 'A slim and beautiful/handsome man', the researcher observes that affective expressions are employed while addressing political leaders, and most negatively, the speaker(s) uses them for selfish reasons. She notes that in situations where political leaders are bad leaders, they collude with the speaker(s) to loot public fund.

Nwankwere's (2012) research and the current work are similar in adopting DA. However, Nwankwere studied different speeches of different individuals without specifically these individuals while the current research studies only the speeches of one properly identified individual- President Goodluck Jonathan. Again, the current research goes beyond studying the structure of the speeches. It further exposes the ideologies/socio-psychological characteristics of the speaker.

In researches conducted by several researchers which were edited by Jones, Chik and Hafner (2015) and reviewed by Schreiber (2017), attempts were made to reveal how DA can be conducted in the digital age. By adopting DA in analysing the *texts* of video games, breaking down traditional distinctions between online and offline contexts and analysing examples of online discourse, such as the @ symbol and the Facebook *Like* found in texts in physical public spaces, examining a variety of data

from YouTube pages to email interviews to a Twitter stream, tracing the performance of celebrity in an online world for young people in Club Penguin Music Videos, among others, the researchers observed that meaning is co-created by players and the video games as players attempt to accomplish goals through the characters' affordances in the video games and that discourse practices flow between online and offline domains. They also observed that self-promotion and fan behaviours in a community which contribute to discourses of recognition and status enable young people to engage with new media and to develop strategies for deploying social capital. They concluded that all human activity consists of a series of conversational interactions, and that DA could be much more broadly applied.

This reviewed work shows similar interest in DA and explored an interesting aspect of applying DA in the new age of Information Communication Technology (ICT) which is commendable. However, just like most other studies on DA, it fails to explore its application to what this researcher considers the most sensitive aspect of language usage, which is Independence Day speeches, which hold and can reveal the ideologies upheld by political leaders, which immensely affect the lives of an entire people, especially in Nigeria and sometimes, humans across all countries of the world.

Fang, Grunberg, Litman and Wang (2017) studied the DA of lyric and lyric-based classification of music to investigate the usefulness of discourse-based musical genre classification, examine the problem of release date estimation and show that assistance from discourse-based features allows for superior classification relative to single-sentence lyric features alone. They analysed lyrics from John Lennon's *Just Like Starting Over* and the theme of Andy Williams' *A Summer Place* and observed that incorporating discourse features achieves more accurate genre classification than single sentence lyric features. These results suggest that discourse-based features are potentially useful for Music Information Retrieval tasks.

This reviewed work is similar in determining the effectiveness of DA in retrieving certain covert information from discourse. However, Fang, Grunberg, Litman and Wang (2017) focussed on applying DA to lyrics and lyric-based classification of

music while the current work studies a more sensitive discourse that affects an entire given population of people, which is the Independence Day speeches of President Goodluck Jonathan, showing how effective DA can reveal the ideologies held by the former president, which can further be applied to many other serving political heads of any group or society.

2.3. Summary of literature review

From the literature review, ideas presented through the works of Fairclough and Holes (1995), Porter (1995), Reed (1996), Van Dijk, (1999), Fairclough (2001), Gee (2005), Van Dijk (2007), Obitube (2014), Warburton (2016), Kelley (2016), as well as Fang, Grunberg, Litman and Wang (2017) on various theories such as DA, CA and CDA were explored. These theories revealed that the study of discourse, generally involves a thorough investigation of an entire text in order to discover crucial aspects of meaning revealed through the relationship binding all the possible components of a given speech or interaction.

Furthermore, studies conducted by Nwankwere (2012), Jones, Chik and Hafner (2015), as well as Fang, Grunberg, Litman and Wang (2017) were reviewed. Their efforts showed that DA can be applied to a wide range of human activities involving language usage such as in politics, literature, and in situations involving human beings and feedbacks from ICT sources. However, their collective inability to research on how DA can permeate political speeches delivered on Independence Day of Nigeria by the number one political leader (the President), which is a source of immense information on the state of the nation, and the means through which the socio-psychological characteristics of the President (which in turn affects his decisions, actions and the lives of the citizens) can be revealed, is a glaring gap that needs to be filled. This is what this paper adequately addresses.

2.4. Theoretical framework

This study adopts the theoretical framework of discourse analysis (DA). DA grew out of works which were conducted in different disciplines in the 1960s and early 1970s, including linguistics, semiotics, psychology, anthropology and sociology (McCarthy, 2011). According to Obitube (2014), DA does not merely seek to account for the phonological, morphological and syntactic aspects of an expression but equally goes ahead to study the usage of the language by a given speaker and

the possible impact of the language, as well as the use of the language within context or society.

DA, according to Bowles (2008), views discourse as a social phenomenon rather than a purely linguistic one. He further notes that it also examines how language is used to sustain social institutions and manipulate opinion; how it is used in the expression of ideology and the exercise of power; and it can also be used to develop awareness of linguistic features in the interpretation of literary texts. Thus, Yatsko (2013) notes that discourse analysis is capable of revealing socio-psychological characteristics of a person/persons.

In terms of its procedure for analysing data, Brown and Yule (1983) posit that DA employs theoretical perspectives and analytical approaches which include: applied linguistics, CA, cognitive psychology, CDA, discursive psychology, emergent grammar, ethnography of communication, functional grammar, interactional sociolinguistics, pragmatics, response-based therapy (counselling), rhetoric stylistics (linguistics), sublanguage analysis, text linguistics, as well as variation analysis. They also note that although these approaches emphasise different aspects of language use, they all view language as social interaction. Consequently, it is the fact that discourse analysis has no laid down procedure of analysis but, rather, adopts any approach such as descriptive approach, statistical approach, etc., which are suitable to enable it reflect the meaning associated with a social context in a given discourse activity. These constitute the strengths of DA which makes is suitable for this study

3. Research methodology

This study is a qualitative research adopting DA in revealing the ideologies/socio-psychological characteristics of President Jonathan, which guide his actions. From the internet, copies of his 2012, 2013 and 2014 Independence Day speeches are obtained, transcribed and analysed. The study adopts a purposive sampling technique to select the three identified speeches out of the five Independence Day speeches delivered by the speaker because they are most current of his Independence Day speeches which address the most contemporary of the country's issues at the time. The study analyses the components of the speeches to evaluate their sequence of occurrence, as well as their inter-relatedness in the

entire speech, which helps to reveal the speaker's manner of language use and subsequently, his ideologies/socio-psychological characteristics guiding or controlling or determining his actions.

4. Data analysis: Ideological analysis of President Goodluck Jonathan's speeches during Nigeria's Independence Day celebrations

4.1. Analysis of the use of pronouns and pronominals

Pronouns were employed by President Goodluck Jonathan in ways that reflect his ideology in his 2012, 2013 and 2014 Independence Day speeches. These were used to create different effects.

4.1.1. Use of personal pronouns

Dr. Jonathan employed the 1st person singular pronouns- 'I' (subject) or 'me' (object), second person plural- you (plural), the 1st person plural pronoun- we (subject) or us (plural), as well as the 3rd person plural- they (subject) or them (object). However, the functions they were used to perform differ in the respective speeches.

A. Use of 1st person singular pronoun

I/*me* was employed in several sentences to perform a number of functions as presented and analysed below.

(I) Instances of his use of 'I/me' in offering encouragements

2012: **I** call on every Nigerian to remain steadfast…. **(Sentence15)**
Other examples occur in sentences **(Sentences 16, 18).**

2013: **I** implore every Nigerian…let us join together to fight this evil of extremism. **(Sentence58)**

2014: **I** enjoin the Independent National Electoral Commission (INEC), all security agencies… to consolidate on the gains of the recent elections **(Sentence56)**

I therefore enjoin all our citizens to continue to adhere strictly to all the guidelines that have been given by our health officials **(Sentence104)**

(II) Instances of his use of 'I/me' in personalised expressions

2012: **I** have an unshaken belief in the future of our great Country **(Sentence19)**
I consider it a priority and sacred duty to continue to strengthen the bond of unity **(Sentence20)**

2013: **I** admit that these may not be the best of times **(Sentence15)**
Other examples occur in sentences **(Sentences 17, 52, 69, 102).**

2014: To **me**, the National Conference is the greatest centenary gift **(Sentence45)**
I am more than confident that our tomorrow will be better than our yesterday and today **(Sentence109)**

(III) Instances of his use of 'I/me' in making assurances

2012: Nigeria, **I** assure you, will continue to grow from strength to strength **(Sentence22)**
Other examples occur in sentences **(Sentences 72, 82)**

2013: But **I** assure you, they will not succeed. **(Sentence54)**
Other examples occur in sentences **(Sentences 57, 64, 71, 74)**

2014: …let **me** restate that our task of building a better and greater country must not waver. **(Sentence26)**
Other examples occur in sentences **(Sentences 41, 43)**

(IV) Instances of his use of 'I/me' to reflect his status or high

2012: Since **I** assumed office as President of our dear country on the 6th of May 2010, **I** have continued to work with our countrymen and women to enhance our nation's growth and development. **(Sentence23)**
Other examples occur in sentences **(Sentences 35, 65, 73, 77).**

2013: It has also allowed my predecessors and **I** to…make political capital out of a state occasion **(Sentence12).**
Other examples occur in sentences **(Sentences 27, 63, 66)**

2014: In my address to the nation last year, **I** did emphasise that we were in a sober moment **(Sentence8)**
I have started by setting up the Ministerial Committee **(Sentence42)**

(V) Instances of his use of 'I/me' in making promises

2012: … by the time **I** address you on our next independence anniversary, many of our reform efforts would have yielded even better results **(Sentence78)**

2013: In all that **I** have done, **I** have been guided by this sacred obligation, to work hard for the good of Nigeria and to make life better for Nigerians. **(Sentence70)**

2014: **I** will continue to do all it takes to enable them to keep on inflicting devastating blows at the heart of terror. **(Sentence21)**

Again, it can be observed that the President, in rare cases, also employs the pronoun **me** (object) with the first person plural **we** (subject) in making assurances too. Examples are:

Let **me** assure all Nigerians that **we** shall not fail. **(2012: Sentence81);**

But let **me** assure you that, if **we** do not despair, **we** shall reap the reward of our labour in due season **(2013: Sentence103)**

(VI) Instances of his use of 'I/me' in making salutations and wishes

2013: **I** would like to say congratulations to us all. **(Sentence2)**

Other examples occur in sentences **(Sentences 40, 106, 107)**

2014: **I** thank all Nigerians for working together to prevent what could have become a major epidemic. **(Sentence106)**

I particularly thank the medical personnel **(Sentence107)**

(VII) Instances of the use of 'I/me' in making requests

2014: **I** ask that you lay down your arms and embrace peace. **(Sentence24)**

I urge every Nigerian to put aside political, sectional or other parochial considerations **(Sentence34)**

(VIII) Instances of the use of 'I/me' in making assertions

2014: To those who have genuine grievances, **I** affirm that Nigeria will listen to you **(216)**

Table 1: Tabulation of the number of roles performed with 1st person singular pronoun

Year	Number of roles performed with the 1st person singular pronoun	Percentage increase in the number of roles
2012	5	**-**
2013	6	**20%**
2014	8	**33.3%**

One glaring observation is that the roles/functions which the President plays using the 1st person singular pronoun increased progressively from 5 in 2012, to 6 in 2013, and then, to 8 in 2014. In 2013, he adds the function of using this pronoun to reach out to the citizens in salutation, commendation and making of wishes as he talks to his subjects while in 2014, he adds the functions of using it to make requests and make assertions against terrorists in Nigeria. This implies that he is gradually realising the extent of power and autonomy attached to his office as the 'Head of State and Commander-In-Chief of the Federal Republic of Nigeria'.

B. The use of 1st person plural pronoun- 'we/us'

1st person plural pronoun- 'we' (subject) or 'us' (object) is one that is well employed within his speeches: as an 'in-group' expression (referring to all Nigerians, including himself and his administration) and as an 'out-group' expression (referring to only himself and his administration). Instances of their use are presented below.

(I) Instances of his use of 'we/us' as an in-group expression

2012: …**we** are the inheritors of a great legacy that goes even much farther into the past. **(Sentence5)**

Other examples occur in sentences **11, 12, 13, 14, 17, 53, 64, 75.**

2013: First and foremost, I would like to say congratulations to **us** all. **(Sentence2)**

Other examples occur in sentences **3, 4, 5-8, 18, 19, 22, 23, 25-27, 30,**

33, 24, 40, 42-46, 48, 51, 64, 69, 72, 73, 75, 78, 84, 98, 100, 103 and **104.**

2014: **We** made some far reaching advances in building a strong, united and prosperous nation. **(Sentence4)**

Other examples occur in sentences **5, 7-9, 11, 207, 23, 35, 44, 45, 47-52, 55, 67, 90, 91, 93, 94, 105, 108-114** and **115.**

(II) Instances of his use of 'we/us' as an out-group expression

2012: **We** are working hard and making progress on many fronts. **(Sentence24)**

Other examples occur in sentences **25, 33, 34, 36, 41, 45-48, 51, 52, 54, 60-62, 64, 66** and **81.**

2013: **we** should not be scoring political points **(Sentence13)**

Other examples occur in sentences **14, 42.**

2014: While **we** continue to deploy our resources in the fight against the terrorists, **we** do recognise the great toll the conflict is taking on our people. **(Sentence27)**

Other examples occur in sentences **28, 29, 31, 37-39, 41, 42, 53, 60, 61, 68, 71, 73, 75, 77, 80, 81, 84** and **88.**

The data above is presented thus:

Table 2: Comparing the use of 'we/us' in 2012 and 2013

Year	Number of usage of 1st person plural pronoun as an in-group expression	Number of usage of 1st person plural pronoun as an out-group expression
2012	10	19
2013	36	2
Percentage Increase	**260%**	**-**
Percentage Decrease	**-**	**850%**

Table 3: Comparing the use of 'we/us' in 2013 and 2014

Year	Number of usage of 1st person plural pronoun as an in-group expression	Number of usage of 1st person plural pronoun as an out-group expression
2013	36	2
2014	33	21
Percentage increase	**-**	**950%**
Percentage Decrease	**8.3%**	**-**

Observation shows that in the 2012 Independence Day speech, he paid greater attention in using 'we' (subject) or 'us' (object) as out-group expression than as in-group expression (19 against 10). However, this drastically reduced in 2013 by 260% with increase in the use of the pronoun as in-group expression, while its usage as out-group expression decreased greatly by 850%. In the 2nd table, observation equally shows that the use of this pronoun as in-group expression decreased a little by 8.3% while his use of it as out-group expression increased greatly by 950%.

This shows the extent these two factors ('giving account of stewardship to the Nigerian citizenry' and 'scoring political points by highlighting the achievements of his administration') have greatly affected his focus in the speeches. 2012 was a period of lesser activities of terrorism while 2013 was the reverse as it recorded immense cases of terrorist activities. The change in the usage of this pronoun in 2014 can be attributed to the balancing of his focus on the two factors influencing his speech.

(C) The use of the 3rd person plural pronoun- 'they'

The use of the 'they' (subject) or them (object) is very much limited. It is used in the following instances:

2012: Beloved countrymen and women, on this day, fifty-two years ago, our founding fathers brought joy and hope to the hearts of our people when **they** won independence **(1)**

Other examples occur in sentences **7, 10**

2013: We should rejoice in our democracy because it enables us to be united by our differences, not destroyed by **them. (Sentence42)**
Other examples occur in sentences **53, 54, 64, 81, 82**

2014: **They** will not succeed! **(Sentence12)**
Other examples occur in sentences **13, 14, 15, 16, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23.**

The data show that the President uses this pronoun only four times in his 2012 speech to create an effect on the listener- which is, to place the founding fathers of the country on one side, and the rest of the citizens on another, and in-between, create a point of aspiration, which the citizens ought to always work to attain (sentences 1, 7 and 10). It was, on the other hand, employed only six times in 2013 to refer to the differences that disrupt the country's unity (sentence 42), separate the true Nigerians from the terrorists (sentence 53 and 54), the people who have developed belief in Nigeria from those who have not and are hoping to do so (sentence 64), as well as, the values of democracy from undemocratic values (sentences 81 and 82). In 2014, it is employed to separate Nigerians whom he reckons as 'faithful' from those 'unfaithful' (sentences 19, 20, 22) and the politicians from the rest of the citizenry (sentence 244). He equally employed it only 10 times in 2014 to imply a separation of the terrorists from the people who are 'true' Nigerians (sentences 12-16 and 21).

The use of this pronoun is, thus, very much limited in the Independence Day speeches of President Jonathan as it implies divisibility. That is, it creates the idea of separating a person or persons from the rest of the citizenry. Thus, since as observed, the President prefers the use of pronouns that denote 'collective responsibility', his using this pronoun is limited; it occurred only 16 times throughout the three speeches.

Based on this fact, he equally makes less use of the 2nd person plural pronoun- 'you' in referring to the citizens who mainly constitute his audience. Thus, in the entire speech, 'you' and 'your' are minimally used as they collectively occurred only 24 times in his entire Independence Day speeches.

4.1.2. The use of possessive pronouns

Possessive pronouns such as 'our/ours' and 'their' are observed in the Independence Day speeches of President Jonathan. These are presented and analysed also.

(A) Use of possessive pronoun- 'my'

'My' was also employed in the 2012, 2013 and 2014 Independence Day speeches of President Jonathan in various degrees. Instances are shown below.

2012: I have given **my** commitment of non-interference in the work of the relevant agencies and I am keeping **my** word **(Sentence65)**

2013: It has also allowed **my** predecessors and I to comment on our stewardship to the nation and make political capital out of a state occasion. **(Sentence12)**

Other examples occur in sentences **17, 34, 41, 55, 62, 66, 71, 79, 90, 104.**

2014: In **my** address to the nation last year, I did emphasize that we were in a sober moment **(Sentence8)**

Other examples occur in sentences **18, 37, 58, 101.**

The data shows that the President employs the possessive pronoun 'my' in very rare cases as it is a pronoun, which refers to himself and also indicates a personalisation of affairs, issues or phenomenon. He used it only in a sentence in his speech of 2012 to create an effect on the listener- which is, emphasising his proposed personal action of not interfering in the duties of agencies set up to fight corruption (sentence **65**). It was, on the other hand, employed in 11 sentences in 2013 and, then, employed in only 5 instances in 2014. Thus, its usage is limited and only employed to achieve the single obviously identified purpose. Thus, the very limited usage of 'my', buttresses the earlier made observation that the president prefers pronouns which imply collectivism, rather than individualism.

(B) Use of the possessive pronoun- 'our/ours'

'Our/ours' was also employed in the 2012, 2013 and 2014 Independence Day speeches of President Jonathan to perform desired functions. Instances are shown below.

(I) Instances of his use of the possessive pronoun 'our/ours' as in-group expression

2012: …**our** founding fathers brought joy and hope to the hearts of **our** people **(Sentence1)**

Other examples occur in sentences **3, 9, 11-15, 19, 20, 23, 25, 32, 39, 41, 45, 53, 55, 58, 60, 69, 71, 75, 77** and **78**

2013: …today marks 53 years of **our** Independence as a nation **(Sentence 1)**

… Other examples occur in sentences **4, 6, 8, 11, 14, 16, 18-20, 23, 24, 26-28, 33, 34, 36-38, 40, 42, 51, 52, 59, 60, 72, 76, 79, 87, 96-98, 100-103** and **104**

2014: Today marks the 54th anniversary of **our** country's independence **(Sentence 1)**

Other examples occur in sentences **2, 6, 8, 10, 11, 15, 17, 18, 22-25, 26, 35, 38, 44-46, 50, 55, 60, 61, 67, 70, 76, 77, 80, 88, 93, 95-97, 99, 100, 103, 104, 108-110** and **111.**

(II) Instances of his use of the possessive pronoun 'our/ours' as out-group expression

2012: This is a central objective of **our** administration's Transformation Agenda. **(Sentence21)**

Other examples occur in sentences **24, 25, 36, 41, 42, 50, 59, 72, 76, 78, 79, 80**

2013: It has also allowed my predecessors and I to comment on **our** stewardship **(Sentence12)**

Other examples occur in sentences **31, 34, 56, 57, 65, 68, 87.**

2014: We are still in that mood in spite of the many accomplishments of **our** administration **(Sentence9)**

Other examples occur in sentences **27**, **31, 47, 51, 57-59, 70, 73, 76, 77, 79, 80, 91, 92, 104.**

Table 4: Tabulation of the use of 'our/ours' as in-group or out-group expression

Year	Number of usage of 1st person plural possessive pronoun as an in-group expression	Number of usage of 1st person plural possessive pronoun as an out-group expression
2012	25	13
2013	38	8
2014	40	17

Observation shows that the President adopts 'our/ours' mainly as in-group expressions than as out-group expression with 25 instances against 13 in 2012, 38 instances against 8 in 2013, and 40 instances against 17 in 2014. This, indeed, reflects the ideological attempts of the President to prefer collective responsibility to individualistic or group-restricted one. This portrays the President as unwilling to take full responsibility of the state of the nation, together with his administration; rather, he prefers to place the responsibility in the hands of every Nigerian.

(C) Use of the possessive pronoun- 'their'

The President also employed 'their'. Instances are presented below.

2012: I want to reassure all affected Nigerians that I share in **their** grief **(Sentence 72)**

2013: But our independence celebration is about the same people, the people of Nigeria: **their** industry, sense of mission and purpose, and **their** patience **(Sentence40)**

Other examples occur in sentences **53, 59, 64.**

2014: …it is important that we remember all the precious souls that have been lost in the unprecedented war of terror unleashed…by these individuals who want to compel us to live our lives **their** way **(Sentence11)**

Other examples occur in sentences **13, 15, 20, 31, 33, 35.**

The data above shows that the President employs 'their' in rare cases as it implies 'out-group' rather than 'in-group'. He used it only once in his 2012 speech to place the 'grieving citizens' on one end and 'himself' on another, and create the idea of

'his caring charisma' existing in-between (sentence 72). It was, on the other hand, employed in 2013 mostly to separate the efforts of ordinary Nigerians, which he views as 'positive' from those of the politicians and terrorists, which he views as negative (sentence 40, 53, 59 and 64), and, then, employed in the most recurring instances in 2014 to connote a separation of the terrorists from the people who are 'true' Nigerians (sentence 13, 15, 20, 31 and 35). Apart from these, the president shows more preference of pronouns that connote 'unity' and 'collective responsibility'.

4.1.3. Use of demonstrative pronouns

The demonstrative pronouns '**this**' and the plural form '**these**' occur in the Independence Day speeches of President Jonathan. Instances occur below:

2012: …on **this** day, fifty-two years ago…. **(1)**
Other examples occur in sentences **6, 15, 21, 36, 50, 52, 55, 58, 64, 67, 68, 72**

2013: Through thick and thin, we have built **this** country together **(3),**
Other examples occur in sentences **10, 13-15, 17, 27, 33, 34, 37, 38, 44, 54, 55, 58, 60-62, 66, 67, 70, 75, 77-79, 83, 97, 99** and **101.**

2014: **This** is also the tenth month of our journey into a new century, having marked the centenary of our nation in January **this** year. **(2)**
Other examples occur in sentences **11, 18, 22, 23, 28, 30, 32, 34, 35, 42, 58, 67, 69, 72, 74, 76, 77, 81, 86-88, 93, 100-102** and **107.**

Important observation to be made from the use of 'this' and 'these' is that aside the regular job of a pronoun replacing a noun in a sentence, President Jonathan employs it also in making emphasis; emphasising a situation, a day, a fact, a phenomenon, etc. thus, we observe expressions such as "this administration" **(Speech 2012: Sentence58),** "this scourge" **(Speech 2012: Sentence64),** "this country" **(Speech 2013: Sentence3)**, etc.

Another demonstrative pronoun which the President equally employed is '**those**'. In the three speeches, he employed it in a miserly 8 instances as seen below:

2012: **Those** who witnessed the lowering of the Union Jack…. **(Sentence4)**
Those challenges should not deter us. **(Sentence70)**

2013: **Those** who are elected to govern… **(Sentence31)**
Other examples occur in sentences **37, 51** and **55.**

2014: …**those** waging war against our country **(24)**

...**those** who have genuine grievances **(25)**

Thus, just as in the case of his general choice of pronouns, the President also avoids demonstrative pronouns since they do not portray sense of collectiveness; recording only 11 instances, in all three speeches.

4.2. Analysis of the use of declarative expressions

Of the four types of sentence that are known to exist in the English language (declarative sentences, interrogative sentences, imperative sentences and exclamatory sentences), it is observed that declarative sentences are common in President Jonathan's 2012, 2013 and 2014 Independence Day speeches.

Declarative sentences state things the way they and are said to be statements of fact. Examples of declarative sentences in these speeches include:

2012: Over the years, several leaders have built on the foundation laid by our Founding Fathers **(Sentence79)**

Other examples occur in sentences **80, 84.**

2013: Fellow Nigerians, today marks 53 years of our Independence as a nation. **(1)**

If we look back over the years, we can say confidently that there is every reason to celebrate. **(7)**

2014: The first one hundred years were marked by triumphs and tribulations… **(3)**

We have proven that we are truly a resilient nation. **(7)**

The preference of declarative sentences in these speeches are attributed to the president's attempts to ensure that his speeches reflect his communication purpose; are informative and viewed as authentic rather than vague and questionable. Consequently, he resorts to using these declarative sentences in order to assume the right personality of a strong, confident and reliable leader.

5. Summary of findings and conclusion

From the investigation of the ideologies/socio-psychological characteristics of President Jonathan as reflected in his Independence Day Speeches, the research observes that he employed the 1st person singular pronouns- 'I/me' to personalise some statements, reflect his high status, state activities he solely undertook, offer

encouragements and make assurances and promises in 2012. The use of this pronoun, however, increased to six in 2013, as he added to the previous functions/roles, the offering of greetings or making of wishes. In 2014, the role of this pronoun equally increased to eight as he employed it in making requests and in making assertions, among the other previously highlighted purposes. The result shows that the President gradually realised the extent of power and autonomy attached to his office as the President in the exercise of his functions/duties as the Head of State and Commander-In-Chief of the Armed Forces of the Federal Republic of Nigeria, as years rolled by; knowing he did not always need to rely on his cabinet and administrative cohorts.

The research equally observes that the President employed the pronoun *we/us.* In 2012, he used it to refer to himself and his administration (out-group) rather than the entire Nigerian citizenry (in-group). This drastically changed in 2013 as he used it to majorly refer to the entire citizenry, while in 2014, there was a relative balance in its usage for both functions. This showed the extent to which two factors- 'giving account of stewardship to the Nigerian citizenry' and 'scoring political points by highlighting the achievements of his administration', greatly affected his focus in the speeches.

Furthermore, his use of 'our' as an incorporating pronoun for the entire citizenry than for just himself and his administration highlighted his unwillingness to take sole responsibility of the situation or current state of Nigeria and the events happening there-in. This research equally establishes that the president did not like to use pronouns such as *my*, *you/your*, *they/them*, *their*, and the demonstratives *this/these* and *those* and their likes because they reflect division or separatism, class/status differentiation, which do not reflect unity and collectivity of Nigerian citizens. The research also observes that the President utilised more of declarative sentences to ensure that his speeches were informative and perceived as authentic, rather than as sceptical and questionable; as well as, to enable him assume the right personality of a strong, confident and reliable leader through his speeches.
This study, originally conducted in 2014, has been able to reveal the ideologies of President Jonathan, thus predicting with the help of DA, the challenges he will face as a consequence of his ideologies/socio-psychological characteristics, which came to fulfilment. It is, therefore, a proof that DA is a highly effective tool that

will help people, citizens, voters and followers of political leaders and aspirations in knowing the ideologies held by these individuals so as to guide their choices of followership or support for politicians; especially in Nigeria. The study, therefore, recommends that DA should always and continually be put into crucial use in order to ensure that Nigerian citizens do not get deceived into voting or supporting political candidates whose ideologies/socio-psychological characteristics they know nothing about, for a greater purpose of voting and supporting the right candidates and ultimately achieving better governance of the Nigerian society and the world generally.

References

Bowles H (2008) 'Meaning and discourse in English. In: *Lingua Inglese 2 llem, Modulo 2 2008-9.* Lessons 1-17 summaries.

Brown G and Yule G (1983) *Discourse Analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Fairclough N (2001) *Language and Power* (2nd ed). London, UK: Pearson Eduction.

Fang J, Grunberg D, et al. (2017) Discourse Analysis of Lyric and Lyric-based Classification of Music. In: *18th International Society for Music Information Retrieval Conference*, Suzhou, China, 23-27 October 2017.

Gee JP (2005) *An Introduction of Discourse Analysis: Theory and Method* (2nd ed). New York: Routledge.

Guthrie GH (2001) Discourse Analysis. In: Black DA and Dockery DS (eds) *Interpreting the New Testament: Essays on Methods and Issues*.Nashville: B&H, PP. 255.

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Conversation_analysis. Accessed 06 November 2017.

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Discourse_analysis. Accessed 06 November 2017.

Jones HR, Chik A and Hafner C (eds) (2015) *Discourse and Digital Practices: Doing Discourse Analysis in the Digital Age*. New York: Routledge.

Kelley N (2016) A Brief Introduction to Discourse Analysis. Available at: https://kelleys 4christ.files.wordpress.com/2010/09/a-brief-introduction-to-discourse-analysis.pdf. (Accessed 06 November 2017).

McCarthy M (2011) *Discourse Analysis for Language Teachers*. Cambridge: Cambridge
University Press.

Obitube KO (2014) *A Discourse Analysis of the Independence Day Speeches of President Goodluck Jonathan*. M.A. Dissertation, University of Nigeria, Nsukka.

Porter SE (1995) Discourse analysis and new testament studies: An introductory survey. In: Porter SE and Carson DA (eds) *Discourse Analysis and Other Topics in Biblical Greek, Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series 113*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press.

Reed JT (1996) Discourse analysis as a new testament hermeneutic: A retrospective and prospective appraisal. *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 39/2.

Schegloff E (1992) Introduction. In: Sacks H (ed) *Lectures on Conversation* (Vol.1: Fall 1964-Spring 1968). Oxford: Blackwell.

Schreiber BR (2017) Review of discourse and digital practices: Doing discourse analysis in the digital age. *Language Learning & Technology,* 21(1): 52-55.

Van Dijk TA (1999) Critical discourse analysis and conversation analysis. *Discourse & Society,* 10(4): 459–460. London: SAGE publications.

Warburton T (2016) Turning the lens: Reflexivity in research & teaching with critical discourse analysis. *Critical Questions in Education (Special Issue) 7:3 Fall 2016.*

Yatsko, VA (2013) Integrational Discourse Analysis Conception. http://yatsko.zohosites.com /integrational-discourse-analysis-conception.html. (Accessed on 22/08/2014).