ANALYSIS OF SPEECH ACTS IN SELECTED MILITARY AND CIVILIAN SPEECHES OF PRESIDENT OBASANJO

AMINU BASIRU

**FACULTY OF LANGUAGES AND LINGUISTICS
UNIVERSITY OF MALAYA
KUALA LUMPUR, MALAYSISA.**

2015

ANALYSIS OF SPEECH ACTS IN SELECTED MILITARY AND CIVILIAN SPEECHES OF PRESIDENT OBASANJO

AMINU BASIRU

DISSERTATION SUBMITTED IN FULFILMENT OF THE REQUIREMENT FOR THE DEGREE OF MASTER OF LINGUISTIC

FACULTY OF LANGUAGES AND LINGUISTICS
UNIVERSITY OF MALAYA
KUALA LUMPUR
2015

UNIVERSITY OF MALAYA

ORIGINAL LITERARY WORK DECLARATION

Name of Candidate: Aminu Basiru

Registration/Matric No: TGC 120071

Name of Degree: Master of Linguistics

Title of Project Paper/Research Report/Dissertation/Thesis ("This work")

Analysis of Speech Acts in Selected Military and Civilian Speeches of President Obasanjo

Field of study: Pragmatics

I do solemnly and sincerely declare that:

(1)   **I am the sole author/writer of this work;**

(2)   **This work is original;**

(3)   **Any use of any work in which copyright exists was done by way of fair dealing and for permitted purposes and any excerpt or extract from, or reference to or reproduction of any copyright work has been disclosed expressly and sufficiently and the title of the work and its authorship have been acknowledge in this work;**

(4)   **I do not have any actual knowledge nor do I ought reasonably to know that the making of this work constitutes an infringement of any copyright work;**

(5)   **I hereby assign all and every rights in the copyright to this Work to the University of Malaya ("UM"), who henceforth shall be owner of the copyright in this work and that any written consent of UM having been first had and obtained;**

(6)   **I am fully aware that if in the course of making this work I have infringed any copyright whether intentionally or otherwise, I may be subjected to legal action or other action as may be determined by UM.**

     Candidate signature   **Date**

Subscribe and solemnly declared before,

     Witness's signature

Name: Dr. Veronica Lowe   **Date**

Designation: Supervisor

ABSTRACT

The objectives of this study are to identify and analyse the commissives and directives that occur in Obasanjo's selected military and civilian speeches. The study will again look at the similarities and differences between the commissives in his selected military and civilian speeches as well as the directives in his selected military and civilian speeches. This study will be of significant to Nigerian leaders and politicians because it will guide them on how to use language. It will also be of benefit to Nigerians since it will give them idea about what their leaders are up to. Likewise to General public and students of Pragmatics who are interest on political discourse. The study uses qualitative research method, the data for this study are six selected speeches of President Obasanjo, three from his military period and another three from his civilian period. This data are generated from the web sites, book and national daily newspapers. The theory apply for this study is Searle, (1976).

The result shows that in the military and civilian commissives President Obasanjo performs 12 promises in the military speeches and 27 promises in his selected civilian speeches. In the military directives he performs 14 different kinds of directives namely advice, commands and warning while in the civilian directives he performs 8 different kinds of directives namely request, commands and warning. The similarities between Obasanjo's military and civilian commissives are he performs promises in both speeches. Another similarity is that he uses first person plural pronoun *we* to share his responsibility, he also uses the modal auxiliary *will, shoul*d and *must* in both military and civilian speeches to express willingness, futurity and strengthen his commitment. He also uses adverbs such as *immediatel*y, *quickly, anytime* in both military and civilian commissives to show his readiness. The difference in the military commissives he has not use the first

person pronoun to represent himself unlike in the civilian where he uses first person singular pronoun *i* to commit himself and show his individual and personal responsibility.

The similarities between Obasanjo's military and civilian directives are in the military and civilian speeches he performs speech act of commands and warning. Another similarity between these speeches is that he uses first person plural pronoun *i* to show his individual responsibility, personal feelings and deep attachment to the acts he is performing. The difference between the directives in the military and civilian is that in the military directives he uses the modal auxiliary *should* while in the civilian directives he uses the modal *must*. Another important difference between the two is that the directives in the military centred on nation building, education and patriotism. The directives in the civilian centre on fighting corruption, promoting the image of the nation, drawing the attention of Nigerians to participate on nation building. Another difference is that in the military directives he performs the act of advice while in the civilian directives he performs the act of request.

ABSTRAK

Objektif-objektif kajian ini adalah untuk mengenalpasti dan menganalisis komisif dan arahan yang berlaku dalam ucapan-ucapan ketenteraan dan awam Obasanjo yang terpilih. Kajian ini akan melihat kepada persamaan dan perbezaan antara komisif dan arahan dalam kedua-dua ucapan-ucapan ketenteraan dan awam yang terpilih. Kajian ini akan memberi kepentingan kepada pemimpin Nigeria dan ahli-ahli politik kerana ia akan membimbing mereka bagaimana untuk menggunakan bahasa. Ia juga akan memberi faedah kepada masyarakat Nigeria kerana ia akan memberi idea tentang apa yang pemimpin-pemimpin mereka sedang lakukan. Begitu juga kepada orang awam dan pelajar-pelajar Pragmatik yang berminat dalam wacana politik. Kajian ini menggunakan kaedah kajian kualitatif, data untuk kajian ini adalah enam ucapan Presiden Obasanjo yang terpilih, tiga daripadanya daripada zaman ketenteraannya dan tiga yang lain daripada zaman awamnya. Data ini diambil daripada laman sesawang, buku dan akhbar-akhbar kebangsaan harian. Teori yang diaplikasikan untuk kajian ini adalah Searle, 1976.

Hasil kajian menunjukkan bahawa di dalam komisif ketenteraan dan awam Presiden Obasanjo melaksanakan tindakan 12 janji di dalam ucapan-ucapan ketenteraan dan 27 janji di dalam ucapan-ucapan awam yang terpilih. Di dalam arahan ketenteraan, beliau melaksanakan tindakan 14 jenis arahan yang berbeza seperti nasihat, arahan dan amaran sementara di dalam arahan awam beliau melaksanakan 8 jenis arahan yang berbeza seperti permintaan, arahan dan amaran. Persamaan antara komisif ketenteraan dan awam Obasanjo adalah beliau melaksanakan tindakan janji-janji dalam kedua-dua ucapan. Persamaan yang lain adalah beliau menggunakan kata ganti nama majmuk pertama *kami* untuk berkongsi tanggungjawab, beliau juga menggunakan mod auxillary *akan*, *perlu* dan *mesti* dalam kedua-dua ucapan ketenteraan dan awam untuk meluahkan kesanggupan,

peristiwa yang akan datang dan memperkukuhkan komitmennya. Beliau juga menggunakan adverb seperti *dengan segera*, *dengan cepat*, *bila-bila masa* dalam kedua-dua komisif ketenteraan dan awam untuk menunjukkan kesediaannya. Perbezaannya terdapat dalam komisif ketenteraaan di mana beliau tidak menggunakan kata ganti nama pertama untuk mewakili dirinya sendiri, tetapi berlainan dalam komisif awam di mana beliau menggunakan kata ganti nama majmuk *Saya* untuk melakukan dan menunjukkan dirinya secara individu dan tanggungjawab peribadi.

Persamaan antara arahan ketenteraan dan awam Obasanjo adalah di dalam ucapan-ucapan ketenteraan dan awam beliau melaksanakan tindakan ucapan arahan dan amaran. Persamaan yang lain antara ucapan-ucapan ini adalah beliau menggunakan kata ganti nama pertama majmuk *Saya* untuk menunjukkan tanggungjawab individu, perasaan peribadi dan ikatan yang mendalam pada tindakan-tindakan yang beliau lakukan.

Perbezaan antara arahan dalam ketenteraan dan awam adalah di dalam arahan ketenteraan beliau menggunakan mod auxillary *perlu* sementara di dalam arahan awam beliau menggunakan mod *mesti*. Antara perbezaan penting yang lain antara kedua-duanya adalah arahan di dalam pusat ketenteraan dalam pembinaan negara, pendidikan dan patriotisme. Arahan di dalam pusat awam adalah mengenai memerangi rasuah, mempromosikan imej negara, menarik perhatian masyarakat Nigeria untuk mengambil bahagian dalam pembinaan negara. Perbezaan yang lain adalah di dalam arahan ketenteraan di mana beliau melaksanakan tindakan nasihat, sementara di dalam arahan awam beliau melaksanakan tindakan permintaan

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW

LIST OF TABLES

Pages

APPENDICES

Pages

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background of the study

Nigeria as a country, is a product of the British colonial rulers who amalgamated the southern and the northern Protectorates in 1914, to what has become known today as Nigeria. The country is the most populous in Africa with an estimated population of 170 million people (Odumegwu, 2013). It is made up of more than 450 registered languages (Gut, 2004). Out of these 450 registered languages, Hausa, Yoruba and Igbo are considered the major ones. Apart from the major ethnic groups, there are other languages of national importance. Speakers of each language are normally concentrated in one area. For example, Hausas live in the North, Yorubas in the West, while the Igbos live in the East. But today due to socioeconomic reasons, many live in other parts of the country and speak the language of the host community. For instance, Igbo traders live in the North and speak the Hausa language, Hausas live in the West and speak the Yoruba language and Yorubas live in the East and speak the Igbo language.

In situations where interactions between families and friends of the same ethnic group occur, native languages are maintained. However, interactions between speakers of different languages where one of the interlocutors cannot speak the language of the other, pidgin/broken English or Nigeria Standard English is used depending on the interlocutors' level of education. With the independence on 1st October, 1960, English was adopted as Nigeria's official language of communication in politics, business, courts and education (Whitely, 1974). Since the 1960s, the country has had four phases of civilian dispensations and over 26 years of the military rule. Among the individuals that ruled the country, President Olusegun Obasanjo was the only person that ruled as a military Head of State from 1976 to 1979 and as civilian President, from 1999 to 2007.

Political speech has been approached by different scholars from different disciplines. Some of these scholars approached it from the field of anthropology, psychology, political science and others looked at it from the linguistics perspectives. Within the linguistics itself, linguists looked at political speech from different areas such as semantics, stylistics, sociolinguistics, discourse analysis, critical discourse analysis, and pragmatics. For the purpose of this study, political speech will be explored from the pragmatic point of view. Beard (2002) states that politics is understood as a struggle by politicians to gain and retain power among themselves. This struggle is done through the use of language. For that reason, Taiwo (2009) states that language is a catalyst of power, it initiates debate, incites support, or revolt. Therefore, the importance of language in every aspect of human endeavour cannot be overemphasised. Remi and Chris (2013) conclude that "language is a powerful tool for everyday communication" (p. 105).

Speech act theory, the central point of this study, originated from the work of John Langshaw Austin, which he presented at William James lectures in Harvard University in 1955. This lecture was later published in his book *How to Do Things with Words* (Austin, 1962). Speech act is defined as the use of language to perform several meaningful acts such as promises, threats (commissives); statements of facts, assertions, beliefs (assertives); commands, advice and warnings (directives); *I declare you husband and wife*, *I pronounce you guilty* (declaration); congratulations, condolence (expressives) (Searle, 1976). This definition sounds comprehensive and convincing, for the reason that it portrays speech act in a clearer, simpler and a comprehensive way, at the same time, it describes what speech act theory is all about.

This study focuses on two out of the five categories of speech acts by Searle (1976), thus: commissives and directives. Commissives: are defined as the use of language by the

speaker to express his intention regarding what he or she intends to do in the future. The typical examples of this speech act are promises and threats. Directives: refer to the use of language by the speaker to tell listeners to do something in the future. Examples of this speech act include requests, commands and advice (Searle, 1976). The rationale behind selecting commissives and directives as the focus of this study is to see how President Obasanjo use language to commits himself to future acts during his tenure as a military Head of State as well as a civilian President, and to see how he directs addressees to do something during the military and civilian tenure. However, the researcher's reasons for not including other speech acts such as assertives, declaratives and expressives in this analysis is that assertives represent acts that are commonly found in every day human communications either in a formal or non-formal contexts. It is as a result of this that they occur in a large number. Moreover, declaratives symbolise acts that are hardly found even in the speeches of politicians, because they need special procedure and circumstance. That is why, they are described as "a very special category of speech acts" (Searle, 1976, p. 18). On the other hand, expressives signify acts that express the psychological state of the speaker through the sincerity of his/her utterances.

President Olusegun Obasanjo is a Nigerian of Yoruba descent, he was born in March, 1937, in Abeokuta, Ogun State, in the South-West of Nigeria. He joined the Nigerian Army in 1958 and attended military schools in England and India. During the Nigerian civil war, he commanded the Army's 3rd Marine Commando Division that took Oweri, and successfully ended the Nigerian civil war. Obasanjo was the deputy to General Murtala Ramat Muhammad during his time as the Nigerian Head of State. He eventually, became Nigeria's military Head of State when Gen. Murtala Muhammad was assassinated on 13th February, 1976. He continued to rule until 1st October, 1979, when

he handed over power to an elected civilian government of Shehu Aliyu Shagari (Olayiwola, 1991).

Obasanjo was once again elected and sworn-in as Nigeria's President on 29th May, 1999, and served for eight years. The first tenure came to an end on 29th May, 2003, and got re-elected until 29th May, 2007 (Adetunji, 2006). Apart from being a military and civilian President of Nigeria, he is also a prolific writer who published more than 37 books, several letters and numerous speeches delivered locally and internationally. Some of the books written by President Obasanjo are: *My command* (1987), *Not My Will* (1999), *Selected Speeches of President Olusegun Obasanjo of Nigeria* (2000), and *Nzeogwu* (1987). Some of these books written by President Obasanjo are today being used for the teaching of Nigerian history and literature in various schools and colleges.

The researcher have chosen to conduct this study on President Olusegun Obasanjo of Nigeria due to his monumental contributions to the restoration of democracy in Nigeria which earned him special respect locally and internationally. This is because he was the first military Head of State who voluntarily handed-over power to a democratically elected government in 1979, at the time when military officers were looking for the slightest excuse to topple existing regimes (Chiama, 2014). When the military ceased power in 1984, Obasanjo continued to castigate and criticise the successive military governments. This action led to his incarceration by the then military government of General Sani Abacha in 1996. Another important reason that motivated this researcher to study Obasanjo's speeches is his (Obasanjo) wisdom of delivering unscripted speeches. Vidal (1999), a renowned reporter with the United States of America's popular magazine, *Outcry*, says that Obasanjo "can be considered an orator who made his presentation without looking at any prepared script. His charismatic attitude won most Nigerians' respect, admiration and appreciation in the hall that night" (p. 2).

1.2 Statement of the problem

In political speech, words choice and the manner through which leaders communicate with their followers need to be handled with care, particularly in heterogeneous society like Nigeria. In the Nigerian context, since the attainment of independence in 1960, successive leaders have delivered speeches on various occasions during the military and the civilian rules. Among these leaders, President Obasanjo was the only individual that ruled the country as a military Head of State and a civilian President. Research have revealed several academic works done on speeches delivered by world leaders as well as Nigerian leaders (McDogal III, 2013; Kamalu & Aganga, 2011; Tarhom & Miracle, 2013). Therefore, even among the Nigerian leaders, the circumstances surrounding the Obasanjo's dual presidencies call for special attention.

It is this uniqueness that gives premise and rationale for the present study to examine some of his selected speeches during the two tenures of his rule. The literature has unveiled that, in the last decade, a number of empirical works have been conducted on various speeches of President Obasanjo from different perspectives (Ayoola, 2005; Okpanachi, 2009; Awonuga, 2005; Adetunji, 2006; Marietu, 2009). So far, none of the previous studies consulted worked on President Obasanjo's speeches as a military and civilian head of governments. Thus, a gap has been identified in the literature and the present study attempts to add to the body of research in political speech by identifying and analysing commissives and directives as speech acts in Obasanjo's military and civilian speeches using Searle's (1976) taxonomy. As stated earlier, President Obasanjo's dual experience as Nigerian military Head of State and civilian President makes his speeches so unique and a worthy source for research. The uniqueness of President Obasanjo compared to other leaders is sufficiently enough to interest a researcher.

1.3 Purpose of the study

The purpose of this study as earlier explained in section 1.1 (the background of the study) is to identify and analyse commissives and directives that occurred in selected military and civilian speeches of President Obasanjo of Nigeria. The speeches selected were delivered during his tenures as military Head of State from 13th February, 1976 to 1st October, 1979, and as an elected civilian President from 29th May, 1999 to 29th May, 2007. The study also aimed at investigating the similarities and differences between the military and civilian commissives as well as the military and civilian directives that occurred in his selected military and civilian speeches.

1.4 Research Objectives

The objectives of this study were:

1. To identify and analyse the commissives and directives speech acts that occurred in President Obasanjo's selected military and civilian speeches.
2. To find out the similarities and differences between the commissives in his selected military and civilian speeches as well as the directives in his selected military and civilian speeches.

As earlier stated in the background of the study (section 1.1), the reason for focusing on commissives and directives is that assertives are commonly found in every day communications, while declaratives are rarely found even in political speeches. Likewise, expressives were excluded on grounds of overlapping with assertive acts.

1.5 Research Questions

This study is geared towards answering the following research questions.

1. What kinds of commissives occur in Obasanjo's selected military and civilian speeches?

2. What kinds of directives occur in President Obasanjo's selected military and civilian speeches?

3. What are the similarities and differences between the commissives in his selected military and civilian speeches?

4. What are the similarities and differences between the directives in his selected military and civilian Speeches?

1.6 Significance of the study

This study will be of significance to Nigerian leaders and politicians. This is because it will guide them to understand how to use language and communicate with their followers. It will also be of importance to Nigerians since it will give them an idea about what their leaders are up to. Likewise, it will be beneficial to the general public and to the students of Pragmatics who are interested in the study of political discourse, because this give them an insight on how leaders communicate. It is anticipated that the outcome of the current study contributes to the existing literature of speech act and political speech in particular, as well as to the field of pragmatics in general.

1.7 Scope and Limitation of the study

The study is limited to investigating and analysing commissives and directives speech acts in the selected speeches of President Obasanjo during his tenure as military Head of State from 13th February, 1976 to 1st October, 1979 as well as civilian President from 29th May, 1999 to 29th May, 2007.

1.8 Summary

This chapter provides an idea about what the current study is all about. This includes areas where political discourse is approached. The chapter gives a brief history of Nigeria and the biography of President Obasanjo, the leader whose speeches are the centre of the study. It also states the reason why this researcher wish to conduct this study. It, as well, contained the problem statement, purpose of the study, research objectives, questions and the significance of the study.

CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Introduction

This chapter undertakes a review of related literature within the sphere of political speech. Initially, it discusses speech acts, relevant theories such as Austin's (1962), Habermas' (1979) and Searle's (1976). The chapter also looked at the application of speech acts in other studies and it explained political speech where it reviewed other studies on political speech and studies on speech acts in political speech.

2.2 Speech acts

The notion of speech acts was first proposed and developed by John Austin (1962) during the William James Lectures at Harvard University in 1955. Though, there was a speculation that this theory was founded prior to Austin's period, scholars such as Wardaugh (1988) are of the view that it originated from the word "constatives and performatives" (p. 275). Therefore, if speech act was derived from the word 'constatives' and 'performatives' as stated above, then it is understood that Austin was the founder of speech act theory. This is because the notion of constatives and performatives was first introduced by J L Austin in 1962.

After Austin, other scholars such as (Searle, 1969; Stubs, 1983; Yule, 1985; Habermas, 1986; Cook, 1989; Rankema, 1993) developed and systematised speech act to its present stage. Since then, speech act theory continued to receive considerable attention from scholars and students of pragmatics. For instance, Tseng (1999) stated that one important approach in pragmatics is the application of the notion of speech act. This scholar posited that the essential insight of speech act is that language performs communicative acts. This

is because language performs different communicative acts. Some of these acts can be verified as true or false and others are performed through actions.

That is why another researcher, such as Akinkulare (2011) described speech act theory as a theory that entails how to perform so many acts through the use of language. His argument was that it originated from the works of Austin (1962) and Searle (1969). Looking at Wardaugh's (1988) argument, it is understood that Austin (1962) is the founder of speech act theory. Mey (2001) proposed that speech acts are those actions we produce verbally and happen in this world. In their own view of speech act, O'Connor and Sandis's (2011) explained that "a nod or hand wave" can be interpreted or understood as an agreement or invitation (p. 59). Looking at O'Connor and Sandis's (2011) supposition, it is enough to conclude that Mey's (2011) definition of speech act appears narrow and has limited speech acts to only verbal utterance. In addition, Osasinwa (2003) describes speech act as:

> … a process in which a person uses an utterance to perform an act such as stating a fact, stating an opinion, confirming or denying something, making a prediction or a request, asking a question, issuing an order, giving a permission, giving a piece of advice, making an offer, making a promise, thanking somebody or condoling somebody (p. 60).

Osasinwas's (2003) definition of speech act above goes in line with Searle's (1969) definition of speech acts. Yule (1994) expounded that the theory of speech act evolves from the fact that language is not just used to explain meaning of words, but rather to perform certain actions through utterances. This definition by Yule (1994) has confirmed Austin's (1962) argument about speech act which resulted to Austin's introduction of constatives and performatives notion of speech act. In order to make it clear, Austin (1962) described speech act theory as "how to do things with words" (p. 2). In other words, as stated by Searle (1979), speech act is the use of language to perform several meaningful acts such as promises, requests, commands, assertions, statements of facts,

expression of joy and sadness. Moreover, he added that speech act is the "basic and minimal unit of linguistic communication" (p. 9). To sum it up, Yule's (1994), Austin's (1962) and Searle's (1969, 1976, 1979) suppositions on speech act provided a comprehensive explanations about speech act. This is because actions are performed through the use of certain utterances. For instance, *I apologise*, and *I pronounce you husband and wife*; these expressions are more than just say but performance of an action which came as a result of the use of language. Therefore, having presented the definitions above, Searle's (1979) definition was adopted for the purpose of the present study as it appears more suitable and relevant.

On the criticism of speech act, scholars like Huang (2007) observed that overlapping occurs between assertives and expressives. A typical example of this overlapping occurs in complaint which is viewed as an expression of statement of fact or assertions and, at the same time, it expresses the speaker's psychological state. For example, if a driver says to his boss "I am not happy with the way you treated me". In this case, he is making a complaint, which is a member of assertive, which can be verified as true or false. At the same time, he is expressing his psychological state of mind which is expressive. Once again, Huang noted that another problem with speech act theory is that it gives no attention to backchannels and feedbacks as well as incomplete sentences. He cited examples such as "was it, oh! and really? which he says they do not fit neatly into the speech act model either, similarly, incomplete sentences such as "but she didn't do the-er-no…" At this point, this present study agree with Huang's (2007) observation that speech act theory has not properly explained these aspects of backchannel and incomplete sentences.

2.2.1 Relevant speech act theories

This section reviews relevant theories of speech acts in order to have a wider and clear understanding of the study. The theories under review include Austin's (1962), Habermas's (1986) and Searle's (1976).

2.2.1.1 Austin's theory of speech acts

It is apparent that Austin made a remarkable contribution to the theory of speech act. That is why some scholars see Austin as the founder of speech act theory (Wardaugh, 1988). In his (Austin, 1962) understanding of speech act, what people say have three different kinds of meanings, thus: the locutionary acts, the illocutionary acts and the perlocutionary acts. The locutionary act is the utterance or act of saying something. The illocutionary act refers to social function of what is being said. The perlocutionary act is the effect of what is being said on the listener (Austin, 1962). For these acts to be successful, Austin provides the following conditions.

1(a) there must be a conventional procedure having a conventional effect.

1(b) the circumstances and persons must be appropriate as specified by the procedure.

(2) the procedure must be executed correctly and completely.

3(a) the persons must have the requisite thoughts, feelings and intentions, as specified in the procedure.

3(b) if consequent conduct is specified then the relevant parties must observe such a consequent conduct.

He further came up with his own taxonomy as follows:

1. Verdictives: are concerned with the utterances of giving verdicts by the authority as the name suggests, by someone who has the authority to do that. They include statement of appraisal, estimate or reckoning. They are also seen as statement of findings such as fact, or value.

2. Exercitives: are utterances where the speaker(s) exercise his authority in performing a particular act such as appointing, voting, warning and advising.

3. Commissives: are utterances that commit the speaker(s) to do something in future and it includes "declaration or announcement of intention". Examples of this class are: promises, undertakings, declarations and announcements.

4. Behavatives: are utterances or what Austin describes as "very miscellaneous group". They are concerned with the speakers "attitudes and social behaviour" (p. 151). Examples of this are: apologising, cursing and challenging.

5. Expositives: the concern of this group is how utterances fit or suit a particular argument or conversation. In a nut shell, this group describes how we use words in general to fit or suit a particular context. Examples are "*I argue*, *I assume*, *I postulate*, *I reply*" (p. 151).

On the criticism of Austin's theory of speech act some scholars are of the view that Searle refined, systematised and advanced Austin's theory of speech act (Huang, 2007). In addition, Searle himself added that "I think the taxonomy (Austin taxonomy) needs to be seriously revised because it contains several weaknesses" (p. 350). Austin himself admitted the weakness of his theory, where he said "I distinguish five more general classes but I am far from equally happy about them" (p. 150). In another instance, he added that the last two classes which are behabatives and expositives "are those I found troublesome, not clear or are cross-classified" (p. 151). This clearly shows that Austin admitted that his theory of speech acts is weak. It is in view of this that this study decided not to incorporate Austin's theory of speech acts, which has been criticised by Austin himself.

2.2.1.2 Habermas theory of speech acts

Habermas is a sociologist and a language philosopher who developed speech acts theory into a theory of formal pragmatics. Habermas (1979) posited that the fundamental objectives of formal pragmatics theory is to analyse universal presuppositions for achievable communication. Pragmatics is "formally an attempt at rationally reconstructing universal and necessary presuppositions and rules of speech actions oriented to reaching understanding" (Habermas, 1984, p. 201). He further added that the rule behind formal pragmatics theory is that a speaker who utters or performs a particular speech act promote common "validity claims". These validity claims are what Habermas described as "comprehensibility, truth, sincerity and rightness". However, he added that for a communication to be successful these validity claims have to be understood and acknowledged by the listener. Effective communication entails that the listener has to understand and agree with a given utterances, otherwise, communication did not take place between the parties (p.138).

In other words, Habermas asserts that for a speech act to succeed, a listener must accept the speech act and enter into a desired relationship. A statement that is articulated with the help of the illocutionary constituent of the speech act. It is in view of this that Habermas classified speech acts into four, as against the Austin's and Searle's classifications. His classification of speech act include constatives, expressives, regulatives and imperatives. These classifications centred on three facets, viz: ontology of three worlds; claims of validity and power; and the pragmatic language function. He went further to explain his classifications as follows:

1. Constatives: these are classes of speech acts that are used to express the actual state of affairs in the objective world and contain truth and falsity representation. He illustrates

this class through the following example "I assert to you that the window is open". In this example, he meant the listener can identify the truth of the proposition if the window is open or not.

2. Expressives: utterances in this class are related to the subjective world of the speaker and it presents something from the speaker's subjective world. Example of this class is seen in a situation where the teacher says "I wish the window is open" in this utterance the speaker's duty is to prove the sincerity of his utterances to the listener in order to motivate the listener to agree with him.

3. Regulatives: these class adjust communication between the performers in the social world. He defined regulatives as types of speech acts that relate to the social world. The speech acts in this category regulate the communication between the interlocutors. For example "I request that you open the window". This is done by recognising social differences between the speaker and the hearer such as age, gender and position.

4. Imperatives: these are classes of speech acts that are related to the objective world which claims for power and the appellative function. The important thing in this category is whether the action demanded by the speaker can be carried out or not. The speaker can also force the listener to interact with the help of sanctions. (Habermas, 1986).

This taxonomy is more concerned with the sincerity of the utterances expressed by the speaker, rightness of the speech act in the context it is expressed, as well as the rightfulness of the speaker. These are the distinctions between Habermas (1986) speech act theory and other speech acts like Austin (1962) and Searle (1976). This shows that Habermas' (1986) theory pay more attention to the sincerity of the utterance rather than the social functions the language performs. This is glaring in his explanation of the "validity claims" which he says are comprehensibility, truth, sincerity and rightness. The

concern of Habermas is more on the language not the language users, which is why he places emphasis on language. This theory has not been chosen because none of the studies so far consulted had used the theory. It again appears to this present study that the theory fluctuates between sociolinguistics and pragmatics.

2.2.1.3 Searle's theory of speech acts

John R. Searle an American Philosopher, was a disciple of John Langshaw Austin. He developed and systematised Austin's theory (Huang, 2007). According to him, speech act is the use of language to perform several acts such as promises, warnings, assertions, beliefs, congratulations, thanks as well as to bring immediate change in the society through utterance such as I declare you wanted, I pronounce you husband and wife. (Searle, 1969). One of the notable contributions of Searle (1975) to speech act theory is the introduction of indirect speech act which he defined as a "case in which one illocutionary act is performed indirectly by way of performing another" (p. 60). It is true that people perform more than one act through single utterance. For instance, if someone says *it is hot in here*, this utterance can be understood as a request to open the door or a complaint that the room is hot. The inclusion of indirect speech act into Searle's speech act theory paved way to another facet of analysis that unveils how people use language to accomplish certain tasks.

He (Searle, 1976) classified speech act theory into five broad categories namely:

1. Assertives 2. Commissives 3. Directives 4 .Expressives 5. Declaration (for detail about Searle's taxonomy refer to section 3.1of this research).

Despite the strength and relevance of Searle's theory, some scholars such as Leech and Thomas (1995) see that Searle's felicity condition failed to provide a comprehensive explanation of overlapping between one speech act and another. This study agrees with

the above criticism that Searle's felicity conditions have not offered a satisfactory explanation regarding some acts that overlap and the prototypical nature of one act with another. For instance, request versus invitation, demand versus question, promise versus assurance, congratulations versus compliments. This is one of the limitations of Searle's speech act theory. Another limitation is pointed out by Habermas (1984) who says that Searle did not differentiate between directives act issued by those who have formal authority and those issued by those related to social norms. This study agrees with Habermas's (1984) criticism that Searle has not distinguished between directives issued by people with authority such as police, teachers and directives issued within the social context like father commanding or advising his child or sister. Another example on the limitation of speech act is with regard to advice by a prison wader to an inmate who completed his jail terms as well as an advice from a friend who visited his friend in prison custody.

2.2.2 Speech acts in other studies

Speech act has applied to studies such as metaphor in theatre, play and drama (Rozik, 1993, 2000), court trials (Kryk-Kastovsky, 2007), compliment response, (Mustapha, 2010), short stories (Altikriti, 2009), doctor-patient communication (Carny, 2007; Wale, 2006), legal language (Jaqueline, 2009), speech act of in-group (Cutting, 2001). In another dimension, Liu (2014) studied classification and recognition of Chinese speech acts. It is in view of this that the current study decided to extend speech acts theory to political speech of President Obasanjo.

2.3 Political Discourse

Leaders of countries, nations and organisations use speech in order to communicate with their followers. It is in view of this that the importance of speech to leaders and followers

cannot be overemphasised. Speech is regarded as an avenue through which leaders express their thoughts, beliefs and plans. It is also seen as a tool that leaders use to captivate and maintain their followers, ensure their loyalty and seek their future support (Taiwo, 2009). Another researcher, Dedaic (2006), classified speeches into three basic categories namely: deliberative (political speech), judicial (forensic), and epideictic (ceremonial). He went further to elucidate that deliberative originated from the political assembly, where orators speak in order to convince, persuade or dissuade their audience from taking action such as going to war. For the term 'speech' in general sense to be classified into only three categories: political, forensic and ceremonial it appears to this study that other important class of speeches like educational, commercial and literary expressions have been neglected. Based on this, the current study concluded that this definition appears to be narrow.

Similarly, another scholar, Bork (1971) said that political speech is a speech that is associated with the behaviour of government in relation to its three arms, namely: the executive, the judicial and the legislative, but he excluded scientific, educational, commercial or literary expressions. The exclusion of these components and the restriction of political speech to behaviour of government in relation to its three arms narrowed down the scope of political speech. (See Obama's speech on US-China economic Dialogue, 2009). However, Sustein (1995) sees political speech as a speech that is initiated and delivered as a contribution to public deliberation over certain issues. This research agreed with Sustain's definition of political speech because as soon as a political speech is delivered it generates public deliberation over certain issues; some will agree with the propositions expressed by the government and others will disagree with it.

Barendt (2005) stated that political speech is a speech on public issues that include attack on government and its officials, dialogues between governors and the governed. This

definition portrays political speech in a wider sense and proper context by acknowledging attack on government and its officials. Looking at Barendt's (2005) definition, we can understand that political speech is not only expressed by leaders or those in power, it is also done by those who are outside the government. This is because it involves attack on the government. That is to say, newspaper articles or broadcast speeches by other people criticising or supporting the activities of government is also regarded as political. With reference to Western society, Hart (1987) stated that presidential speeches symbolise a special kind of discourse type which is associated with governance that includes state of the nation which involves inaugural addresses, farewell speeches and impeachments speeches. This is similar to what is obtainable in other parts of the world including African continent. In Nigeria for example, whenever there is an inauguration of new government the incoming President will deliver an inaugural speech. Likewise, the outgoing President will also deliver a farewell speech. It is not surprising that what symbolises political speech in the Western society, as explained by Hart (1987), is similar to what is obtainable in the African society considering the relationship between the two continents.

2.3.1 Other studies on political speeches

A number of research works were conducted on the speeches of leaders across the world with the aim of discovering different phenomena that aided the governed or followers to have a clear picture or understanding of their leaders' usage of language. This section looks into the previous studies conducted on different leaders of the world from different angles using different approaches. Hallidayan systemic functional linguistic (SFL) approach to language has been used in studying some political speeches. For example, Ye (2010) peeped into the interpersonal metafunction analysis of Barack Obama's victory speech. The analysis showed that Obama used *will*, *can* and *must*. The use of *will* was to predict future, *can* was to show permission, and *must* was to signal a high degree of

pressure on the other persons to carry out the command. Dontcheva-Navratilova (2009) studied interpersonal meaning in the opening addresses delivered by the Directors-General of UNESCO at international conferences and meetings. The study revealed that addresses generally followed the same rhetorical sequence. The Directors-General used address terms to attract the attention of the people in order to persuade them to listen thereby creating common ground.

The major criticism of Ye's (2010) and Dontcheva-Navratilova's (2009) studies is that both investigations were limited to a single constituent of what Halliday and Hasan (1985) proposed. According to the SFL theory, meaning-making in language interpretation is "multifunctional" involves three different metafunctions: the ideational, the interpersonal, and the textual (p. 23). That is to say, according to Halliday and Hasan (1985), using any one or two out of the three components in meaning-making represent a sort of misunderstanding of the entire SFL approach. However, since multifunctionality is the norm, therefore, for language to be fully comprehended, its analysis should be conducted taking these three constituents into consideration.

In another study, Feng and Liu (2010) studied interpersonal meaning in Obama's speech. The speech chosen for this study was Obama's speech commemorating his 100 days in office. The findings revealed that he used the modal auxiliary *will* to reveal his future action, *can* to intensify confidence in Americans, *should* to express strong advice. He (Obama) also used *have* to express obligation. On the use of pronouns, he used the first person plural pronoun *we* to refer to himself and the listeners and in other places represent Obama and the members of his cabinet. The speaker (President Obama) also used the possessive form *our* to integrate himself with the American people, *I* to show his personal responsibility and *you* to interact with the people directly.

In a broader African context, Alfakhi (2014) evaluated political speeches of some African leaders from the linguistic standpoints. It aimed at identifying the use of elements of persuasion and manipulation. The sampling covered speeches delivered during the span of over thirty years (1981-2013). Speeches delivered by African leaders such as Presidents Hosni Mubarak of Egypt, Robert Mugabe of Zimbabwe, Olusegun Obasanjo of Nigeria, Thabo Mbeki of South Africa, Paul Biya of Cameroon, Laurent Kabila of the Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC), Moye Kibaki of Zambia, John Attah Mills of Ghana, and many others, have been analysed. In Malaysian context for example, Alkhirbash (2010) investigated some speeches of Dr Mahathir Mohammed with reference to the use of persuasion.

Literature on political speeches has uncovered a number of previous studies that employed the critical discourse analysis (henceforth, CDA) paradigm. For example, Rashidi and Souzandehfar (2010) used the CDA to investigate debates between the Republicans and the Democrats over the continuity of war in Iraq. The findings of this study showed that candidates of the Republican Party were against the withdrawal of the American troops from Iraq while candidates of the Democrats were in support of the withdrawal of American forces. Using the CDA, David and Dumanig (2011) examined Dr. Mahathir's selected political speech from 1982-2007. The findings revealed that the discourse aimed at creating sense of oneness and nationhood among various ethnic groups in Malaysia. Daramola (2008) examined functional semiotic discourse analysis of the relevant statements, comments and responses on dramatic shift of power through interim government of Chief Earnest Shonekan whom in this paper was referred to "child of necessity". The speeches for this analysis were Shonekan's resignation speech and General Abacha's maiden speech. As CDA applies to situations where power is exercised and expressed through the use of language, Rudyk (2007) looked at power relations in

President's Bush State of the Union speeches. The findings of the study showed that Bush used the modality *must* to show obligation, the personal pronoun *we* to stress unity with the people of America. He appealed to highly emotional events that have strong impact on people. Bush also emphasised on events and promises with the aim of making the addressees to believe that he is acting on their behalf.

In another study, McDougal (2013) studied issues of framing the black experiences using discourse analysis to evaluate some of Obama's speeches. Using CDA, Juraj (2000) assessed the political discourse of Barack Obama. Correspondingly, rhetorical elements and the use of texts in an Obama speech delivered in Ghana, Africa, were investigated by Hernandez-Guerra in (2012). Once again, Wang (2010) used CDA to study some of Obama speeches. Sarfo and Krampa (2013) used CDA to explore the language of the war on terrorism in speeches of Barack Obama and George W. Bush. In this study, the researchers selected three of Obama's speeches and three of Bush's, delivered at the United States on different occasions. In a CDA, Kamalu and Aganga (2000) employed CDA to analyse Goodluck Jonathan's statement of interest in his party, Peoples Democratic Party (PDP), presidential primaries. The study employed a qualitative approach and the findings clearly indicated that the candidate employed rhetorical strategies to articulate an alternative ideology for the future of Nigeria.

In a comparative study, Sharififar (2015) employed CDA to study Obama's and Rouhani's speeches in accordance with Halliday's (SFL). The findings revealed that Obama applied a colloquial language, consisting of simple words and short sentences that are easily understandable. On the other hand, Rouhani used more difficult words and his language is rather hard and formal. Both Presidents used modal verbs to show their firm plan to fulfil their tasks. They also used the modal *will* and *can* to persuade their audience to have faith in the government ability to confront difficulties in their respective countries.

They also put emphasis on using personal pronoun *we* to portray some sense of intimacy with their audience. Within the American context, Abdel-Moety (2015) explored Hillary Clinton's interview through the use of CDA approach. The results indicated some characteristic of casual conversation such as use of fillers, informal or casual style, ellipsis, vocatives, deixes and humour. The study showed Clinton's strategic and manipulative use of personal pronouns and modality. She used personal pronoun *I* and *we* to answer questions. The use of *I* was to show individual feelings, while the use of *we* was basically to connect her with the audience.

According to the literature, pragmatic approach has been incorporated into a number of previous studies. For example, Allen (2006) studied Australian political discourse through pronominal choice in six campaign speeches of John Howard and Mark Latham during the 2004 federal election. The researcher looked at the ways in which pronominal choice indicated a shifting scope of reference to create pragmatic effects and serve political functions. Howard and Latham used generic *you* to attack opposition and save their face when confronted with face threatening questions. They also used the pronoun *I* to promote themselves as politicians with individual achievements, *we* to implicate the general public by establishing the referent, and *they* to distance themselves from what they said in order to lessen speaker's responsibility.

Proctor and Su (2011) analysed self-identifications developed by American politicians through the choice of pronouns. The data selected for this analysis was the 2008 US presidential election debates and interviews. The findings revealed that external context influenced pronoun distributions more than the topic. Moreover, politicians revealed self -identification through the choice of pronouns and these pronouns indicate the relationship between a politician and his/her party. All the candidates used personal

pronoun *we* to align themselves with other Americans. In a European political context, Arroyo (2000) looked at personal deixes *I*, *you* and *we* in political debate of two Spanish political leaders: Felipe Gonzalez and Jose Maria Aznar during the 1993 elections. The findings indicated that Gonzalez used singular personal pronoun *I* to present his ideas and the plural personal pronoun *we* to state what he and his party intended to do. On the other hand, Aznar also used *I* to express his feelings and ideas. He again employed less use of person deixes *we* than his opponent. The study also revealed that socialist candidate, Gonzalez, surpassed that of the conservative candidate, Aznar, in ideological context.

Al-Gublan (2015) analysed the discourse of election campaign speeches by Mauritanian's presidential candidate, Ahmed Dadeh, in 2009. The findings of this study revealed that Dedah used more simple words, phrases and short sentences in order to shorten the distance between him and his voters. He also used simple present tense to present political and cultural situations. The simple future tenses in the speeches were believed to have aroused Mauritania's people confidence toward him and his future government. On a different note, Liu (2012) used the Swalesian (1990) move analysis to examine 35 inaugural speeches delivered by various American presidential candidates ranging from President Washington to President Obama. Identifying eight moves, the data showed that all the speeches began with salutation, announcement of entering office and the challenges ahead, assumption of responsibility, pledges, and arousing patriotism, announcing political principles to guide the new administration, appealing to audience and resorting to religious beliefs.

Moreover, the literature showed that much has been done in the political speeches of the former Nigerian President, Obasanjo, whose selected military and civilian speeches are the central point of this study. For instance, Adetunji (2006) came up with a deictic analysis of President Obasanjo's speech delivered at Harvard University, USA, in 2000,

and another speech that had to do with the enforcement of the state of emergency in Plateau State in Nigeria. Results from the analyses of the two speeches revealed that in the earlier speech the speaker made use of the first person plural pronoun *we* to convince the audience, while the later speech was characterised by the use of the first person pronoun *I* to commit himself and expressed his personal feelings. Okpanachi (2009) used discourse analysis to examine Obasanjo's speech to the Nigeria Labour Congress (NLC). Yusuf (2002) investigated the elements of offensiveness in the language of Obasanjo. In another study, Ayoola (2005) studied Obasanjo's speech at the Nigerian National Assembly on July 26, 2005. Similarly, Marietu (2009) peeped into the language of politics and political behaviour with respect to President Obasanjo and the 2007 presidential polls.

Jabber and Jinquan (2013) investigated the modal verbs in a research aimed at analysing the speech act of request in the speech of the President of the United States. Request is one of the typical examples, of speech acts of directives which is one of the focus of this study. The speech considered for that analysis was Obama's speech at the US-China strategic and economic dialogue, delivered at the Ronald Reagan Building and International Trade Centre Washington, on July 27, 2009. The study applied the theory of Searle's. The findings revealed that Obama had used three different modal auxiliaries in his speech: *can* to show ability, *will* to express future actions and *must* to make emphasis.

Similarly, Awonuga (2005) conducted a stylistic analysis of President Obasanjo's speech entitled "Sustenance of Democracy" in 2002. The study was designed in order to identify the styles of language adopted so as to promote sustenance of democracy in Nigeria. The findings revealed that President Obasanjo employed the use of personal pronouns such as *I will…, I assure…, I say….* etc. Other elements that characterised the speech include the use of metaphors, biblical echoes, repetition, analogy, etc.

2.3.2 Studies on speech acts in political speeches

As stated earlier, various scholars undertook different studies on the speeches of different leaders. All these were done in order to discover how language is used when it comes to communicating with audiences. It was also meant to explain the strategies being evoked in order to maintain followership by means of engaging into political talks even with members from the opposition wings. Pratma (2014) investigated commissives and directives act in David Cameron's speech delivered at World Economic Centre. The findings revealed that out of the 24 commissives acts found in the data, promises account for (17), warning (5), offering (1), and threatening (1). The directives act found amount to 32 utterances out of which suggestions (11), questions (3), commands (8), and requests (10).

In a Nigerian context, Agbedo (2008) analysed speech act in the Nigerian political discourse as reflected in the speeches of the editors-in-chief of the print media. Speech discourses of Babayo Onanuga of *The News* and Yakubu Mohammed of the *Newswatch* magazine have been examined. The findings of the study showed that speech acts of Onanuga and Mohammed failed to meet Austin's felicity conditions as well as Grice's cooperative principles. Moreover, debates between political parties parliament was not left out in the analysis of political speech. That is to say, any speech delivered for the purpose of contribution to the well-being and promotion of any institutions, organisations is also regarded as a political speech. This goes in line with Dedaic's (2006) definition of political speech. Akinwotu (2013) looked at speech act in the Unity Party of Nigeria (UPN) presidential nomination speech of Chief Obafemi Awolowo in 1979, and the Social Democratic Party (SDP) presidential nomination speech of Chief Moshood Kayode Abiola in 1992. The analysis was based on Austin's (1962) speech act theory. Findings of the investigation revealed the following: assertives 12 of (40) with 27%,

expressives and commissives each occur 10 times out of (40) with 22% each, directives occur 8 times out of (40) with 18.2% and declarative has the least occurrence of 4 out of (40) with only 9%.

A discursive analysis of the farewell speech of Obasanjo was conducted by Adetun and Atolagbe (2011). The investigation was designed to test the felicity condition of the utterances as well as the implicatures derived from the utterances in line with the then current socio-political circumstances in the country. The findings revealed that the speaker made excessive use of speech acts of assertives with the intention of convincing Nigerians to accept and support his successor then, the late President Umaru Musa Yar'Adua, as the newly president-elect of the country. Ayeomoni (2012) evaluated 20 sentences each from both the victory and inaugural speeches of President Umaru Musa Yar'Adua pragmatically. The analysis was anchored on Austin's (1962) and Searle's (1969) theories. The findings in both victory and inaugural speeches revealed the following: verdictives occur 8 times out of (28) which placed it at 40%, directives occur 7 times out of (28) with 35%, commissives 6 times out of (28) with 30% and declaratives 4 times out of (28) with 20%.

In an additional similar study, Abuya (2012) studied 20 sentences out of President Jonathan's inaugural speech pragma-stylistically using Austin's and Searle's theories of speech acts as well. The Findings revealed assertives representing 55%; verdictives representing 15%; directives representing 10%; commissives representing 75%; and declaratives with 45%. In the same way, Tarhom and Miracle (2013) assessed both President Jonathan's victory and inaugural speeches. Likewise, they adopted the speech acts theory of Austin (1962) and Searle (1969). The findings indicated that President Jonathan used more sentences that performed assertive acts while the sentences that were verdictives and directive enables him to assert authority and exercise constitutional power

as the president of the Federal Republic of Nigeria. In their study, Josiah and Johnson (2012) explored the use of speech acts in the inaugural speeches of the serving Nigerian President, Goodluck Jonathan, and the current US President, Barack Obama.

Literature indicates paucity in empirical works dealing with military political speeches. It is in view of this that the present research work aimed at incorporating President Obasanjo's speeches as a military Head of State, hence, it is expected to contribute to the literature of the military and political speeches. Notwithstanding, Kumuyi and Akinkurolere (2000) analysed specified military speeches in Nigeria, and in particular, General Muhammadu Buhari's December 31, 1983, coup speech, and General Ibrahim Babangida's August 27, 1985, coup speech. The researchers applied the speech acts theory of Austin (1962) and Searle (1969). The findings showed assertives occurring (9) times; verdictives occurring (6) times; commissives occurring (3) times; directives occurring (3) times; and declarative and expressive each occurred (1) time.

Despite the number of research works done on the political speeches of President Obasanjo, yet, the literature reviewed showed no evidence of empirical work conducted on Obasanjo's takeover and handover speeches as a military Head of State and as a civilian Executive President. In addition to the other two relevant crucial speeches. Therefore, this serve as the gap identified in the literature which the present research work aimed to fill. This will be achieved as the present study is designed to identify the types of speech acts that occurred in President Obasanjo's selected military and civilian speeches. It will again look at the similarities and differences between the military and civilian commissives as well as military and civilian directives. Nonetheless, Adetun and Atolagbe (2011) have already carried-out a discourse analysis sampling only one farewell speech and with a different research objective. Undoubtedly, this type of research work

that treated a single farewell speech creates a research gap for wider research involving larger data.

Interestingly enough, President Obasanjo served as both military and civilian capacities as the Head of the nation. The first presidency came after the assassination of the then Nigerian military Head of State, General Murtala Ramat Muhammad, in 1976, while the second presidency came in 1999 after he was released from prison. This kind of life is certainly enough to evoke the psychology of someone. Therefore, research on the political speeches of President Obasanjo using six different speeches from different eras as the data for this study would likely be much interesting and linguistically intriguing. It is hereby hoped that conducting a study of this nature would fill the existing gap and contribute to the literature of political speeches, and to the field of pragmatics in general.

CHAPTER 3
METHODOLOGY

3.1 Introduction

This chapter explains the method used by the researcher to collect and analyse data in order to identify the types of commissives and directives that occur in six selected speeches of Obasanjo, during his time as a military Head of State and a civilian President of Nigeria from 13th February, 1976 to 1st October, 1979 as well from 29th May, 1999 to 29th May, 2007. The study will as well look at the similarities and differences between the commissives in the military and civilian speeches as well as the directives in the military and civilian speeches. The chapter consists of introduction, theoretical frame work, data collection, research design, procedure for data analysis and justification for selecting the speeches.

3.2 Theoretical framework

This theory of speech act was pioneered by John Langshaw Austin in 1955 at the Williams James lecture at Harvard University in 1955 (Wardaugh, 1986). As Austin formulated his theory of speech act, other philosophers and researchers such as Searle (1976), Bach and Harnish (1979), Habermas (1986) developed and systematised speech act theory to its present stage. Speech act is defined as the use of language to perform several meaningful act such as statements of fact, beliefs, assertions, promises, threats, requests, commands, advice, warnings, congratulations, condolence, thanks and expressions such as I declare you guilty, *I pronounce you husband and wife* (Searle, 1976, 1979). Yule (1994) sees speech acts as the use of language to explain meaning of words and to perform certain actions through utterances. This definition tallies with Austin's (1962) understanding of speech acts. This is because Austin was the first who classified speech act into ''constatives and performatives''. The constatives are those utterances that can be verified

as either true or false, while the performative are utterances which through them actions are performed. Examples of these are represented in sentences like *I sentence you to two years imprisonment,* and *you are fired*. These utterances are not meant to be verified as true or false, rather, certain actions are being performed through this type of expressions (Austin, 1962. p. 9). In order to explain this theory, clearly, Searle came up with the following taxonomy.

Table 3.1 Searle's (1976) taxonomy of speech acts.

Searle's Taxonomy	Definitions	Examples
Assertives	Are utterances that commit the speaker in various degree to the truth of the expressed proposition. Utterances in this class are verified through true or false test. Examples of assertives are complaining, concluding, asserting, statements of facts and boasting.	I state that it is raining. I predict he will come.
Commissives	Are speech acts that commit the speaker to future actions. This class simply expresses speaker's intention regarding what to do in the future. Speaker can commit himself through the use of first person pronoun I or We (Huang, 2007). Examples of commissives are promises, threats (Searle, 1976).	I will see to it. I will be allegiant to the flag.
Directives	Are category of speech acts that directs or informs the addressee to do something. Unlike commissives where the speaker commits himself to future actions. In directives the utterances direct the hearer to do something or change hearer's cause of action. Examples of this class are commands, advising and warning.	I command you to stand at attention.

Searle's Taxonomy	Definitions	Examples
Expressives	Are acts where the speaker expresses his/her psychological state such as greetings, thanking, congratulating, apologising as well as joy or sadness (Searle, 1976).	I apologize for stepping on your toe. I thank you for giving me the money. I congratulate you on winning the race.
Declaratives	These are special class of speech acts that bring immediate changes in the world. Declaration could only be successful when they are made by the right person in the right place. Members of this class brings about "the correspondence between the propositional content and reality" (Searle, 1979, p. 16). That is why this class of speech acts is described as a very special category of speech acts. They are normally performed by someone who has authority to do that (Searle, 1971).	I now pronounce you man and woman. I declare the meeting adjourned. I appoint you chairman.

Utterances where the speaker mention the act performed such as I promise…, I command are said to be explicit while utterance where the act performed is not mentioned such as I will see you tomorrow, I will speak to him are said to be implicit (Searle, 1979; Huang, 2007).

3.3 Research design

The research design employed in carrying out this study is qualitative in nature. Frequency and percentage of speech acts that occur in Obasanjo's selected military and civilian speeches will be provided in tabular form for clarity and justification. The researcher's reason for choosing qualitative research is that it is considered as the best to describe acts performed.

3.4 Data collection

The data for this study are 3 selected speeches of President Obasanjo during his tenure as military Head of State from 13th February, 1976 to 1st October, 1979 and another 3 selected speeches during his tenure as civilian President from 29th May, 1999 to 29th May, 2007. The speeches will be taken from the different sources such as internet, books and newspapers. The table below shows the data used for this study, date of delivering the speeches as well as the words count.

Table 3.2: Obasanjo's selected military and civilian speeches

No	Military speeches	Date	Source	Word count
1	Obasanjo's take-over speeches as military head of state	13th February, 1976	http://www.PascalStatConsultingAndBusinessManagementNigeria/Posts/345824828826942	890
2	Farewell speech and return to democracy	1st October, 1979	New Nigerian Newspaper	723
3	Launching of Universal Primary Education	6th September, 1976	Nigerian Observer	1919
	Civilian Speeches			
4	Inaugural speech.	29th May, 1999	Vanguard Newspaper	2943
5	Farewell speech	29th May, 2007	http://www.nairaland.com/56298/full-text-president-obasanjo-last	919
6	Re-launching of Universal Basic Education	30th September, 1999	Selected Speeches of President Olusegun Obasanjo	1119

3.4.1 Temporal Gap

An examination of the research data may revealed a temporal gap of 28 years between Obasanjo's selected military and civilian speeches. This should not be a source of concern, with regard to this study. Though, references may be made to certain cases of some world leaders where it may be assumed that specific changes had manifested in their speech over time. A very good reference is always made to the case of the former British Prime Minister, late Lady Margaret Thatcher, where it was believed that her speeches changed when she got older. Nevertheless, it should be noted that some of the tendencies discovered were mostly physiological that were associated with tone and pitch (Gardner, 2014).

It is paramount to understand that, this study is focused on exploring a peculiar condition in the Nigerian polity where retired military Generals dominate politics. Ekpre, Ekanem and Anthiga (2013) admitted the fact that present political establishment in Nigeria have been overwhelmingly dominated by former military men. What is much more peculiar about this study is that it is aimed at doing a comparative study of the speeches delivered by a politician that was a onetime military leader and, later on, a democratically elected president. This reason alone is sufficient to draw researcher's attention and make the problem under study worth examining.

3.5 Reasons for selecting Obasanjo's speeches

The choice of President Obasanjo's speeches is due to a number of reasons. (1) He (Obasanjo) is a well-known figure all over the African continent. (2) As a former military Head of State and one time civilian President, his political speeches may symbolise the Nigerian political discourse in the context of both military and civilian period. It should be recalled that Nigeria had "experienced over 26 years of military rule that all most

brought her to a near total collapse" (Maitama, 2003). (3) Another important milestone in Obasanjo's administrative and political career was the fact that he was the only Nigerian leader that introduced free and compulsory primary education for Nigerian children known as Universal Primary Education (UPE). This programme was initiated during his period as the military Head of State in 1976. Subsequently, the programme was rebranded and reintroduced as Universal Basic Education (UBE) after he assumed power as a civilian President in 1999. (4) He is seen as a champion of democracy in Africa as he successfully handed-over power to two different civilian governments: i) President Alhaji Shehu Shagari in 1979, and ii) Late President Umar Musa Yar'adua in 2007.

3.6 Procedure of data analysis

This section provides an explanation regarding the method and procedures used in the analysis of the study. The approach employed is discourse analysis (DA henceforth). DA is the interpretation of language in the context of its use. The concern of DA is both on written texts and spoken language from conversation to highly forms of talk (McCarthy, 2000). Says DA involves looking at the form and function of language in either written or spoken forms. For that reason, Brown and Yule (2000) say that "the analysis of discourse means the analysis of language in use" (p. 44). In this sense, the analysis is concerned with the function of language involved in the social relation and social attitude. Below are the procedures used for this study in steps.

Step 1. Line numbering

In this step the lines of utterances will be numbered sequentially as they appeared in each text serially. For example, the lines in Obasanjo's takeover speech of 13th February, 1976 speech will be numbered from the first line (as line 1 of 13th February, 1976) to the last

(line of 13th February, 1976 speech) and this procedure will be applicable to all the speeches. The aim of this numbering is to ease the analysts and readers understanding.

Step 2. Identification and classification

In this step, utterances are identified and classified as assertives, commissives, directives, expressives and declaratives based on Searle's (1976) definitions and felicity conditions. The aim of the identification and classification are to ascertain the frequencies of occurrence of each act in the selected military and civilian speeches and to separate commissives and directives acts from the other speech acts as well as to analyse the commissives and directives utterances qualitatively.

Step 3. Presentation of frequency and percentage.

Frequency and percentage of the kinds of speech acts that occur in the selected military speeches will be presented separately in tabular form. Likewise, that of civilian speeches. This presentation of frequency and percentage will also present the commissives in the military and commissives in the civilian as well as directive in the military and directives in the civilian in tabular form. The significance of the percentages and the frequencies incorporated in this study is to aid the qualitative design employed so as to provide the occurrence of each type of act for clarity and understanding. It is worth indicating that graphs, charts, tables and other quantitative tools of analysis are allowed to be incorporated in qualitative research works in order to make the findings more convincing and to solidify the richness of the analysis (Merriam, 2002).

Table 4.1 Analysis of three selected military speeches of President Obasanjo.

Total number of act found in a speech divide by the total number of acts in the speech multiply by hundred. Example 35/47x100=74%

Table 4.2. Analysis of three selected civilian speeches of President Obasanjo.

Total number of act found in a speech divide by the total number of acts in the speech multiply by hundred. Example 76/109x100=70%

Table 4.3 Analysis of commissives in three selected military speeches of Obasanjo.

Total number of acts found in a speech divide by the total number of acts in a speech multiply by hundred. Example 5/47x100=11%

Table 4.9 Analysis of commissives in three selected civilian speeches of Obasanjo

Total number of acts found in a speech divide by the total number of acts in a speech multiply by hundred. Example 22/109x100=20%

Table 4.23 Analysis of directives in three selected military speeches of Obasanjo.

Total act found in a speech divide by the total number of acts in a speech multiply by hundred. Example 2/14x100=14%

Table 4.31 Analysis of directives in three selected civilian speeches of President Obasanjo. Example 1/8x100=13%

Step 4. Analysis

This analysis is focused on the military and civilian commissive, then the military and civilian directives. The reasons for focusing on these two acts have been stated in section 1.1 (background of the study). The analysis will first begin with the commissives in the military then commissive in the civilian followed by directives in the military then directives in the civilian. Utterances of the same speech act with similar structure will be grouped and analysed separately before proceeding to other acts with similar structures. For example, the utterances identified as commands will first be analysed before

proceeding to advice and within the speech act of commands, indirect commands will be analysed separately followed by the direct commands.

CHAPTER 4

ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION

4.1 Introduction

The chapter presents an analysis and discussions of commissives and directives that occurred in selected military and civilian speeches of President Obasanjo. The analysis began with the commissives that occurred in his selected military speeches followed by those in his civilian speeches, then directives that occurred in his selected military speeches followed by those in his civilian speeches (the procedure for the analysis has been earlier detailed in page 35-37 in section 3.6 of this study).

4.1.1 Commissives

Commissives are utterances where the speaker commits himself to future actions (Searle, 1979). For details on commissives and directives (see Table 3.1 in page 31-32). The analysis will go further to classify commissives into sub-types such as promises, threats depending on what occurred in the data. In this regard, a promise is an undertaking to do a future action (Searle, 1979). Felicity conditions are the set of rules which are associated with the valid performance of speech acts (Searle, 1969, 1979; Jacobs, 2002). The felicity conditions for promise are: the utterance must be a future action of the speaker where the hearer prefers the speaker to do the act rather than not do the acts. In addition, the speaker must not be under duress to do the act and such an utterance should counts as an undertaking to do a future action (Searle, 1979).

Utterances with similar structure within the three selected military speeches will first be grouped and analysed before proceeding to the other three selected speeches in his civilian tenure. In addition, this study will consider linguistic elements such as pronouns, modal auxiliaries, phrases and adverbs in order to see how those acts were performed. Tables will also be provided to present the frequency and percentage of the occurrences of the

sub-types of act within the military commissive and civilian commissive respectively. At the end of the analysis, a summary will be provided.

4.1.2 Directives

For any utterance to be analysed as directives such an utterance has to fulfil the felicity conditions outlined by Searle (1969, 1979). Directives are the use of language by the speaker to get the hearer to do something (Searle, 1979). For details about directives (see Table 3.1 in page. 31-32). This study will go further to classify and analyse utterances to other sub-types of directives such as advices, commands and warnings depending on what is obtained in the data. In order to do that, the study will look at the felicity conditions of these utterances. For example, for an utterance to be classified as command such an utterance must be

> "a future action of the hearer. The hearer is able to do the act and the speaker believes the hearer is able to do the act. It is not obvious to both speaker and hearer that the hearer will do the act in the normal course of events. Another important condition for any act to be classified as command is that the speaker must be in a position of authority over the hearer" (Searle, 1969, p. 64).

The conditions for advising are that the utterance has to be "a future action of the hearer, and the speaker has some reason to believe that the said act will benefit the hearer. It is not obvious to both speaker and hearer that the hearer will act in the normal course of events" (Searle, 1969, p. 67). The felicity conditions for the speech act of warning are "future event, and the speaker thinks the act will not be in hearer's interest. The speaker believes the act is not in hearer's best interest" (Searle, 1969, p. 71). The analysis will follow the following order: utterances identified as command will first be analysed, then advising and lastly warning. Within the sub type of speech act, for example, utterances

with similar structures will be grouped and analysed before proceeding to other utterances that have similar structures.

4.1.2.1 Directness

In addition, directives will be analysed in terms of directness. In order to do this, the study will follow the following criteria: direct speech acts are those acts that are associated with corresponding basic sentence type. This means interrogative sentence commonly used for asking questions, imperative for giving commands and requests, and declarative for statement (Searle, 1979; Becker, & Bieswanger, 2002). Indirect speech acts is a "case in which one illocutionary act is performed indirectly by way of performing another'' (Searle, 1975 p. 60). In order to identify indirect speech act, Searle (1979) suggested that we need to use our knowledge of three elements: i) felicity conditions, ii) principle of conversational cooperation of Grice's maxim and iii) the contexts. Another criteria to consider in order to understand an utterance as direct or indirect is to see if there is a relationship between the structural forms and communicative functions. Indirect speech act is recognised as a result of indirect relationship between the function of a sentence and the structure (Searle, 1979). A summary section will again be provided after the analyses of military and civilian directives.

4.1.3 Justification for selecting commissive and directive speech acts.

Table 4.1: Analysis of three selected military speeches of Obasanjo.

Data	Assertive		Commissive		Directive		Declaration		Expressive	
	Frequency & Percentage		Frequency & Percentage		Frequency & Percentage		Frequency & Percentage		Frequency & Percentage	
Speech 1 13th February, 1976	35/47	74%	5/47	11%	6/47	13%	0/47	0%	1/47	2%
Speech 2 1St October, 1979	24/33	73%	2/33	6%	2/33	6%	0/33	0%	5/33	15%
Speech 3 6th September, 1976	45/59	76%	5/59	8%	7/59	12%	0/59	0%	2/59	3%

Table 4.2: Analysis of three selected civilian speeches of Obasanjo.

Data	Assertive		Commissive		Directive		Declarative		Expressive	
	Frequency & Percentage		Frequency & Percentage		Frequency & Percentage		Frequency & Percentage		Frequency & Percentage	
Speech 4 29th May, 1999	76/109	70%	22/109	20%	5/109	5%	0/109	0%	6/109	6%
Speech 5 29th May, 2007	42/50	84%	2/50	4%	1/50	2%	0/50	0%	5/50	10%
Speech 6 30th September, 1999	41/47	87%	3/47	6%	1/47	2%	1/47	2%	1/47	2%

The tables above were drawn to substantiate the earlier arguments justifying the reasons for focusing on commissives and directives in this study, as earlier stated in section **1.1** (background of the study). The tables clearly show that assertives are common speech acts that occurred all the time and in a large proportion. From the tables above, we could understand that assertives occurred in a large proportion which amount to a total of 345 utterances in Obasanjo's selected military and civilian speeches. With occurrence of 139 in Table 4.1 and 206 in Table 4.2**.** Moreover, in the case of declaratives, the tables have shown that declaratives are hardly found in the data as it occurred only once in Table 4.2 with no occurrence in Table 4.1. Therefore, it appeared that there will be no room for any comparison that is why they are called special class of speech acts (Searle, 1979 and Leech, 1987).

Expressives have also been excluded from this study for the reasons that some of the members of assertives class overlap with the members of the expressives class (Huang, 2007). It is based on this overlapping, expressives speech acts were excluded from this analysis. Examples of the members of these groups that overlap are complaint, greetings and compliments. Complaint is a member of assertive class and it also expresses the speaker's psychological state and can also be verified as true or false (Leech, 1983). However, Compliments and greetings are said to lack sincerity condition (Jucker & Taavitsamen, 2008). In other words, Searle (1969) added that greetings can be assertives or expressives. It is based on this prototypical nature and overlapping behaviour between the two acts that this study decided to concentrate on commissives and directives. Additionally, expressives are acts that require the sincerity of speakers utterances that is difficult to established especially in politicians speeches.

4.2 Commissives

Commissives are speech acts used by the speaker or speakers to commit himself or themselves to some future actions. They differ from directives because in directives it is the speaker that direct the addressee to do something. In commissives, speakers commit themselves to do something in the future. Commissives simply express the intention of the speaker to do something in future time. Examples of commissives include promises and threats (Searle, 1979). In performing commissives, a speaker can commit himself through the use of "first person singular *I* or plural *we*" (Huang, 2007, p. 91). The commissives found in Obasanjo's selected military speeches were mainly promises. A promise is defined as an undertaking by the speaker or speakers to do something in the future which the addressee likes and believes that the speaker has the ability to do (Searle, 1979). A promise differs from a threat which is also the use of language to do something to the addressee in future, but in case of a threat, it is something that the addressee will not like to happen and it is not certain whether the speaker can do it or not (Searle, 1979).

4.2.1 Commissives in military speeches

The table below provides the frequencies and percentages of the types of commissives that occurred in Obasanjo's selected military speeches. In these selected speeches, he performed only promises the frequencies and percentages are provided according to the occurrence in each speech. The findings in Obasanjo's selected military and civilian speeches with regard to the types of acts performed, correspond with the findings of Pratma (2014) who investigated commissives and directives in David Cameroon's speech.

Table 4.3 Analysis of commissives in three selected military speeches of Obasanjo.

Data	Promise	
	Frequency	Percentage
Speech 1 13th Feb, 1976	5	11%
Speech 2 1st Oct, 1979	2	6%
Speech 3 6th Sept, 1976	5	8%

Table 4.4: Promises in Obasanjo's selected military speeches

Date	Lines	Utterances
1st October, 1979	39-40	*Our* two major vital resources land and people *must* be developed and be judiciously utilised.
13th February,1976	33-34	*Our* purpose is to instil a new public morality among all classes of Nigerians.
6th Sept, 1976,	46-48	*Our main task* in the first year of the scheme *is to* provide a classroom and a teacher for as many children of school going age as will report at the opening of schools throughout the country.

The utterances in Table 4.4 above, President Obasanjo performs the speech acts of promise. The utterances are promises because the speaker undertakes to do future actions. That is why Searle, (1971) says that "in a promise an act must be predicated of the speaker and it cannot be a past act" (p. 48). Additionally, what the speaker promises in these utterances are what the addressees want. These are (developing nation vital resources, instilling public morality among all Nigerians and provision of classrooms and teachers). The addressees also believed that Obasanjo as a Head of State has the capacity to do what he promised and he was not under duress to make such promises (Searle, 1979). The speaker uses possessive plural pronoun *our* in all the three sentence in Table 4.4 above to

create group membership with Nigerian people and members of the Supreme Military Council. Instead of reminding the administration of his authority, he (Obasanjo) used the pronoun *our* to show solidarity with the members of the Supreme Military Council so as to make them believe that he is a leader with a sense of care and togetherness.

In addition, he uses the modality *must* in (lines 39-40 of 1st October, 1979) to show emphasis on what he promises. Thus: that is to make sure Nigeria land are judiciously utilised. The use of the plural pronoun *our* in (lines 33-34 of 13th February, 1976 and 46-48 of 6th September, 1976) comprises the speaker and the members of the Supreme Military Council. This can be inferred through Obasanjo's choice of the phrases *our purpose* and *our main task in the first year of this scheme…*which signify responsibility of the government in this context. Unlike in the use of the plural pronoun our in (lines 39-40 of 1st October, 1979) which refers to Obasanjo and entire Nigerian, the aim here is for the speaker to integrate himself with the Nigerian in order to create sense of commonality. The use of the possessive pronoun *our* in Table 4.4 above is similar with the findings of Feng and Liu (2010) in their study of interpersonal meaning in Obama's speech.

Table 4.5: Promises in Obasanjo's selected military speeches

Date	Lines	Utterances
6th September, 1976	28-29	*The Federal military government intends* that the institute *will have centres* in all the states of Nigeria.
13th February, 1976	45-46	*The federal military government will* continue to ensure smooth running of all our essential services.
6th September, 1976,	127-131	The product of UPE have no reason to be apprehensive of the future because *the federal government* is already examining the whole question of the policy on education and adequate provision will be made to absorb majority of the products of UPE into post primary institutions.
6th September, 1976	118-120	In order to ensure the smooth execution of the programme, *the federal military government will hence forth* make UPE funds available direct to the state, thereby removing one of the causes of the delays in the implementation.

In these utterances of Table 4.5 above, Obasanjo performs the speech acts of promise. This is because he makes undertakings to do future actions which the addressees want (like establishing centres for UPE, the smooth running of essential services and absorbing majority of the UPE candidates to post-primary institutions). All these are what the addresses liked and believed Obasanjo as a Head of State had the ability to do what he promises. Obasanjo's use of the modal auxiliary *will* in all the four sentences above shows futurity and undertaking to do something good in future time, Searle (1969, 1979). The use of the phrase *the federal military government* in (lines 45-46 of 13th February, 1976 and 28-29,127-131,118-120 of 6th September, 1976) is to deflect power from himself and attribute it to military institution. The aim of the speaker here is to show the supremacy of the military institution over himself (Head of State). That is why Obasanjo did not use

singular personal pronoun in his military speeches in order to show that military institution is more important than the military personal.

Table 4.6: Promises in Obasanjo's selected military speeches

Date	Line	Utterance
13th February, 1976	28-30	He *will* from now be treated as a wanted person to face the allegations against him *anytime* he sets his foot on Nigerian soil.

In the utterance of Table 4.6 above, Obasanjo promises to prosecute General Yakubu Gowon for his involvement in the military coup anytime he returns to Nigeria from exile in the United Kingdom. Obasanjo's use of the adverb *anytime* in (lines 28-30 of February, 1976) implies his seriousness and urgency to execute the promise. He also shows boldness in the use of the expression *he will from now be treated as a wanted person...* in (lines (28-30 of 13th February, 1976).The difference between this promise and the other promises above is that, this is a promise to punish (Yakubu Gown) because of his involvement in a military coup that assassinated the then Nigeria's Military Head of State, General Murtala Muhammad and brought Obasanjo to power. This utterance is a promise because it satisfied the conditions outlined by Searle. This is because it is something that will occur in the future time (if he returns to Nigeria). The use of the modal *will* in this utterance qualifies the act as a promise and as well it indicates futurity.

Table 4.7: Promises in Obasanjo's selected military speeches

Date	Lines	Utterances
6th September, 1976,	42-43	Although, the UPE is launched today, it *will* become compulsory only towards the end of the present plan.
13th February, 1976,	57-58	*But* those who continue to be indolent, inefficient *will be removed*.

The utterances in Table 4.7 above are promises to make (UPE compulsory and to fire any public servant found wanting). It is a promise because of the Obasanjo's use of the modal auxiliary *will* in the two utterances above which clearly shows the acts are promises and they will occur in a future time. The promise in (lines 42-43 of 6th September, 1976) contains time reference *toward the end of the present plan* the aim of the speaker here is to be categorical and precise about the time of executing the promise. However, in the second utterance of (lines 57-58 of 13th February, 1976), the promise is contained in the use of the phrase *will be removed*. Obasanjo's use of the phrase *will be removed* qualifies the act as promise because the addressees as citizens of Nigeria would like to see those indolent and inefficient public servants removed in order to have a better Nigeria. This utterance has a dual illocutionary force because to the addressees it is a promise while to the indolent and inefficient civil servants it is a threat. It is considered here as promise because the speaker is not directly addressing the indolent and inefficient civil servant but rather general public about what he promises to do at a time of taking over as a new military Head of State. The use of the conjunction *But* in the initial position of this sentence distinguishes the promise made in (lines 56-57 of 13th February, 1976) with the promise earlier made by the President in (lines 57-58 of 13th February, 1976) *Indeed they will be rewarded* which is to reward diligent and efficient civil servants.

Table 4.8: Promises in Obasanjo's selected military speeches

Date	Lines	Utterances
13th February, 1976	56-57	*Indeed* they *will be* rewarded.
1st October, 1979	33	*We must* realise these potential.

Both utterances in Table 4.8 above, Obasanjo promises (to reward diligent and efficient civil servants as well as undertakes to develop Nigerian potential) using simple and short sentences for the purpose of clarity and straight forwardness. The use of the adverb *indeed* in (lines 56-57 of 13th February, 1976) emphasises his intention to actualise what he promises. He also uses the modal auxiliary *will* to indicate futurity and his firm intention to carry out a future action. Unlike in the utterance of (line 33 of 1st October, 1979) where he uses the modality *must* to show obligation to discharge what he promises. Obasanjo's use of the first person plural pronoun *we* in (line 33 of 1st October, 1979) is a way to describe the fact that the decision to realise Nigeria's potential was made by the Supreme Military Council, and not by the President alone. This statement reminds the Supreme Military Council that it has played a part to realise Nigeria's potential. The aim of the speaker here is to show a sense of shared responsibility. Obasanjo's use of the modals *will* and *must* in all the utterances in this section correspond with the findings of Ye (2010), Feng and Liu (2010) and Jabber and Jinquan (2013).

We is an important pronoun in political speeches in the sense that it expresses "institutional identity", i.e. when one person speaks as a representative of or on behalf of an institution (Bramley, 2001, p. 76). *We* is, sometime, used to convey image of one political party as a team or institution, therefore, a shared responsibility. The function of the pronoun *we* can be divided into two categories: inclusive and exclusive that is to say *we* can be used to refer to the group excluding the listener or the group including the

listener (Karapetjana, 2011; Feng and Liu 2010). In addition, the personal pronoun *we* functioned as the subject of a commissive, to show that more than one person are committing themselves to future action. That is why Huang (2007) states that commissive can be performed through the use of personal pronouns *I* or *We*. If it is performed through the use of *I* the speaker is portrayed as someone who does not share his responsibilities with his subordinate and if it is performed through the use of a plural personal pronoun *we* then it portrays the speaker as someone who shared his responsibility with his subordinate, whereby termed and respected as a someone that cares about his subordinate in decision making (p. 9).

4.2.2 Commissives in civilian speeches

The table below provides the frequencies and percentages of the types of commissives that occurred in Obasanjo's selected civilian speeches. In these selected speeches, he performs only promises.

Table 4.9: Analysis of commissives in three selected civilian speeches of Obasanjo.

Data	promises	
	Frequency	percentage
Speech 4 29th May,1999	22	20%
Speech 5 29th May,2007	2	4%
Speech 6 6th Sept, 1999	3	6%

Table 4.10: Promises in Obasanjo's selected civilian speeches

Date	Lines	Utterances
29th May, 1999	70-71	*I am determined* with *your full cooperation*, to make significant changes a year of my administration.
29th May, 1999	206-208	*I am also determined* to build a broad consensus amongst all parties to enhance national harmony and stability and thus ensure success in long struggle ahead.

In these utterances in Table 4.10 above, Obasanjo promises (to make significant changes and to build consensus among parties to enhance national harmony and stability). Here he performs promises because they are all undertakings to do future actions which the addressees want. The use of the first person singular pronoun *I* in these utterances is for the speaker to portray his capabilities for certain actions and to also commit himself to his beliefs. These can be seen in the expression *I am determined* in (lines 70-71 of 29th May, 1999). In this utterance, he clearly portrayed himself as someone that is capable, ready and has the potential to make significant changes. Though, the capabilities and readiness are conditioned by the preceding statement *with your full cooperation* (lines 70-71 *of* 29th May 1999) which mitigate the strength of the speaker's determination and readiness. Because it hinges on other peoples' cooperation. Similarly, in (lines 206-208 of 29th May, 1999) he uses the phrase *I am also determined* as used in the previous utterance to show capability in order to convince the audience to believe that he is capable and has all the determination to actualise what he promised.

Table 4.11: Promises in Obasanjo's selected civilian speeches

Date	Lines	Utterances
29th May, 1999,	111-112	*A determined effort will be made* to cut down significantly the incidence of violent crime.
30th September, 1999	38-40	*It is the determination* of this government to restore within *our society* the interest and dignity of learning and scholarship.

In both utterances in Table 4.11 above, Obasanjo promises (to promote people's interest and respect for learning and scholarship. In the second utterance, he promises to reduce the rate of crime). Both are promises because the addressees would really like to have these acts from the government. Another reason to understand these utterances are promises is that the speaker commits himself to future actions which the addressees believe he has the authority to do. The use of the phrase *this government* in (lines 38-40 of 30th September, 1999) refers to the government of the Federal Republic of Nigeria of which he was the head, the aim here is for emphasis and specification. Obasanjo's use of the pronoun *our* in this utterance is to create a sense of togetherness. Moreover, the use of the modal auxiliary *will* in (lines 111-112 of 29th May, 1999) is to show futurity.

Table 4.12: Promises in Obasanjo's selected civilian speeches

Date	Lines	Utterances
29th May, 1999	184-187	*We shall* pursue a dynamic foreign policy to promote friendly relationship with all nations and *will* continue to play a constructive role in the United Nations, Organisation of African Unity, and other international bodies.
29th May, 1999	187-188	*We shall* continue to honour existing agreement between Nigeria and other countries.
29th May, 1999	203-204	*We shall* re-store military cooperation and exchanges with our traditional friends.

In the utterances of Table 4.12 above, the speaker performs the speech acts of promising. This is because he commits himself in various degrees to undertake future actions such as (pursuing dynamic foreign policy, promoting friendly relationship with all nations, honouring existing agreement between Nigeria and other countries and to re-establish cooperation with the military and to harmonise relationship between Nigerian and other traditional friends). All these are what the addressees like.

The most common way of expressing futurity in English is the modal auxiliary construction with *will* and *shall* or'*ll* (Quirk, et al, 1985, p. 213). The modal auxiliary *shall* is regarded as strong modal than *will* in terms of future indication. This is because the modal *shall* is the most preferred modal when used in more formal style (broadcasts, speeches, lectures). "A strong teaching tradition especially, in BrE, has upheld the use of *shall* in preference to *will* in formal style (p. 214). Another important point to consider with regard to the strength in indicating future is in relation to their function. The function of the modal *shall* are predictive, volition and **obligation** unlike the modal *will* which has predictive and volition only (p.229-230). The modal *shall* is used in "legal and quasi legal discourse, in stipulating regulations or legal requirements. Here *shall* is close in meaning to ***must***. In this situation, it has archaic and **authoritative** function. *The vendor shall maintain the equipement in good repair*. Note in this connection the archaic use of *shalt* in the biblical ten Commandments" (p.230".). In an attempt to show the difference between the modal *will* and *shall*, Graver (1971) states that, the modal *will* and *shall* are used in expressing plain future (ordinary future). If it is a matter of not plain future but volition, permission or obligation *shall* is the most preferred. Examples, *you shall go* (you must go) (p. 219). It is based on the above clarifications that the modal *shall* is considered stronger than *will*.

President Obasanjo uses the modal *shall* in some context and *will* in another. He uses *shall* in utterances that required serious concern and attention at the time of delivering the speech. The aim of the speaker here is for the *shall* to show meaning closer to *must*, so as to show duty and obligation on his part regarding the issues. In addition, the use of the modal *shall* in this context is to make people believe that he is serious regarding the issues. In other word, he uses the modal *will* in issues that are less serious at the time of delivering the speech. The pronoun *we* used in these utterances represents the speaker himself and the members of the Federal Executive Council. The speaker's aim of using the pronoun *we* in both utterances above is to share his responsibility with the members of his executive council so as, to make them feel they are important and part and parcel of his administration.

Table 4.13: Promises in Obasanjo's selected civilian speeches

Date	Lines	Utterances
29th May, 1999	204	And *we will* help the military to help itself
29th May, 1999	191-192	*We will leave no stone unturned* to ensure sustenance of democracy because it is good for us.

The utterances in Table 4.13 above, Obasanjo performs another acts of promising (to strengthen the Nigerian Military Forces and to ensure the sustenance of Nigeria's democracy). The actions performed are what the addressees want and the presence of the modal auxiliary *will* clearly shows the act will occur in the future. Just as it occurred in the preceding utterances where the speaker performs the speech acts of promising through the first person plural pronoun *we*. In these utterances he also used the same pronoun *we* for the purpose of sharing responsibility with the members of his council in order to acknowledge their presence. The difference between the promises performed in these two utterances with those performed in the utterances of (lines 184- 187, 187-188, 203-204 of

the speech of 29th May, 1999) is the use of the modality. Here, he uses the modality *will* to show futurity. Unlike in the preceding utterances where he uses the modality *shall* to show futurity and strong conviction to do what he promised. This corresponds to what Dunmire (2005) says modals auxiliary is essential in performing commissive speech act since it indicates futurity.

Table 4.14: Promises in Obasanjo's selected civilian speeches

Date	Lines	Utterances
29th May, 2007	50-52	*Tomorrow I will* hand over the instrument of government to Alhaji Umaru Musa Yar'adua our newly elected President.
29th May, 1999	68-70	*On my part, I will give forthright, purposeful, committed, honest and transparent leadership* that the situation demand.

In both utterances in Table 4.14 above, President Obasanjo performs the speech acts of promise (to hand over power to the newly elected President Umar Musa Yar'adua and to serve his country diligently). These acts are what the addressees want and they will take place in the future, therefore, they are said to be speech acts of promise. Obasanjo's use of the modal auxiliary *will* in these utterances shows futurity. These utterances fulfil the conditions outlined by Searle (1979) for any utterance to be considered as promise. The use of the first person singular pronoun *I* in both utterances shows personal responsibility. Obasanjo's use of the adverb of time *tomorrow* at the beginning of the utterance in (lines 50-52 of 29th May, 2007) indicates the actual time he will hand over power to the newly elected president. However, the use of the phrase *on my part* in (lines 68-70 of 29th May, 1999) implies the speaker's personal submission to carry out the promise.

Table 4.15: Promises in Obasanjo's selected civilian speeches

Date	Lines	Utterances
30th September, 1999	60-61	*Funds will be made available* for properly equipping the schools.
29th May, 1999	109	The police *will be made t*o do their job.

In the utterances of Table 4.15 above, Obasanjo promises (to allocate enough funds to UPE schools and to ensure Nigerian Police do their job effectively). They are speech acts of promise for the reason that, the addressees will prefer the speaker to do what he promises because they are good for them and for the country. In both utterances, he commits himself to future action. This is shown in the use of the modal auxiliary *will* which indicates that the acts will occur in the future.

Table 4.16: Promise in Obasanjo's selected civilian speeches

Date	Line	Utterance
29th May, 1999	86	*There will be no sacred cows*.

The utterance in Table 4.16 above, is a promise to treat people equally. Here, Obasanjo uses an idiomatic expression *there will be no sacred cows* to show his readiness to punish anyone found guilty under his administration. The aim here possibly is for the speaker to make his addressees believe that his government will be fair and just to everyone. Obasanjo's use of the modal *will* in this utterance shows futurity.

Table 4:17: Promises in Obasanjo's selected civilian speeches

Date	Lines	Utterances
29th May, 1999	90-91	*Specifically, I shall immediately reintroduce* civil service and financial instructions and enforce compliance.
29th May, 1999	136-138	*I shall quickly* ascertain the true state of our finances and the economy and let the nation know.
29th May, 1999	138-139	In the light of the resources available, *I shall concentrate* on these issues that can bring urgent beneficial relief to our people.

The utterances in Table 4.17 above are speech acts of promise. This is because the speaker commits himself to future actions such as (reforming civil service and financial regulations and investigates the Nigerian economy and updates citizens of it status). The utterances are future actions of the speaker, therefore, they are regarded as promise. Searle (1971) says that promise should be something that will occur in the future not in the past. They are also what the audiences want, therefore they will prefer the speaker to do these acts rather than not do Searle, (1969). The promises in these utterances are performed through the use of personal pronoun *I* which represents Obasanjo. The choice of the pronoun *I* in these utterances is for him to express his personal responsibility. The use of *I* as indicated in Table 4.17 above, corresponds with the findings of Feng and Liu (2010). The speaker's feelings and concern is seen in the use of the adverbs s*pecifically* and *immediately* in (lines 90-91, of 29th May, 1999 and *quickly* in (lines 136-138 of 29th May, 1999) which clearly describes his eagerness and readiness to carry out these acts. Additionally, Obasanjo's choice of the modal auxiliary *shall* in these utterances portrays his strong conviction to do what he promises and, at the same time, the modal *shall* indicates futurity.

Table 4.18: Promises in Obasanjo's selected civilian speeches

Date	Lines	Utterances
29th May, 1999	102-103	*One of the immediate acts of this administration will be to implement quickly and decisively*, measures that would restore confidence in governance.
29th May, 1999	135-136	Details of the focus and measures of this administration on these and other matters *will be announced from time to time*.
29th May, 1999	93-95	The rampant corruption in the public service and cynical contempt for integrity that pervades every level of the bureaucracy *will be stamped out.*

The utterances in Table 4.18 above are speech acts of promise. For the reason that they satisfy the conditions outlined by Searle 1979. In these utterances Obasanjo commits himself to future actions and the addressees will prefer the speaker to do the acts than not do the acts, because they are good for them. Obasanjo's use of language in these utterances is to convince the addresses that he comes with the good intention of transforming the country. He clearly shows that his administration will give priority to matters that are bedevilling the country at the time of performing this speech in 1999. This can be seen in the use of the phrase *one of the immediate acts of this administration* in (lines 102-103 of 29th May, 1999) which shows the priority of his government. The use of the adverbs *quickly* and *decisively* in the same utterance describes his eagerness and readiness to tackle these problems the moment he takes over the administration of the country. Moreover, he also uses the modal auxiliary *will* in all the three sentences to show futurity.

Table 4. 19: Promises in Obasanjo's selected civilian speeches

Date	Lines	Utterances
29th May, 1999	152-154	Regular weekly meetings of cabinet *will be reinforced* to enrich the quality and decision of government through open discussion of memoranda in the council.
29th May, 1999,	160-161	A code of conduct for ministers and other public offices *will be introduced.*

The utterances in Table 4.19 above are speech acts of promising to strengthen government policies through open discussions of memoranda in the council and to introduce laws that will regulate the conduct of ministers and other public offices. In these utterances again, Obasanjo commits himself to future actions as stated in both utterances above. The utterances are promises because the addressees like what Obasanjo promise because they are good for them and for the country that is why they are considered as promises (Searle, 1979). The use of the modal auxiliary *will* in the utterances above shows the acts will take place in the future.

Table 4.20: Promises in Obasanjo's selected civilian speeches

Date	Lines	Utterances
30th September, 1999	49-51	*This administration* has therefore *chosen to pick up* the challenges to arrest the decline and decay in *our* education sector, as well as to improve upon the UPE scheme.
29th May, 1999	88-90	Under *this administration*, therefore, all the rules and regulations designed to help honesty and transparency in dealings with government *will be restored and enforced.*

In the above utterances in Table 4.20 above Obasanjo performs the speech acts of promise. This is because the speaker commits himself to future actions: that is (to revamp

the country's education sector and to sensitise members of his government on the need to be upright). These acts are what the addresses prefer the speaker to do rather than not do, because they are good for them. That is why they are classified as speech acts of promise. Obasanjo's use of the phrase *this administration* and *under this administration* in (lines 49-51 of 30th September and 88-90 of 29th September, 1999) emphasises and highlights the commitment of his government. Here, also the modal auxiliary *will* signifies that the government will restore and enforce honesty and transparency in the future.

Table 4.21: Promise in Obasanjo's selected civilian speeches

Date	Lines	Utterances
29th May, 1999	214-218	*I assure* you all that it is the policy of this government *to ensure* fair remuneration in services and retirement to public servants, which include legislators, civil servants, the police and member of the armed forces, parastatals and public owned educational institutions.

In the Table 4.21 above, the speaker performs the speech act of promise through the use of the first person singular pronoun *I* in order to show his personal responsibility. This could be seen in the expression *I assure you,* which is aimed at instilling confidence in the mind of the addresses to believe that what he is promising is part of the policy of his government.

Table 4.22: promise in Obasanjo's selected civilian speeches

Date	Line	Utterance
29th May, 2007	54-55	*I pledge* my continued support for him and his government.

In this utterance of Table 4.22 above, Obasanjo promises to be (loyal to the newly elected President and his government). His use of the performative verb *pledge* in this utterance

has not changed the illocutionary force of the utterance. Both promises and pledges are undertaken by the speaker to do a future actions. The use of the performative verb *pledge* in this utterance shows that he is performing an action rather than mere say. This corresponds to what Austin (1962) says actions are also performed through utterances. Obasanjo's choice of the performative verb *pledge* in this utterance shows that his utterance is more than a say but performance of an action through the use of the word (Austin, 1962). Obasanjo's use of the modal *will* in both selected military and civilian commissives tallies with the findings of Ye's (2010) and that of Jabber and Jinquan (2010).

4.2.3 Summary

President Obasanjo performs mainly promises in both his selected military and civilian speeches. His military commissives centre on developing human and agricultural resources, instilling public morality and promoting education in the country. The commissives in his selected civilian speeches expresses his determination and readiness to serve his people diligently, strengthen diplomatic relationship between Nigeria and other countries, improved the welfare of the military and the police, ensure accountability, fairness and transparency in governance, as well as instil confidence in governance and eliminate corruption.

In the military commissives he uses the modal auxiliaries *will* to show futurity and the modality *must* to convey duty and obligation and to show his seriousness to discharge what he promises. Similarly, in the civilian commissives he uses the same modality *will* to show futurity as well as the modal *must* to strengthen his promises. Obasanjo uses the pronoun *our to* show solidarity with the members of his cabinet as well as to create communality with the Nigerians. However, in the civilian commissives he again uses

pronouns such as *I* and *we* to show his personal responsibilities, as well as to share responsibility with the members of his cabinet.

In the same speeches, Obasanjo uses phrases like *federal military government* in order to deflect power from himself and attribute it to the Supreme Military Council. In order to show the supremacy of the military institution over an individual. In his civilian commissives he uses phrases *I am determined*, *I am also determined,* to show individual capabilities and determination to do what he promises. Additionally, he uses the adverb of time *anytime* in order to show seriousness and eager to execute what he promises while in the civilian speeches he uses adverbs such as *immediately*, *quickly*, *tomorrow* to indicate actual time, to show readiness and seriousness to perform what he promises.

4.3 Directives

Directives are the use of language by the speaker to direct the addressee to do something. Unlike, commissives where the speaker commits himself to a future action, in directives the speaker is not committing himself to do something but directing the addressee to do something. Directives change the hearer's directions. This type of act includes commands, advices, requests and warnings (Searle, 1976). The directives found in the selected military speeches of President Obasanjo were commands, advice and warnings. Command "can be thought of as the use of language to get someone to do something" and it usually comes from a person who has authority or is superior to the addressee (Adler, 1980, p. 7). Just like other speech acts, commands can also be direct or indirect. Direct commands are those that have "the format of grammatically imperative sentences" while the indirect commands are those that have no format of grammatically imperative sentences (Adler, 1980, p. 1). Searle (1969) contrasts advising with the speech act of requesting; the former "is not a specie of requesting…. Advising you is not trying to get

you to do something in the sense that requesting is. Advising is more likely telling you what is best for you (p. 67).

Though there is no clear division between commands and other directives such as requests, advices and invitations, the difference between those acts, as pinpointed by scholars, depend on the "relative authority of the speaker towards the addressee" (Downing & Locke, 2006, p. 205). Another important difference to note is whether the speaker gives option of non-compliance to the addressee or not. In issuing the command, the speaker gives no option of compliance to the addressee unlike in performing request or advice, where the speaker gives options to the addressee. Another important factor to consider in identifying the differences between one directive and another is who will be the beneficiary among the interlocutors if the act is accomplished. In advising, it is the addressee who benefits, while in requesting is the speaker who does (Downing & Locke, 2006). On the other hand, warning is a signal by word/words that are serious or negative like "don't" or an adverb like "never", and sometimes carries repercussion and the hearer has the reason to believe that the event which he is warned may likely occur in the future and may not be in his interest (Searle, 1969, 1979).

4.3.1 Directives in military speeches

Table 4.23: Analysis of directives in three selected military speeches of Obasanjo

Data	Advising		Commanding		Warning	
	Frequency	%	Frequency	%	Frequency	%
Speech 1 13th Feb,1976	2	14	2	14	2	14
Speech 2 1st Oct, 1979	1	7	-		-	-
Speech 3 6th Sept, 1976	2	14	5	36	-	-

The Table 4.23 above presents the frequency and percentage of the sub-types of directives that occurred in three selected military speeches of President Obasanjo.

4.3.1.1 Commands

Table 4.24: Commands in Obasanjo's selected military speeches

Date	Lines	Utterances
6th September, 1976	48-49	*I* consider it *necessary* to invite the attention of the pupils, the teachers and the parents to their responsibility in this programme.
13th February, 1976	52-54	I expect every public officer, indeed every Nigerian, to measure up to a high degree of efficiency, integrity and moral rectitude.
13th February, 1976	63-64	*I am therefore calling* on every one of you to rise to the challenge.

The utterances in Table 4.24 above, President Obasanjo performs the speech acts of indirect commands. They are said to be indirect because the utterances use in issuing the said acts are declarative sentences. This is because declarative sentence is a sentence that

makes a statement and contains a subject (Downing & Locke, 2006; Quirk & Greenbaum, 1980) (see section 4.1.2 for criteria outlined by Searle, 1969; Becker & Bieswanger, 2006). That is to say there is no correspondence between the sentence type and the act performed. Another reason to classify the utterances as indirect is that they have overt subjects. Downing and Locke (2006) pp. 191-194), say an imperative "is a sentence or clause that carries no overt subject, it also uses the base form of the verb, with no modals or tense-aspect forms and uses "don't" (placed before a subject) and "do" to negate or emphasise 2nd person imperatives, respectively" (pp. 191-194).

Based on Downing and Locke's (2006) argument, the utterances above may be considered as speech acts of commands, because they are future actions of the hearers and the speaker believes that the hearers are able to do it and the said utterances are produced by a speaker who is in a position of authority over the hearers (Searle, 1979). Additionally, the utterances correspond to what Adler, (1980); Downing & Locke, (2006) say that in the act of commanding the speaker gives the addressee no option for non-compliance. This can be seen in expressions such as *I consider it necessary to invite you* (lines 48-49 of 6th September, 1976) and *I expect every public office*r *indeed,* (lines 52-54 of 13th February, 1976).

The utterances in Table 4.24 above show no option for non-compliance. They again portray Obasanjo's seriousness regarding nation building, and that anything below that expectation will not be taken kindly. It is a speech of a taking over after the failed military coup from which we may infer that any public officer that failed to rise to the challenge of realising the goals of nation building will face the consequences. The expression is forceful and therefore imbued with duress in order to coerce "*every public officer, indeed, every Nigerian*" to rise to the challenge of nation building. Likewise the expression *I am therefore calling* (lines 63-64 of 13th February, 1976) is also forceful and indicates

Obasanjo's concern, care and desperate need to persuade Nigerians to rise to the challenge of nation building. The speaker's choice of the verb a*m* and the present progressive verb *calling* signifies his urgency and desperation at the moment of making these utterances. The first person singular pronoun *I* used in the above utterances is a substitute for the speaker's name; it is the way for him to refer to himself. In addition, the use of the personal pronoun *I* in this context portrays the speaker's power and authority. This could be seen in the speaker's use of the phrase *I consider it necessary* (lines 48-49 of 6th September, 1976), *I expect every public officer and every Nigerian* (lines 52-54 of 13th February, 976) and *I am therefore calling on everyone* (lines 63-64 of 13th February, 1976) which clearly portrays him as someone with power and authority.

"That is why Bremley (2001, p. 28) says the most motivating reasons for a politician to use the pronoun I in his/her speech is to come across as good and responsible, to describe himself in a positive way and highlight personal qualities that politicians want to express include being someone with principles, moral power and who is not afraid to take action when necessary."

Table 4.25: Commands in Obasanjo's selected military speeches

Date	Lines	Utterances
6th September, 1976	114-117	*Every Nigerian should* look upon the primary schools in his locality, not as government schools as such but, as his own institution which he *should* nurture and care for just in the same way as he looks after his own.
6th September, 1976,	92-93	*They should* be dedicated, and prepared to teach wherever *they* are posted; *they should* equally be loyal and hard working.
6th September, 1976,	87-89	Also the nation (symbolised by the hoisted national flag) *should* be saluted every morning by pupils in primary and secondary schools with national anthem.

Once again, the speaker performs indirect commands, just as he performs in the sentences above. The utterances are commands because the speaker has relative authority over his addressees. Another, condition that qualifies the acts as commands is the presence of the modal auxiliary *should* which portrays speaker's authority over the addressees. If the utterances are to be rephrased as *they may equally be loyal and hardworking* it would have appeared simple and less forceful but the speaker's choice of the modal auxiliary *should* places his authority over the addressees and thereby gives them no option for non-compliance, that is why Quirk and Greenbaum (1980) signified that one of the uses of *should* is for obligation. This also corresponds with the findings of Feng and Liu (2010) who say *should* usually expresses imperative suggestions or commands. Moreover, Obasanjo's use of the phrase *every Nigerian* in (lines 114-117of 6th September, 1976) is to stress the importance of education to all Nigerians male or female, young or old to participate in the development of education.

The pronoun *they* in (lines 92-93 of 6th September, 1976) refers to the teachers. The utterances are indirect commands because of the mismatch between the sentence type and the act performed. The utterances used are declaratives because they are constructed in a form of statements and they carry subjects this paved way for the mismatch. Therefore, they are indirect speech acts (Searle, 1975; Leech, 1987; Yule, 1992; Huang, 2007). Commands belong to the class of imperative sentences and if it is performed or issued through the use of sentence type other than imperative sentence such a command is valid but is said to be performed indirectly (Downing & Locke, 2006; Becker & Bieswanger, 2006).

Table 4.26: Command in Obasanjo's selected military speeches

Date	Line	Utterance
6th September, 1976	85-87	*With immediate effect*, children in primary and secondary schools *will make a pledge* at the beginning and the end of every school day and every major assembly or congregation.

In this utterance of Table 4.26 above, the speaker performs indirect command. This is because the utterance used is declarative in nature because it appears in a form of statement and it contains subject. Another reason is that there is a mismatch between the sentence form and the act performed (Searle, 1979). In addition, it is performed by the speaker President Obasanjo who has relative authority over the addressees therefore, it is said to be a command. Another thing to note in this utterance is Obasanjo's use of the phrase *with immediate effect* (lines of 85-87 6th September, 1976) shows no option for compliance and it as well shows Obasanjo's seriousness and urgency regarding the act.

4.3.1.2 Advice

Table 4.27: Advice in Obasanjo's selected military speeches

Date	Lines	Utterances
1st October, 1979	13-16	*May I call on Nigerians*, no matter to which political party they may belong, *to rise up* in unity of purpose *to support* the President- elect in his task of consolidating and strengthening the political and socio-economic structures of the country.
6th September, 1976	97-100	*It is therefore, up to you teachers to re-assure* the nation by turning out knowledgeable, well behaved and useful pupils from your classrooms and that you are not contributing to the falling standard of education.

The utterances in Table 4.27 above are indirect advices. They are said to be indirect as a result of the mismatch between the sentence type and the act performed as elucidated by

Grundy (2008) who posits that imperatives are used to issue commands and requests. He further added that it is also used for advising, warning and encourages people to work hard and to wish them a good journey. The sentences are declaratives because they both contain subjects and they are constructed in form of statement. The utterances are speech acts of advising, for the reason that if the addressees take the advice and support the president elect he will have the opportunity to discharge his duties effectively that will transform the Nigerian society and brings about positive development to the country.

Likewise, the second advice to Nigerian teachers if taken they will have the benefit and credit of producing literate, good and useful pupils that will in turn become good leaders. Another important reason that qualifies the two speech acts of advising is that the speaker gives option for compliance as shown in the two utterances. For example, he states that *may I call on Nigerians* and *it is therefore up to you teachers* (lines 13-16 of 1st October, 1979 and lines 97-100 of 6th September, 1976)which is one of the differences between advising and commanding (Adler, 1980). It should be borne in mind that an act of advice represents telling someone to do what is good for him. This advice, therefore, requires no compulsion unlike commanding, where the speaker shows his relative authority over the addressees.

Table 4.28: Advice in Obasanjo's selected military speeches

Date	Lines	Utterances
13th February, 1976	43-44	Those who have genuine grievances or complaints *should* us*e* the established channel to secure redress.
13th February, 1976	50-52	*You shall* be *sever*e in your dealings with foreign profiteers who try to stand in the way of our policy to free our economy and improve the lot of the ordinary and deprived citizenry of this country.

The utterances in Table 4.28 above are speech acts of advice performed indirectly. It is said to be indirect due to the mismatch between the sentence type and the acts performed. The sentences used are declaratives because they are constructed in a form of statement. Declarative sentence is a sentence that makes a statement (Adler, 1980; Downing & Locke, 2006). However, the utterances contain the modal auxiliary verbs s*hould, shall* and *have,* these features qualify them as declaratives (Downing & Locke, 2006). Another thing that qualifies (lines 43-44 of 13th February, 1976,) as an indirect advice is that inference is required to understand the act as advice. This is because the researcher's background knowledge is needed here to support the argument (Searle, 1979). In this utterance, Obasanjo is indirectly advising friends and relatives of the dismissed members of the Nigerian armed forces as a result of their involvement in the military coup to keep quiet and stop making any further complaint or grievances the following are (lines 25-26 and 26-28 of 13th February, 1976) as thus: *in the meantime the supreme military council has decided to dismiss Yakubu Gowon from Nigerian Army. Dauda Usman and Clement Yildar have also been dismissed from the army*).

In the second utterance of (lines 50-52 of 13th February, 1976), the advice is contained in the phrase: *you shall be severe in your dealings with foreign and Nigerian profiteers who try to stand in the way* ….This shows the utterance is advising because it is for the benefit of the addressees not the speaker (Searle, 1979) the speaker's use of the modal auxiliary *shall* in this utterance refers to a future action.

Table 4.29: Advice in Obasanjo's selected military speeches

Date	Line	Utterance
6th September, 1976	5-7	*Every Nigerian* child *should regard* basic education as his natural heritage, a right not a privilege.

In this utterance of Table 4.29 above, Obasanjo performs the act of advising (Nigerian child to value the importance of education). It is said to be an advice because it benefits the addressees not the speaker. Obasanjo's use of the phrase *every Nigerian* in this utterance emphasises the constitutional right of Nigerian children to education and it serves as an awareness campaign to Nigerian parents who are of the believe that right to education is only limited to children of the select few at the time of this speech in 1976

4.3.1.3 Warnings

Table 4.30: Warnings in Obasanjo's selected military speeches

Date	Lines	Utterances
13th February, 1976	44-45	*But anyone* who takes the law into his hands *will* henceforth have himself to blame
13th February, 1976	40-42	Let me therefore, *here and now* serve notice that we *shall not allow* inefficiency or improper conduct on the part of any public officer.

The utterances in Table 4.30 above are speech acts of warnings performed indirectly. They are said to be indirect due to the mismatch between the sentences type and the acts performed. The sentences are in the declarative form, because they contain overt subjects and auxiliaries. These brought about the mismatch, because for warning to be direct it has to be issued through imperative sentence (Grundy, 1980). Additionally, the utterances signal punishment, another important criteria that qualifies utterance to be a warning (Searle, 1979). This punishment will be meted to anyone who failed to comply with the President's warning. The warnings are seen in the utterance of (lines 44-45 of 13th February, 1976) *will henceforth have himself to blame* and (lines 40-42 of 13th February, 1976,) *let me therefore, here and now serve notice that we shall not allow inefficiency or improper conduct.* From these utterances, one can discern that there will be punishment for anyone who failed to comply with the President's warning. These expressions qualify

the utterances as warning because they clearly show their occurrences are not in the hearer's interest.

4.3.2 Directives in civilian speeches

Table 4.31: Analysis of directives in three selected civilian speeches of Obasanjo

Data	request		commanding		warning	
	Frequency	**%**	**Frequency**	**%**	**Frequency**	%
Speech 4 29th May, 1999	1	13%	4	50	1	13
Speech 5 29th May, 2007	-	-	-	-	-	-
Speech 6 30th Sept, 1999	-	-	2	25	-	-

This table above, presents the frequencies and percentages of the types of directives that occur in three selected civilian speeches of President Obasanjo.

4.3.2.1 Commands

Table 4. 32: commands in Obasanjo's selected civilian speeches

Date	Lines	Utterances
29th May, 1999	211-212	Politicians *must carefully examine* the budget to ensure that public funds are judiciously spent.
29th May, 1999	213-214	*They must* join in the campaign against corruption and help re-establish integrity in the conduct of public affairs.
29th May, 1999,	212-213	*They must* avoid damage to their own credibility and vote for themselves special privilege.

The utterances in Table 4.32 above are commands performed indirectly by President Obasanjo. They are indirect due to the mismatch between the sentence type and the acts performed. The sentences used for these utterances are declarative because direct command is typically associated with imperative sentences (Adler, 1980). Another,

reason that qualifies these utterances as indirect is the presence of the modal auxiliary *must,* the impersonal subject *politicians* that appeared in a form of statement. Moreover, they are future actions of the addressees and the speaker knows the addressees will be able to do what he commands them to do. Additionally, the utterances are performed by the speaker who has relative authority over his addressees. Having the authority counts as an attempt by the speaker to use his power to get the hearer to do the acts by the virtue of his authority. He also uses the modal auxiliary *must* in all the utterances in order to obligate the hearers to do what he commands them to do without giving them any option. (Searle, 1979).

Obasanjo's use of the expression *politicians must carefully examine the budget…* (lines 211-212 of 29th May, 1999) is to be specific and direct for them to understand the strength of his command. This expression also stresses the importance of the message to them and shows his concern regarding the issue. Obasanjo's use of the pronoun *they* refers to the politicians and it is used for the purpose of avoiding repetition.

Table 4.33: Command in Obasanjo's selected civilian speeches

Date	Line	Utterance
29th May, 1999,	220-221	*I shall* end this address by stressing again that you *must change* your ways of governance and avoiding business on this eve of the coming millennium.

In this utterance of Table 4.33 above, Obasanjo performs the speech act of commanding Nigerians indirectly to change their ways of governance. It is performed indirectly as a result of the mismatch between the sentence type and the act performed. The utterance used in Table 4.33 above is a declarative sentence. It is worth clarifying that "utterance" in the context of this study refers to particular linguistic sequence word/s, phrase/s, sentence/s used by a particular speaker on a particular occasion to convey a particular

message (Huang, 2007). On the other hand, direct command is associated with imperative sentences. If a command is performed using other type of sentence other than imperative, then such a command is said to be indirect. Another condition that qualifies the utterance as command is that they are future actions of the addressees and the speaker, President Obasanjo, knows the addressees will be able to do what he commands them to do. In addition, the speaker has relative authority over the hearer (Searle, 1976, 1979). Another reason indicating command is that Obasanjo's use of the modal auxiliary *must* in these utterances obligate and compel the hearers to do what he wants them to do without giving them any option (Searle, 1979). He also used a forceful expression in (lines 220-221 of 29th May, 1999) *I shall end this address by stressing again that you must change….*The aim of the speaker here is to express his personal feelings and concern about the need for the politicians to change their attitude in discharging their official duties.

Table 4.34: Command in Obasanjo's selected civilian speeches

Date	Lines	Utterances
30th September, 1999	74-75	*Everybody must chip in.*
30th September, 1999,	75	*But no one should shirk his or her own responsibility.*

The utterances in Table 4.34 above, Obasanjo commands Nigerians to participate in nation building and in the second sentence he commands the civil servants not to avoid their responsibilities. These commands are indirect because of the mismatch between the sentence type and the act performed as it appears in the previous sentences. This mismatch arises as a result of Obasanjo's use of declarative sentences and performed commands. Command is typically associated with imperative sentences. The utterances used in issuing these commands are declarative because they contain modal auxiliaries *must* and

should which portray them as declarative (Downing & Locke, 2006; Quirk & Greenbaum, 1980). They are commands because they are produced by a speaker who has relative authority over the addressees and they are future actions of the addressees and the speaker knows the addressees will be able to do what he commands them to do Searle, (1976, 1979). Additionally, Obasanjo's use of the modal auxiliaries *must* and *should* in these utterances qualify the acts as commands because the use of these modal auxiliaries give the hearer no option for compliance, because both auxiliaries *must* and *should* show obligation and necessity (Quirk & Greenbaum, 1980).

The speaker's use of the indefinite pronoun *everybody* in (lines 74-75 of 30th September, 1999) refers to all Nigerians. The use of the indefinite pronoun *everybody* in (line 74-75) in this utterance is to draw the attention of all Nigerians to realise that every single Nigerian has a role to play in the development of education. The use of the conjunction *But* in (line 75 of 30th September, 1999) narrows the command from all Nigerians to those who are officially vested with the responsibility. If they evade their duties they will be punished. This sentence reinforces and reconfirms the earlier sentence as commands.

4.3.2.2 Request

Table 4. 35: Request in Obasanjo's selected civilian speeches

Date	Line	Utterance
29th May, 1999	218-219	*I call on all Nigerians, but* particularly on *our religious* leaders to pray for moral and spiritual revival and regeneration in our nation.

The utterance in Table 4.35 above, President Obasanjo performs indirect request. It is a request because it benefits the speaker (Obasanjo) not the addressees (religious leaders). This is because if they pray for revival and regeneration of the nation the credit for a new

Nigeria will go to Obasanjo as the President of the country. This request is performed indirectly because of the mismatch between the sentence type and act performed. Direct request and command are typically associated with imperative sentence (Downing & Locke, 2006; Grundy, 1980; Searle, 1979). The structure of the sentence here is declarative because it appears in form of a statement and it contains the subject *I*. Obasanjo's use of language in this sentence is to honour the religious leaders by showing that they are important, needed, and are also part of the society. While the use of the conjunction *But* in (line 218-219 of 29th May, 1999) narrowed down the speaker's request from all Nigerians to religious leaders in order to show recognition and make them feel they are important.

4.3.2.3 Warning

Table 4. 36: Warning in Obasanjo's selected civilian speeches

Date	Line	Utterance
29th May, 1999	86-88	*Nobody, no matter who and where, will be allowed to get away* with the breach of the law or the perpetration of corruption and evil.

The utterance in Table 4.36 above is a speech act of warning to all Nigerians regardless of their position in a society or region. This is shown in the expression *nobody, no matter who and where, will be allowed to get away* (lines 86-88 of 29th May, 1999) which clearly shows there will be punishment for anyone who refuses to abide by the warning. The use of the modal auxiliary *will* in this utterance indicates futurity at the time of making the speech henceforth anyone found guilty will be penalised. The act performed is a warning not promise because in promise the addressees want the act to occur, but in this respect we can discern that no criminal will like any person or authority to stop him from perpetuating his/her illegal act.

4.3.3 Summary

Obasanjo performs a total of 22 different kinds of directives in his selected military and civilian speeches. Out of these 22 directives, 14 were found in his selected military speeches, while the remaining 8 were found in his selected civilian speeches. The directives he performs in the three selected military speeches were commands, advice and warning, while there were commands, request and warning in his three selected civilian speeches.

He uses the modal auxiliary *should* in his military directives to compel and obligate his addressees. In the civilian directives, he uses the modal auxiliary *must* to compel and obligate his addressees to do what he commands them to do and to clearly show his seriousness and concern regarding the acts he performs. He also uses soft expressions like *may I call on Nigerians* in the military directives and *I call on all Nigerians*, particularly religious leaders in order to appeal to them to accept his advice and do what he requests them to do. In other words, Obasanjo uses expressions such as *I expect every public officer, indeed every Nigerian to measure up* in his selected military directives which are to indicate and emphasise his seriousness regarding nation building. Additionally, he uses the expression *I am therefore*, *calling, on every one to rise….* The aim here is to show his care for patriotism, concern and desperate need to persuade Nigerians to rise to the challenge of nation building. However, in the civilian directives, he uses impersonal subject *politicians* in order to be direct and categorical.

Another important difference is that Obasanjo's military directives centred on nation building, promoting education and inculcating patriotism among Nigerians. However, his directives in the civilian speeches are more on accountability, fighting corruption, promoting the image of the public officers and hope for a new Nigeria.

CHAPTER 5

CONCLUSION

5.1 Introduction

This chapter presents the findings of this study. It also offers possible recommendations for future research as well as the implications of the research findings. As stated in the initial chapter, the objectives of this study were to identify and analyse the commissives and directives that occurred in Obasanjo's three selected military speeches and three selected civilian speeches. In addition, the study looked at the similarities and differences between the commissives that occurred in his selected military and civilian speeches as well as the similarities and differences that occurred in his selected military and civilian speeches. To achieve these, the data was analysed using Searle's (1976) taxonomy to get the research questions set for this present study answered (for the summary of the research questions and their answers, see the sub-section 5.3 below).

5.2 Nature of Political Speech

It is widely accepted that it is through speeches that communications take place between the leaders and the led all over the world. These types of speeches are simply termed as political speeches. They include various speeches delivered by world leaders at different national or international occasions, campaigns, public anniversaries, interviews, debates and so forth. By way of definition, political speech, according to Dedaic (2006), has been classified into three categories: i) deliberative, ii) judicial, and iii) epideictic. Differing from Dedaic's (2006) definition, Bork (1971) perceives political speech as a kind of attitude associated with the way governments are run through its three arms of administration. That is to say, Bork's definition has confined the political speech within the three arms of governments while other major aspects of social life, such as education and commerce, were excluded. Bork's (1971) explanation has limited political speech

within the corridors of power and almost excluded the ordinary people from the equation. In an opposing view to Bork's (1971), Barendt (2005) sees political speeches as a vehicle through which the system may be criticised by the common people, or as a tool for dialogue between the leader and the led.

As indicted earlier, this present study was focused at examining speeches delivered in two different contexts: a military and a civilian dispensations. Literature has uncovered a number of previous studies on the use of speech acts in political speeches. For example, Akinwotu (2013) used Austin's (1962) theory of speech act to investigate campaign speeches of Awolowo and Abiola. Ayeomoni (2012) combined Austin's (1962) and Searle's (1969) theories to study victory and inaugural speech of Umaru Musa Yar'adua. Parallel to Ayeomoni's (2012) study, Abuya (2012) used Austin's (1962) and Searle's (1969) theories of speech acts to study President Jonathan's inaugural speech. In the same line Tarhom and Miracle (2013) used the same Austin's (1962) and Searle's (1969) theories of speech acts to study the same President Jonathan's inaugural speech. Once again, Kumuyi and Akinkurolere (2000) applied the same Austin's (1962) and Searle's (1969) theories to study General Muhammadu Buhari's 1983 and General Ibrahim Babangida's 1985 coup speeches.

Virtually, almost all the previous studies listed above have incorporated Austin's (1962) and Searle's (1969) theories of speech acts. It may not look very surprising considering the fact that Austin tutored Searle, and that certain components in Austin's (1962) taxonomy differ from the ones existing in Searle's (1969) taxonomy. This might be the justification why these studies combined the two different taxonomy. Looking at the analytical frameworks used by the previous studies, this present study chose to incorporate Searle's (1976) taxonomy as no previous study has done that so far.

5.3 Findings

This segment present summary of research questions and findings. This research work sampled 6 speeches of President Obasanjo and it is believed the data analysed has answered the research questions of the study as listed below.

5.3.1 What kinds of commissives occur in Obasanjo's selected military and civilian speeches?

The analysis of President Obasanjo's selected military and civilian speeches shows that in both military and civilian commissives he performs mainly promises. In his selected military speeches he performs 12 promises (out of 12 utterances). Similarly, in his selected civilian speeches, the analysis again shows he performs 27 promises (out of the 27 utterances). These shows that the kinds of speech act performed by Obasanjo in his selected military and civilian speeches were all promises.

5.3.2 What kinds of directives occur in Obasanjo's selected military and civilian speeches?

The analysis shows in his selected military speeches he performs three different kinds of directives namely advice, commands and warnings. Similarly, in his selected civilian directives he performs another three different kinds of directives namely commands, request and warnings. In the selected military speeches the advice occurs five times (out of 14 utterances) with 21%, commands seven times (out of 14) with 50% and warning two times (out of 14) with 14%. In the civilian speeches request occurred only one time (out of 8) which places it at 13%, commands six times (out of 8) with 75% and warning one time with 13%.

5.3.3 What are the similarities and differences between the commissives in his selected military and civilian speeches?

The similarities of Obasanjo's military and civilian commissives are presented below in Table 5.1for clarity and understanding.

Table 5.1: Similarities between Obasanjo's military and civilian commissives

Military	Civilian
Promise	Promise
First person plural pronoun (we)	First person plural pronoun (we)
Modals auxiliary (will, must and should)	Modals auxiliary (will, must and should)
Adverbs (immediately, quickly and anytime)	Adverbs (immediately, quickly and anytime)

Table 5.1 above, shows the similarities in Obasanjo's military and civilian commissives where he performs *promises* in both military and civilian speeches. Another similarity is Obasanjo's use of first person plural pronoun *we* in his military and civilian speeches. Obasanjo uses first person plural pronoun *we* in both military and civilian speeches to share his responsibility with the members of the Supreme Military Cabinet as well as the members of his cabinet. In both speeches he again uses modals auxiliary *will, must* and *should*. The modal *will* is to show futurity, *must* and *should* to show obligation, emphasis and to strengthen his commitment. The use of the modal *will* correspond to the findings of Feng and Liu (2010) in their study on interpersonal meaning in Obama's speech. Another area of similarity is in the use of adverbs like *immediately, quickly and anytime* to express eagerness and seriousness.

Table 5.2: Differences between Obasanjo's military and civilian commissives

Military	Civilian
Possessive plural pronoun (our)	First person singular pronoun (I)
Deflect power from himself and attribute it to the military institution	Expressed his capabilities and determination.
Obasanjo's military commissives centred on developing human and agricultural resources, instilling public morality and promoting education.	His civilian commissives expresses his determination and readiness to serve the country diligently, strengthen his diplomacy between Nigeria and other countries, improves the welfare of the military and police, transparency and as well instil confidence in governance and eliminate corruption in the country.

Table 5.2 shows the differences in Obasanjo's ways of performing military and civilian commissives. The findings revealed that the speaker uses Possessive plural pronoun *our* in his military speeches a lone. Obasanjo's use of the possessive plural pronoun *our* in his military speeches is to show solidarity and sense of togetherness. Obasanjo's use of the possessive pronoun our in both inclusion and exclusion form. The aim of the speaker here is to show that he is a leader that cares for both the citizens and members of the Supreme Military Council. However, in the civilian speeches he uses first person singular pronoun *I*. The use of the singular pronoun *I* is for the speaker to show his personal responsibilities and determination so as to persuade Nigerians to believe that he is a leader that has concern for his citizens.

Another differences is that in his military commissives he uses expressions like *the federal military government* while in the civilian commissives he uses expressions like *I am determined, I am also determined. The use of the phrase the federal military government* is for Obasanjo to deflect power from himself and attribute it to an institution

(military) so as to show the Supremacy of the military institution over an individual. In the civilian speeches he uses expressions such as *I am determined, I am also determined* in lines (70-72 and 221-223 of May, 1999) to show his capabilities and determination for certain actions so as to persuade the addressees to believe him that he is capable of leading Nigeria to success. Another important difference to consider is that Obasanjo's military commissives centred on developing human and agricultural resources, instilling public morality and promoting education while in his civilian commissives he expresses his determination and readiness to serve the country diligently, strengthen his diplomacy between Nigeria and other countries, improves the welfare of the military and police, transparency and as well instil confidence in governance and eliminate corruption in the country.

5.3.4 What are the similarities and differences between the directives in his selected military and civilian speeches?

The similarities between Obasanjo's military and civilian directives are presented below in table 5.3.

Table 5.3 Similarities between Obasanjo's military and civilian directives

Military	Civilian
commands	commands
Warning	Warning
Use of first person singular pronoun *I*	Use of first person singular pronoun *I*

The analysis of President Obasanjo's military and civilian directives revealed that there is a close similarities. He performs commands and warning in both military and civilian directives. Another important similarity between the military and civilian directives is

that Obasanjo uses first person singular pronoun *I* to show personal responsibilities and personal feelings to persuade Nigerians to believe that he is capable of offering a deserving leadership. Examples *I consider it necessary* (lines 50-51 of 6th September, 1976) *I expect every public officer* (54-56 of 13th February, 1976) I *am therefore calling (*lines 69-70 of 13th February,1976), I *shall end this address by stressing again* (lines 241-242 of 29th May, 1999) and *I call on Nigerians* (lines 238-239 of 29th May, 1999).

Table 5.4 Differences between Obasanjo's military and civilian directives.

Military	Civilian
Should	Must
Advice Nigerians to support Newly elected president.	Advice religious leaders to pray for the country.
Second person pronoun (you)	Impersonal subjects (politicians)
Military directives centred on nation building, promoting education and patriotism.	Civilian directives are concerned with accountability, fighting corruption, promoting image of the public officers and hope for the nation.

The analysis of military and civilian shows that President Obasanjo uses the modal auxiliary *should* to advise his addresses to do something good while in the civilian speeches he uses the modal *must* to command his addressees. The modals *should* is used to offer strong advice. That is why Murthy (2007) says *should* are used to offer strong advice. He again used the modal *must* in his civilian directives. The reason for this possibly is that he was commanding politicians to be honest in discharging their duties. Therefore, he has to use forceful language to let them understand he has serious concern towards their attitude and he wants them to change instantly. Another difference to note is that he advise Nigerians to support newly elected President so as to ensure the

sustenance of democracy in the country while in the civilian directives he advises religious leaders to pray for the country. These portrays his love and patriotism to his country. Moreover, Obasanjo uses second person pronoun *you* in his military directives to address his audience directly while, in the civilian speeches he used impersonal subject *politician* in order for him to be direct and categorical. Another important difference is that Obasanjo's military directives centred on nation building, promoting education and patriotism.

In another difference between the directives in Obasanjo's selected military and civilian speeches is that his directives in the military centred on nation building, promoting education and patriotism. However, the directives in his civilian speeches are concerned with accountability, fighting corruption, promoting image of the public officers and hope for the nation. In addition Obasanjo advises Nigerians to support the newly elected President while in the civilian directives he advises religious leaders to pray for the country. Moreover, he uses second person pronoun *you* in the military directives to address his audience directly while, in the civilian speeches he used impersonal subject *politician* in order for him to be categorical and direct.

Having presented the findings above, it should be taken into consideration that this present study was focused on two different types of speeches delivered during military and civilian regimes. It is clear from the literature consulted that no study has done that so far. Moreover, it is only Pratma's (2014) that looked at commissives and directives in David Cameroon's speech at World Economic Centre. On the one hand, this present study looked at commissives and directives as well as the different types performed.

Comparing the findings for example, Akinwotu (2013) found 10 commissives out of 40 utterances with 22%, and directives 8 out of 40 with 18.2% Ayeomoni's (2012), found

commissives 6 times out of 28 utterances with 3o% and directives 7 times with 35%, Abuya (2012), discovered 75% commissives out of 50 sentences and 10% directives out of 50 sentences likewise, Kumuyi and Akinkurolere (2000) study revealed the occurrence of commissives and directives three times each. Comapred to the other studies found in the literature, this present study sampled a much larger data. In addition, this study investigated sub-types of commissives and directives (see chapter 4 of this study). That is to say having used a different framework, a larger data, different types of speeches and exploring further into sub-types of speech acts and the way they were performed is expected to have contributed to the body of literature in political speech.

5.4 Implication of the research findings

It should be noted that the findings of the previous studies have revealed that they were limited to investigating only speech acts, without given consideration to how those acts were performed. No study from the literature so far consulted attempted to examine the ways these speech acts were performed. It is worth nothing that, the current study examines Obasanjo's use of language in relation to the acts performed. Therefore, future studies on political discourse should as well look at language use in the analysis of speech acts in order to understand how those acts were also performed.

5.5 Recommendation for further research

Having investigated the selected speeches of Obasanjo as a military Head of State and civilian President. This study makes the following recommendations:

Future researchers who are interested to work on the political discourse of President Obasanjo should consider his online interviews since none of the studies so far consulted by this researcher used his online interviews as a source of data to justify the findings of other studies.

It is recommended that further research should look into selected speeches of President Obasanjo outside politics. This should bring the basis of comparison between the speeches he delivered while in office and those he delivered outside power.

Speeches delivered by Obasanjo outside Nigeria either as a Head of State or civilian President can be an interesting area for further study. To the best of this researcher only one researcher Adetunji (2006) used a speech of Obasanjo at Harvard University in order to explore the use of Deixis in Obasanjo's speeches. The findings of this study set a parameter for subsequent research to be conducted in similar situations in Nigeria and beyond.

REFERENCES

Abdel-Moety, M. D. (2015). American political discourse as manifested in Hillary Clinton's interviews: A critical approach. *English Linguistic Research*, 4(1), 1-13.

Abuya, E. J. (2012). A pragma-stylistic analysis of President Goodluck Ebele Jonathan inaugural speech. *Canadian Centre for Science and Education, 5*(11), 8-15. Retrieved from http://dx.doi.org/10.5539/elt.v5n11p8

Adeoye, O. A. (2009). Godfatherism and the future of Nigerian democracy. *African Journal of Political Science and International Relations, 3*(6), 268-272. Retrieved from http://www.academicJournals.Org/AJPSIR

Adetunji, A. (2006). Inclusion and exclusion in political discourse: Deixis in Olusegun Obasanjo's speeches. *Journal of Language and Linguistics*, 5(2), 177-191. http://webspace.buckingham.ac.uk/kbernhardt/journal/5_2/LING%202.pdf

Adedun, A. E., & Atolagbe, A. A. (2011). A man whom I have great confidence: Discourse analysis of former President Olusegun Obasanjo's farewell speech to Nigeria. *Akademeia,* (1), 1-9.

Adler, M. J. (1980). *A pragmatic logic for commands*. John Benjamin.

Agbedo, C. U. (2008). A speech acts analysis of political discourse in the print media. *Ikenga International Journal of African studies, 10*(1&2).

Akinwotu, S. A. (2013). A speech acts analysis of the acceptance of nomination speeches of Chief Obafemi Awolowo and Chief M.K.O. Abiola. *Sciedu Press,* (1), 43-51. Retrieved from http://dx.doi.org/10.5430/elr.v2n1p43

Al-Faki, I. M (2014). Political speeches of some African leaders from linguistic perspectives. *International Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences, 4*(3), 180-197. http://www.ijhssnet.com/journals/Vol_4_No_3_February_2014/18.pdf

Al-Gublan, B. K. (2015). A pragmatic study of a political discourse from the perspective of the Linguistic Adoptation Theory. *International Journal of English Linguistics*, 5(2), 151-164.

Allen, W (2006). Australian political discourse: pronominal choice in campaign speeches. Selected paper from the 2006 conference of the Australian Linguistic Society.

Alkhirbash, A. (2010). Persuasive language in selected speeches of Tun Dr. Mahathir Mohammad. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Universiti Putra Malaysia. Retrieved from http://psasir.upm.edu.my/12339/1/FBMK_2010_15A.pdf

Altikriti, S. F. (2011). Speech act analysis to short stories. *Journal of Language Teaching and* Research, 2 (6), 1374-1384.

Arroyo, B. L. (2000). Personal deixis in Spanish political-electoral debate. *Journal of pragmatics, 32*, 1-27.

Austin, J. L. (1962). *How to do things with words*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Awonuga, C. O. (2005). A stylistic study of "Sustenance of Democracy" by Nigerian President Olusegun Obasanjo. *Journal of social Science*, *11*(2), 111-119. Retrieved from www.krepublishers.com/...2005...2005...2005...Awonuga-C-O/JSS-11-2...on 02/02/2013

Ayeomoni, O. M., & Akinkulare, O. S. (2012). A pragmatic analysis of victory and inaugural speeches of President Umaru Musa Yar'adua. *Academy Publisher,* 2(3), 461-468. doi:10.4304/tpls.2.3.461-468

Ayoola, K. (2005). Interpreting Nigeria's political discourse: A study of President Olusegun Obasanjo's July 26, 2005 address to Nigeria's National Assembly. *Papers in English Linguistics* (PEL) 6. 1-13. Retrieved from http://ojs.academypublisher.com/index.php/tpls/article/view/tpls0203461468 on 02/ 02/2013

Bach, K., & Harnish R. M. (1979). *Linguistic communication and speech acts*. Cambridge, Massachusetts, MA: MIT Press.

Beard, A. (2002). *The language of politics*. London: Routledge.

Barendt, E. (2005). *Freedom of speech* (2nd ed.). Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Bramley, N.R. (2001). *Pronoun of politics: the use of pronoun in the construction of 'self' and 'other' in political interviews*. London: Routledge.

Brown, G., & Yule, G. (1983). *Discourse analysis.* Cambridge*:* Cambridge University Press.

Cerny, M (2007). On the function of speech acts in doctor-patient communication. *Linguistica online,* 1-15. Retrieved from http://www.phil.muni.cz/linguistica/art/cerny/cer-001.pdf

Cook, G. (1989). *Discourse*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Cutting, J. (2001). The speech acts of the in-group. *Journal of Pragmatics, 33*(8), 1207-1223.

Chiama, P. (2014, October 3). Real reason Obasanjo went back to school. *Leadership,* p. 1. Retrieved from http://leadership.ng/news/385992/real-reasons-obasanjo-went-back-school

Daramola, A. (2008). A child of necessity: An analysis of political discourse in Nigeria. *International Pragmatic Association*, *18*(3), 355-380. Retrieved from http://elanguage.net/journals/pragmatics/article/viewFile/596/513

David, K. M., & Dumanig, F. P (2011). National unity in multi-ethnic Malaysia: A critical discourse analysis of Tun. Dr. Mahathir's political speech. *Journal of Language and Society, RC 25 of the International Sociolinguistic Association*, *1*(1), 11-31. Retrieved from http://language-and-society.com/journal

Dedaic, M. N. (2005). Political speeches and persuasive argumentation. *Journal of language and linguistics*, *1*(2), 111-119.

Dontcheva-Navratilova, O. (2009). Interpersonal meaning in the genre of diplomatic address. *Brno Studies in English*, 35(2), 129-143.

Downing, A., & Locke, P. (2006). *University grammar English course* (2nd ed.). Oxon: Routledge.

Dunmire, P. (2005). Pre-empting the future: Rhetoric and ideology of the future in political discourse. *Journal of Discourse and Society, 16*, 489-513.

Ekpre, E. N., Ekanem, S. A., & Anthiga, A. (2013). Politics and responsibility: The post military management of the nation. *Research on Humanities and Social Sciences, 3*(4), 113-118. Retrieved fron http://www.iiste.org

Feng, H., & Liu, Y. (2010). Analysis of interpersonal meaning in public speeches: A case study of Obama's speech. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, (6), 825-829. Retrieved http://www.academypublisher.com/jltr/vol01/no06/jltr0106.pdf

Fishman, A. J. (1974). *Advances in language planning*. United Kingdom: Walter de Gruyter.

Gardner, B. (November 18, 2014). From shrill housewife to Downing Street: the Changing voice of Margaret Thatcher, *The telegraph.*

Graver, B. D. (1971). *Advanced English practice.* London: *OUP.*

Gut, U. (2004). *Nigerian English phonology*: *A handbook of varieties of English.* Amsterdam: Mouton de Gruyter.

Habermas J. (1986). *What is universal pragmatics? In communication and the evaluation of society*. London: Heinemann.

Halliday, M. A. K., & Hasan, R. (1985). *Language, context, and text: Aspects of language in a social-semiotic perspectives*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Hart, R. P. (1987). *The sound of leadership: Presidential communication in the modern age*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Hernandez-Guerra, G. (2012). Outstanding rhetorical devices and textuality in Obama's Speech in Ghana, Africa. *Open Journal of Modern Linguistics,* 2(3), 97-104. http://www.scirp.org/journal/PaperDownload.aspx?paperID=22783

Huang, Y. (2007). *Pragmatics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press

Jabber, W. K., & Jinquan, Z. (2013). The modal verbs: Speech act of request in the speech of the President of the United States Barak Obama. *The Criterion International Journal in English*, 1-12. Retrieved from www.the-criterion.ccom

Jacobs, S. (2002). *Language and interpersonal communication: In handbook of interpersonal communication* (3rd ed.). California, CA: Sage Publication.

Josiah, E. U., & Johnson, S. E. (2012). A pragmatic analysis of President Goodluck Jonathan and President Barack Obama's inaugural address. *International Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences*, 2(12), 261-277. Retrieved from http://www.ijhssnet.com/journals/Vol_2_No_12_Special_Issue_June_2012/32.pdf

Jucker, H., & Taavitsamin, I. (2008). *Speech acts in the history of English (1).* 176 U: John Benjamin.

Kamalu, I., & Aganga, R. (2011). A critical discourse analysis of Goodluck Jonathan's declaration of interest in the PDP presidential primaries. *Language, Discourse and Society, 1*(1), 32-54. doi: 10.1.1.386.5203

Karapetjana, I. (2011). Pronominal choice in political interviews. *Baltic Journal of English Language, Literature and Culture*, *1*, 36-45.

Kryk-Kastovsky, B. (2009). Speech acts in early modern English court trials. *Journal of Pragmatics*, (41), 440-457.

Leech, G. N. (1983). *Principles of pragmatics*. New York: Longman Group Limited.

Liu, F. (2012). Genre analysis of American presidential inaugural speech. *Theory and Practice in language Studies, 2*(11), 2407-2411.

Liu, S. (2014). An experimental study of the classification and recognition of Chinese speech acts. *Journal of Pragmatics*, (64), 1-16.

Maitama, S. (August, 1999). Democracy for Nigerians. *Daily trust, p 27.*

Marietu, C. (2009). The language of politics and political behaviours: Rhetoric of President Olusegun Obasanjo and the 2007 general elections in Nigeria. *Journal of Public Administration and Policy Research, 1*(3), 047-054. Retrieved from http://www.academicjournals.org/jhf

Merriam, S. B. (2002). *Qualitative research in practice: Examples for discussion and analysis*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Mey, J. L. (2001). *Pragmatics: An introduction* (2nd ed.). Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.

McCarthy, M. (2000). *Discourse analysis for language teachers*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

McDougal III, S. (2013). Framing the black experience: A discourse analysis of President Barack Obama's speeches. *Journal of Pan African Studies*, *6*(4), 1-17. Retrieved from http://www.jpanafrican.com/docs/vol6no4/6.4-ready1.pd on 16/07/2013.

Mustapha, S. A. (2011). Compliment response patterns among speakers of Nigerian English. *Journal of Pragmatics* (43), 1335-1348.

Obasanjo, O. (1976). Obasanjo's take over speech. http://www.PascalStatConsultingAndBusinessManagementNigeria/Posts345824 828826942 on 11/3/14

Obasanjo, O. (1976, September 8). UPE marks the dawn of a new era. *Nigerian Observer*, p. 5.

Obasanjo, O. (1979, October 2). Farewell and return to democracy speech. *New Nigerian*, pp. 3 & 27.

Obasanjo, O. (1980). *My command: An account of the Nigerian civil war*. London: Oxford University Press.

Obasanjo, O. (1987). *Nzeogwu: An intimate portrait of Major Chuckuma Kaduna Nzeogwu*. Ibadan: Spectrum Publishers.

Obasanjo, O. (1999a). *Selected speeches of President Olusegun Obasanjo of Nigeria*. Abuja: Abuja Government Press.

Obasanjo, O. (1999b). *Not my will*. Ibadan: University Press Ltd.

Obasanjo, O. (1999, May 31). My agenda for growth and development. *Vanguard*, pp. 7 & 15.

Obasanjo, O. (2007, May 29). Obasanjo hand-over speech. Retrieved from http://www.nairaland.com/56298/full-text-president-Obasanjo-last

O'Connor, T., & Sandis, C. (2012). *A companion to the philosophy of action*. United States: John Wiley & Sons.

Odumegwu, O. (2013, September 28). Population: How many are we in Nigeria? *Vanguard*, p. 27. Retrieved from www.vanguard.com/2013/09/population-many-nigerian

Olayiwola, O. R. (1991). Political communication: Press and politics in Nigeria's second Republic. *Africa Media Review,* 5(2), 31-45.

Okpanachi, M. I. (2009). Discourse analysis of President Obasanjo's national address on Nigeria Labour Congress on the 8th of October, 2007. *Language Gender and Politics,* 313-325.

Osasinwa, W. (2003). *Introduction to discourse analysis and pragmatics*. Lagos: Femolus-Fetus Publishers.

Pratma, B. N. (2014). *Commissives and directives acts performed by David Cameron in his Davos speech.* (Unpublished master's thesis). Universitas Brawijaya. jimbastrafib.studentjournal.ub.ac.id/index.php/jimbastrafib/article/.../398

Proctor, K., & Su, L. (2011). The 1st person plural in political discourse-American politicians in interviews and in a debate. *Journal of pragmatics, 43*, 3251-3266

Quirk, R, & Greebaunm, S. (1980). *A university grammar of English*. London: Longman.

Quirk, et al. (1985). *A Comprehensive grammar of the English Language*. London: Longman.

Rankema, J. (1993). *Discourse studies: An introductory textbook*. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamin.

Rashidi, N., & Souzandehfar, G. (2010). A critical discourse analysis of the debates between Republicans and Democrats over the continuation of the war in Iraq. *Journal of Linguistic intercultural Education*, (3), 56-82. Retrieved from http://www.uab.ro/jolie/2010/4_rashidi-souzandehfar.pdf

Remi, R. A., & Chris, C. O. (2013). Language of political campaigns and politics in Nigeria. *Canadian Social Science, 3*(9), 104-116.

Rozik, E. (1993). Categorisation of speech acts in play and performance analysis. *Journal of Dramatic Theory and Criticism, (1).*

Rozik, E. (2000). Speech acts metaphor in theatre. *Journal of Pragmatics*, (32), 203-218.

Rudyk, J. (2007). Power relations in President Bush's state of the union. *International Journal of language society and culture*, (23), 68-76.

Sarfo, E., & Krampa, E. A. (2013). Language at war: A critical discourse analysis of speeches of Bush and Obama. *International Journal of Social Sciences and Education, 3*(2), 378-390.

Searle, J. R. (1969). *Speech acts*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Searle, J. R. (1971). *An essay in the philosophy of language learning*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Searle, J. R. (1976). A classification of illocutionary acts. *Language in Society, 5*(11), 1-23. Retrieved from http:// www.jstor.org/stable/4166848

Searle, J. R. (1979). *Expression and meaning: Studies in the theory of speech acts*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Sharififar, M. (2015). Critical discourse analysis of political speeches: A case study of Obama's and Rouhani's speeches at UN. *Theory and practice in language studies*, *5*(2), 151-164.

Stubbs, M. (1983). *Discourse analysis*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Sustein, C. (1995). *Democracy and the problem of free speech* (2nd ed.). New York, NY: The Free Press.

Tarhom, D., & Miracle, O. (2013). A pragmatic analysis of victory and inaugural speeches of President Jonathan: A measure for transformation and good governance in Nigeria. *Innovare Journal of Social Science*, *1*(2), 17-21. http://innovareacademics.in/journals/index.php/ijss/article/view/558, 17/3/2013

Taiwo, R. (2009). Legitimisation and coercion in political discourse: A case study of Olusegun Obasanjo address to the PDP Elders and Stakeholders Forum. *Journal of Political Discourse Analysis*, *2*(2). 191-205. Retrieved from rotimitaiwo.com/wp-content/uploads/2014/10/TAIWO-2009-ISSUES-IN-POLITICAL-DISCOURSE-ANALYSIS.pdf

Tseng, M. F. (1999). A pragmatic study on speech acts in Chinese invitational conversations. (Unpublished doctoral Dissertation). University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign.

Vidal Y. V. (1999, October). My mission is to do God's will to liberate Nigeria. *Outcry Magazine*, p. 19.

Visconti, J. (2009). Speech acts in legal language: An introduction. *Journal of Pragmatics*, *41*(3), 393-400.

Wardaugh, R. (1988). *An introduction to sociolinguistics*. New York, NY: Basil Blackwell Publishers.

Wale, A., & Odebunmi, A. (2006). Discourse tact in doctor patient interaction in English: An analysis of diagnosis in medical communication in Nigeria. *Nordic Journal of African Studies, 15*(4), 499-519. Retrieved from http://www.njas.helsinki.fi/pdf-files/vol15num4/adegbite.pdf

Wang, J. (2010). A critical discourse analysis of Barack Obama's speech. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*.

Ye, R. (2010). The interpersonal metafunction analysis of Barack Obama's victory speech. *Journal of English Language Teaching*, 146-151.

Yule, G. (1985). *Pragmatics* (2nd ed.). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Yusuf, Y. K. (2002). Dysphemism in the language of Nigeria's President Olusegun Obasanjo. *AILA Review, 16*, 104-119.