

## A CRITICAL DISCOURSE ANALYSIS OF THE USE OF PERSONAL PRONOUNS IN GOVERNOR WILLIE OBIANO'S SECOND TERM INAUGURAL SPEECH

IFEOMA A. UMEH, Ph.D & CHINELO J. EZEKULIE, Ph.D

### Abstract

The study focuses on a critical discourse analysis of the use of personal pronouns in the 2018 Second Term Inaugural Speech of Governor Willie Obiano in Anambra State, Nigeria. The analysis was anchored on Norman Fairclough's three tier dimensional model. Two research questions were formulated to guide the study. The personal pronouns selected for this study were *I*, *we*, *they* and *you*. The study made use of both quantitative and qualitative methods of data presentation. It was identified that 'we', is the most frequently used pronoun in the speech. Thus, Obiano uses 'we' intentionally and strategically to emphasize the willingness and the representative role of his administration; to identify that

he and his government are part of the whole state; and, that achievements should be attributed to the efforts of the people of Anambra State while the challenges before them call for their united hard work. Significantly, this paper provides insights into the peculiar uses of personal pronouns in political speeches and concludes that politicians exploit the flexibility of pronominal reference to construct a view of themselves and others that is favourable to their image.

**Keyword:** Critical Discourse Analysis, Personal Pronouns, Politics, Governor, Anambra State

### Introduction

Politics is a struggle for power in order to put certain political, economic and social ideas into practice. Language in this process plays a vital role since no political action is prepared, accomplished or implemented without language. The study of political discourse, like other areas of discourse analysis, covers a broad range of subject matter. The present study is a critical discourse analysis of the use of personal pronouns in political speech with particular reference to the second term inaugural speech of

Governor Willie Obiano in Anambra State on March 17, 2018. Based on the functions and contents, political speech is a kind of public speech given by authorities with political purposes that tries to influence a certain group of people (Feng & Liu, 2016). The speech under study has symbolic significance since it is the speech delivered at the beginning of Governor Willie Obiano's Second

Term in office as the governor of Anambra State. The speech is important because it is an opportunity for the governor not only to present his achievements in his preceding tenure, but also to set a good image and gain continuous support for his administration in the next four years.

Studies in Critical Discourse Analysis (henceforth CDA) focus exclusively on the aspect of language and power relations: language as a context for power and domination. Fairclough argues that "power is implicit within everyday social practice and that it is predominant at every level in all the domain of life" (1992, p.50). CDA was birthed from research into the interplay of language and power. Thus, CDA is an analysis of discourse from the social practice and cultural representation. As language is a powerful instrument for those interested in controlling people's idea, CDA seeks to explore the nuances that are employed in doing this. Fairclough is of the view that as a social practice, language is not just a tool of communicating one's ideas or information to others; rather, it actively works at every level of a society especially in reshaping ideologies. It is deductible that CDA identifies correlations between textual structures and their functions in interaction within the society.

---

Department of English University of Jos, Nigeria ifyumeh288@mail.com, Department of English University of Jos, Nigeria, lophine@gmail.com; ezekuliej@unijos.edu.ng

Corresponding Author  
IFEOMA A. UMEH  
E-mail: ifyumeh288@mail.com

The study of personal pronouns' usage has become an important aspect of analyzing political speeches. According to Makutis (2016), it is not a secret that politicians tend to be evasive during their speeches and, through the different uses of personal pronouns, ambiguous meaning can be formed. Bramley (2001) asserts that politicians exploit the flexibility of pronominal reference to construct a view of themselves and others that is favourable to their image. Corroborating this, Beard (2000) points out that pronoun reference is always important in putting over a piece of political persuasion. Beard continues that politicians present themselves as being able to identify with the wants, interest and needs of the audience. They present themselves in that way to be perceived as good politicians, that is, suitable leaders of the nation or state.

The general features of personal pronouns are well known. They are used to refer to a specific person or thing. According to Eyisi (2011), the term personal pronouns refers to grammatical persons. There are three grammatical persons: the first person (singular *I*; plural *we*) refers to the person speaking; the second person is the one listening and comprises *you* in either singular or plural; and the third person is the person or thing spoken about. The examples are: *he, she, it* (singular) and *they* (plural). Obviously, personal pronouns are complex and are usually employed by politicians as rhetorical devices. Pronouns are one of the most favourable rhetoric devices used by politicians, according to Bramley, and this is because through the different uses of pronouns such as (*I, you, they, we*), they can create multiple identities. They can create identities of 'selves' as individuals as well as 'selves' as members of collectives. However, politicians mostly do not deliver speeches as individuals but rather as representatives of political parties, governments, states or nations.

Beyond using personal pronouns for self-representation, Allen (2006) asserts that politicians also use these pronouns to refer to their audience and their opposition. He further states that personal pronouns can successfully be used to persuade the audience. When giving speeches, politicians present the positive aspects of themselves while drawing attention to the negative aspects of their opponents. One way of achieving this is by intentionally manipulating the use of personal pronouns in

reference to themselves or others.

The present study, therefore, seeks to analyze the personal pronouns used in Governor Willie Obiano's second term inaugural speech to find out the most frequently used personal pronoun and also identify how these personal pronouns are used in the speech. Specifically, the objectives of the study are to identify the most frequently used personal pronoun in the speech and to explain the meaning of each of the personal pronouns as used in the speech.

### **Theoretical Framework**

The corpus generated as data in this research work is analysed using Norman Fairclough's three-tier dimensional model for discourse analysis which includes: First, the description of the text which involves the linguistic analysis; second, the interpretation of the text which involves the interpretation of the production, distribution and consumption of the text as discursive practice; and third, the exploitation of the text in relation to power, ideology or other socio-political context. According to Fairclough (2002), a text can be analysed at the descriptive level by interrogating its lexical, syntactic and textual structures at three different values of analysis, i.e. the experiential, rational and expressive.

The experiential value is a 'cue' to and 'trace' of the way in which text producers or writers present their experience of the natural or social world. The relational value, on the other hand, relates to the social relationships texts in discourses enact while the expressive value deals with the text producers' evaluation of their reality and what social identities are intended to be projected. Choices of pronouns, for instance, do not merely pertain to deictic or anaphoric grammatical reference but to references that may relate to identities, group solidarity and the like with the sole aim of indirectly promoting and sustaining power. As Simpson (1993, p.6) rightly observes, "Language is not used in a countless vacuum; rather, it is used in a host of discourse contexts which are impregnated with the ideology of social systems and institutions." The careful selection of linguistic items even becomes much more expedient in the world of politics that relates to the "socialization of humans involving the formation of coalition, the signaling of group

boundaries and all that these developments imply, including the emergence of what is called reciprocal altruism” as opined by Chilton (2004, p.6). Thus, CDA generally makes towards deconstructing the intricate manipulation of texts and thoughts that go into a given discourse.

Wodak and Meyer (2001) see CDA as being fundamentally about analyzing opaque as well as transparent structural relationship of dominance, discrimination, power and control as manifested in language. Language is the domain of the ideology of the powerful elements in the society and it is the “commonest form of social behavior where we rely most on 'common sense' assumptions” (Fairclough, 1992). The connection between language and politics is highly strong as political action itself is carried out through language. Chilton (2004, p.30) rightly maintains that “only in and through language can one issue commands and threats, ask questions, make offers and promises, provided one has convinced their interlocutors that they have the requisite resources to make the speech act credible”; in fact, the 'doing' of politics is the 'doing' of language. To Fairclough, politicians use speech with the aim of manufacturing consent and lifting their image while tarnishing the image of their opponents. Chilton describes this as legitimization of self and delegitimization of the other (2004). According to him, delegitimization can manifest itself in acts of negative presentation, acts of blaming, scapegoating, marginalizing, excluding, attacking the moral character of some individual or group, attacking the communicative cooperation of the other, and attacking the rationality and sanity of the other. The extreme is to deny the humanness of the other. At the other end of the spectrum delegitimization, usually oriented to the self, includes positive self-representation, manifesting itself in acts of self-praise, self-apology, self-explanation, self-justification, and self-identification as a source of authority, reason, vision, sanity where the self is either an individual or the group with which an individual identifies or wishes to identify with. This view makes clearer Van Dijk's (1997) ideological square which polarizes actors into in and out groups and how the former project their positive side but downplay their negative side. Fundamental to the political sphere is the construction of identity, group membership and

ways of talking about self, others and the polarizing categories of us and them (Allen, 2007). Politicians' selection of personal pronouns helps them to evoke multiple identities of themselves and others from a range of perspectives. Allen (2007, p.3) believes that “it is in the politicians' interest to present themselves as multi-faceted in order to appeal to a diverse audience, and a careful pronoun choice is one way of achieving this aim.”

The essence of analyzing pronouns in political discourse, as such, is that they help in reconstructing these various identities, associations, actors and ideological groupings. Fairclough further maintains that English pronouns have relational values i.e., values that help to construct social relationships. These relationships can be excluded or included with ideological ease. Wodak sees pronouns especially personal plurals as being able to be used to induce interpreters to conceptualize group identity, coalition, parties and the like as insiders or as outsiders. Bramley also argues that pronouns are not merely a way of expressing person, number and gender as is suggested by traditional grammarians nor do they only do deictic or referential work. They must be thought of in terms of the context of interaction and identity work that they accomplish.

### **Methodology**

The study adopts both qualitative and quantitative designs. President Muhammadu Buhari's 2019

Inaugural June 12 Democracy Day speech was the primary source of data for this study. The speech was downloaded from the Internet via this link: <http://saharareporters.com/2019/06/12>. All the first person pronouns featured in the text were drawn for analysis using purposive sampling.

The sample was double checked by MS words 'find' function to ensure accuracy. The sample size of 95 first person pronouns was then subjected to quantitative analysis using frequency count to determine the distribution in the data. The second step was to identify how these first person pronouns are used in the speech and the reasons behind the use of each of the first person pronouns and their variants using Fairclough's analytical model.

### **Review of Previous Studies**

Scholars have been interested in and have carried



out studies on the use of personal pronouns in political speeches. Defina examined pronominal choice, identity and solidarity in political discourse (1995). She presents an empirical analysis of the pragmatic role that pronouns expressing person deixis have in the speeches of two Mexican participants in a conference on the Chiapas revolt of January 1994 in Mexico. The study argues that pronominal choice in political discourse reflects differences in the way in which speakers present themselves with respect to other individuals and groups in the political areas and in relation to the situation that is being discussed. She identified that the speaker's identity emerges through consistent use of certain pronouns with a stable referent and through the oppositions and connections established in the text-between these referents and the referents of other pronominal and non-pronominal forms.

Karapetjana (2011) carried out a study on pronominal choice in political interviews. He investigated the pragmatics of the choice in two political interviews. The result revealed that the politician who created interpersonal involvement with the audience and used comprehensible and clear language established credibility, and such a strategy was more likely to receive positive evaluation. The study further claims that the pronoun *I* implies a personal level and makes it possible for the speaker to show authority and personal responsibility as well as commitment and involvement. On the other hand, the pronoun *we* can be used by the politician if he or she wishes to share the responsibility as well as to create involvement with the audience.

Gbedgesin and Onanuga (2019) studied the enactment of ideology and self-presentation in political campaign videos of the 2015 general election in Nigeria. The study analyzed both verbal and non-verbal texts in the driving ideologies of two parties: the Peoples' Democratic Party (PDP) and All Progressive Party (APC). They discovered that political parties convey discourse issues through multiple modes and these ideologies and identities are geared towards creating long-lasting positive opinions in the electorate.

Bello (2013) carried out a critical Discourse Analysis to unravel the complex webs of political associations and identities that go into political

speeches of Nigerian Presidents using President Goodluck Jonathan's presidential speech. The study shows how personal pronouns are used by President Jonathan in his presidential declaration interest speech to construct various identities and to transport sentiments and sympathies in order to probably promote a political agenda. He discovered that the pronouns used in the speech end up creating identities that foster the president's political interest and sustain the state of affairs while at the same time mystifying the real class and power struggle at the political center.

Kamalu and Agangan (2011) used a Critical Discourse Analysis approach to look at the overall representation of Goodluck's presidential declaration speech. The thrust of their paper is on the persuasive and rhetorical strategies used to yield acceptance. While they use CDA in their general ideological analysis, they have not actually used the model provided by Fairclough with clear-cut analytical widows and interpretations.

Oluremi (2018) focused on the pragmatic study of pronouns in Nigerian's President Muhammadu Buhari 2017 Budget Speech. He discovered that, across political discourse, choice of pronouns is more of pragmatic means in the linguistic repertoire of any politician than a semantic one.

The findings revealed that both the singular, *I* and its variants and the plural *We* and its variants together with its possessive case, **our**, deployed by President Buhari in his Budget of Recovery and Growth are instances of ostensive – inferential stimulus which produce positive cognitive effects about Buhari's executive power as the man at the helm of affairs, his commitment, and solidarity scheme in ensuring the recovery and growth of the Nigerian economy.

The review of literature shows that the amount of research done on the use of personal pronoun in political speeches is rather big but none has actually dwelt on the CDA of Personal pronouns on Governor Willie Obiano's second term inaugural speech using Fairclough's three tier analytical model.

This therefore justifies the present study.

## Methodology

The study adopts both qualitative and quantitative designs. Governor Willie Obiano's 2<sup>nd</sup> term

inaugural speech was the primary source of data for this study. Sentences involving the use of personal pronouns were extracted from the Governor's Second Term inaugural speech for analysis. The speech was downloaded from the Internet via this link: <https://www.reportnaija.ng>. All the personal pronouns featured in the text were drawn for analysis using purposive sampling. The sample was double-checked by MS word's "find" function to ensure accuracy. The sample size of 121 pronouns was chosen and then subjected to quantitative analysis using frequency count to determine the distribution in the data. The second step was to identify how these personal pronouns are used in the speech and the reasons or purposes behind the use of these personal pronouns.

The personal pronouns chosen for this research work are *I*, *you*, *we* and *they*. They were chosen in particular because they indicate who the speaker identifies with. They are used in power relations to include and exclude the audience as well as separate *self* from *other*. These words are efficacious in public discourse because they have the ability to change the effects speeches have on the audience.

## Discussion and Results

The personal pronouns– *I*, *we*, *you* and *they* – most frequently used in the inaugural speech

Table 2 presents the frequency and percentage distribution of the personal pronouns. This was done using the Overall Relative Frequency Percentages (ORFPs)

Table 2: Distribution of personal pronouns *I*, *we*, *you* and *they* in Governor Willie Obiano's Second Term inaugural speech

| Personal pronouns | Frequency | Percentage % |
|-------------------|-----------|--------------|
| <i>I</i>          | 39        | 32.23%       |
| <i>We</i>         | 56        | 46.3         |
| <i>You</i>        | 23        | 19.00        |
| <i>They</i>       | 3         | 2.47         |
| Total             | 121       | 100%         |

From Table 2, it is identifiable that *we* has the highest frequency of occurrence in the speech, occurring 56 times representing (46.3%) of the total

number of personal pronouns used in the speech. This is followed by *I* with the second highest frequency of 39 representing (32.23%). *You* occurred 23 times representing (19.00%) while *They* occurred three times (2.4%) and is minimally used in the speech. The highest frequency of occurrence of *we* corroborates Fairclough (1989) view that when *we* is used by a leader inclusively as part of the led, it assimilates the leader to 'the people' possibly as a humbling tactic.

## How the personal pronouns (*I*, *we*, *they*, *you*) are used in the second term inaugural speech

To ascertain this, each of the personal pronouns and their variants are analyzed separately. This is done so as to identify whom these pronouns refer to and the functions or purposes behind their use.

### The use of "*I*"

In the Second Term inaugural speech, the personal pronoun *I* occurred 39 times, representing a total of (32.23%). The most motivating reason for a politician to use the pronoun *I* in his speech is to come across as good and responsible, to describe himself in a positive way and highlight personal qualities. Examples of personal qualities that politicians want to express include being someone with principles and moral power, who is not afraid to take action when necessary (Branley, 2001). Examples (1), (2) and (3) below show how Governor Willie Obiano used *I* in the speech to reflect the above assertions.

- 1) *I* am the evidence that when the occasion demands, we can rise together as one and that when we stand together as one, we can bend the tide of destiny in our favour.
- 2) *I* am the proof that we have attained great political maturity in this state.
- 3) *I* stand on the crest of your love to declare a new season of excellence for our beloved Anambra State.
- 4) It is for this reason that *I* have decided to add another enabler to *my* Economic Blueprint which *I* have designed as the Creative Economy.

Example (4) shows how the use of *I* conveys Governor Obiano's personal decision. By using the singular personal pronoun *I*, he clearly states his

sole decision without the suggestion that someone agrees with him on the matter. Even if other members of his administration do agree with his statement,

Obiano does not include them in the statement, and avoids “putting words in their mouths”. It makes him speak in the institutional sense as a serious leader with set priorities who concentrates on his work and does politics at the appropriate time. This, however, presents him as a self-confident, assured and powerful politician. He also uses the possessive form – *my* economic blue print – as a way to show authority as well as take credit for the work. It makes him come across as a good governor by being able to make good and independent decisions.

- 5) *I* urge those who have yet to obtain their permanent voters card to do so now because the greatest power on earth today springs from the ballot box!

Example (5) is used to remind the audience that the governor is the one with the highest authority and power. It distinguishes *self* from *other* and puts *self* in a mostly positive light. According to Beard (2000), it can be considered as negative to highlight that one has higher authority than others, creating a sense of inequality and suggesting that the speaker thinks of others as inferior to himself.

There are also instances of the use of the pronoun *I* to express acknowledgements in the governor's speech.

- 6) So, *I* must say '*thank you*' to the newest senator of the Federal Republic of Nigeria and the chairman of my re-election campaign organization – Chief Sir Victor Umeh and his team, for running what has been largely described as an outstanding campaign in Nigeria.

It can be pointed out that the pronominal choice above in example (6) was chosen to highlight the governor's personal qualities showing that he is humble and appreciates the efforts and participation of other colleagues in winning the election for the Second Term. Also, since all the cases of acknowledgements appeared almost at the beginning of the speech, it can be stated that it is used as a signpost for the audience to transit from

one aspect of the speech to another.

- 7) *I* am proud of our infinite capacity to change our story, our silent resolve to make every new day better than the day before.
- 8) Indeed, *I* am proud that we have successfully placed our dear state on the tortuous path of progress.

Examples (7) and (8) represent the instances of the use of *I* as a representative. Governor Willie Obiano is speaking not as a person but as a representative of the government/state or politician who is delivering the speech. These examples directly illustrate that he is delivering the speech on behalf of the government. Also, it is an indication that he is expressing his government's achievements and great success in the past four years.

### The use of “*You*”

The pronoun *you* usually refers to the person(s) the speaker is talking to. However, *you* has multiple functions one of which is to serve as an indefinite (generic) pronoun. The indefinite *you* can be used by the speaker to include himself as a member of a category. It has also been suggested that indefinite *you* is not used to discuss actual experience; instead, it is used to discuss 'conventional wisdom'. In this sense, *you* is used to convey common sense or generally admitted truth, with the hope of receiving the agreement of the audience (Allen, 2006).

Examples:

- 9) I have no doubt that when Dim Chukwuemeka Odumegwu Ojukwu looks down from heaven, he would be proud of what *you* did on November 18, 2017.
- 10) He would be happy that when the people he appointed to preserve his legacy jumped ship, *you* fought hard enough to keep the political vessel he bequeathed us afloat on the turbulent sea of Nigerian Politics.

Both (9) and (10) are examples of the pronoun *you* being directed towards the entire people of Anambra State of which probably many of them may not have had the chance to listen to the speech, at least not at the exact moment it was given. The use of *you* in this context is particularly because the Governor wishes to present the action as something



that everybody did as a way of giving more credibility to the action. '**You**' is also used in the above example in the generic sense, in which **you** includes everyone and by which the governor presents 'self' as normal or typical. Since generic **you** implicates everyone in the action, the effect is to give more weight to the argument (Laberge & Sankoft, 1980).

Some linguists describe **you** to specify the participant role as hearer or addressee/participant, which is different from the referential third person pronouns (Halliday&Hasan, 1976; Lyons, 1977) while Levinson (1988) refers to 'you' as the 'addressed recipient.'

- 11) Four years ago today, when I spoke to **you** from this same podium, I told **you** that the time had come to prove to ourselves that the enterprising spirit for which our people are known all over the world can take firm roots at home, and that together as one, we can be masters of our own house.

In example 11, it is difficult to decide if Obiano refers to '**you**' as the people of Anambra state or '**you**' as members of his administration. Many of the occurrences of '**you**' in the data seem to be directed towards both the members of his administration and the entire people of Anambra State, and at times it is almost impossible to set them apart and since the members of his administration represent the people, it might not be necessary to do so. The confusing aspect of deciding whom the Governor refers to is that the speech is given on the inauguration day to those that were present but is also viewed by the millions of people of Anambra State.

- 12) Beloved, **you** fought without looking back to bring us to this glorious moment and to my precious daughter, Dr. Ogechukwu Obiano, and my beloved son, Difu; (13)**You** are the reason the earth still spins on its orbit. (14) I love **you** all!

In example (12) Obiano uses '**you**' to refer specifically to his wife- Chief Mrs. Ebele Obiano. In 13 '**you**' is also used to refer specifically to his daughter and his son. However, in (14) the use of '**you**' can be considered as fairly general because even if it is probably directed towards the members

of his family, it could at the same time be applied to the entire people of Anambra state as well. From the above therefore, one can deduce instances of negotiations, reassurances and persuasions using the linguistic and spatial proximity of '**you**'. As '**you**' according to Umar (2013) has the potential to give the notion of discorsal proximity and the notion of the addressee being in bond with the addresser, politicians love to use it to create harmony. Fairclough (1989, p.52 in Bello, 2013) defines this as a compensatory tendency to give the impression of treating each of the people 'handled' enmasse as individual. Moreover, the sentence "I **love** you all" is used to establish such a friendly and classless bond between the Governor and the entire people of Anambra state.

### The use of "**We**"

The personal pronoun **we** has the highest frequency of occurrence in Governor Willie Obiano's second term inaugural speech. It occurred 56 times (46.38%). **We** is an important pronoun in political speech in the sense that it expresses "institutional identity," that is, when one person speaks as a representative. The use of **we** can be divided into two categories. By using **we** the speaker includes others in the utterance, creating a group with a clear identity, making others responsible for potential issues as well.

The following examples show whom **we** refers to in the Governor's second term inaugural speech.

- 15) **We** suspended taxes for low income earners and put more money in the hands of breadwinners.
- 16) **We** grew our GDP by one trillion naira in the middle of recession and increased our internally generated revenue while most taxes remain suspended.
- 17) **We** are the new agricultural model for Nigerian.

In 16 **we** is used as a way to describe the fact that the decision to increase the GDP by one trillion naira was made by him and his administration and not by Governor Willie Obiano alone. **We** could have been replaced by the second person **you** although that would exclude the governor himself in a sense.

- 18) I have no doubt that together **we** will rise against them and together **we** will put them behind us for good.

Example (18) shows how *we* can be used to create unity and cohesiveness by saying: "together *we* will rise...together *we* will put them..."By saying *we* the governor creates unity within his administration and the entire people of Anambra State.

- 19) *We* have elevated governance from building roads and bridges to building lives.
- 20) *We* have taken back our cities and communities from brutal armed robbers and kidnappers who once made our beloved state a dread to decent people and a taboo to investors.

Here the use of pronoun '*we*' excludes the audience. Examples (19) and (20) are both interesting examples of how Governor Willie Obiano uses the personal pronoun *we* to refer more to *other* than *self*. In both sentences he refers to himself and his administration. He projects a positive image of his administrative and presents a negative image of the administration that handed over to him last four years. Therefore, what Obiano actually is doing here is criticizing the previous administration. He deliberately uses *we* to avoid openly accusing the previous administration, which could be a risk of offending people. He uses *we* in this sense to establish an *us* and *them* separation, thus creating an image of the group he belongs to in a positive way and the other group in a negative way (Bramley, 2001). To Defina (1995), this might be to avoid subjectivity and to soften the statement in order not to sound so direct.

- (21) *We* shall tighten the screws on our security architecture to ensure that Anambra remains Nigeria's safest state.

In example (21) when Governor Willie uses *we* instead of *they*, he reminds the audience that he is the Number 1 security officer or the chief security officer in the state and that he can relate to the people's fears as regards security issues. This creates a feeling of togetherness and is a way of sharing problems. Using *we* in this context makes him seem like a good politician because it is a way to express that he cares about the people in the state and that he is involved.

- 22) *Our* administrations have established the basis for hope.
- 23) *We* shall drive hard reforms in education sector to retain our position at the top.

By saying *our* administration instead of *my* administration (in22) Obiano creates a group membership instead of reminding the administration of his authority. Excerpt (23) shows how *our* can be a more suitable substitute for *the*. Obiano uses the pronoun *our* deliberately to make his people feel obliged to help build the education sector. If he had said *the position*, he would not have created a sense of institutional identity and togetherness and the wish to work together to help build that state for good.

- 24) Fellow compatriots, as the election year draws nearer, think of the better Nigeria. Think of APGA. If *we* can do it in Anambra with lean resources *we* can do it in Nigeria with our abundant human and material endowment.

Example (24) illustrates the expressive use of *we*. In the first sentence the Governor refers to the audience as fellow compatriots, and in the second sentence he introduced the pronoun *we* thus including himself as the speaker and also the audience. This symbolizes unity between him and the audience and thus expresses solidarity (Makutis,2016).

### The use of "They"

The pronoun *they* occurred three times (2.47%) in the second term inaugural speech. According to Murthy (2004), *they* is used for third person plural for all gender in the subjective case. Politicians use third person plural *they* to separate themselves or their 'group' from *others*; *they* excludes. *They* points to those who are not *we*, and is used to form an oppositional relationship between him or her and others, often with negativity towards others. It is used to show ideological difference among people and positive presentation of *self* of the speaker (Bramley, 2001). Karapetjana posits that *they* can be used to distance *self* and *other* both consciously and subconsciously. According to the author by separating *us* from *them* the speaker sometimes creates an image of *them* being inferior to *us* (p.4).The following examples illustrate how *they* is used in Governor Willie Obiano second term inaugural speech:

- 25) Indeed I must recognize all the candidates who ran against me in the last gubernatorial election for putting up a formidable fight.



- 26) **They** fought like true sportsmen and women and accepted the decision of the people in good faith.
- 27) **They** did not waste time to congratulate me and applaud the verdict from the polls.
- 28) In doing so, **they** added a bright new chapter to our narrative of excellence in this great State.

In example (26) the pronoun **they** is used in a very positive way: **they** fought like true sportsmen and women. In this case it is not clear that **they** is a pronoun that divides *self* from *other* because in a political context **they** is often used in a negative way directed towards the opposition.

In 27 and 28 **they** is exclusively used to refer to his oppositions, that is, those who contested against him in the last election. Governor Willie Obiano refers to the people in a somewhat negative way by implying that **they** are inferior. Since Obiano assumes that by congratulating him and applauding the verdict from the polls, **they** have added a bright new chapter to his administrations' narrative of excellence in the state. As a politician, he uses this to create ideological differences and presents himself in a more positive way. This corroborates Muhlhauser and Harre (1990) assertion that generic '**they**' is deployed to obscure the gender of the referent, a strategy used by politicians to present a person without disclosing the gender of their identity.

Generally, interpretation is generated through a combination of what is in the text and what is in the interpreter in terms of their mental or cognitive resource of recall or what is termed "members" resources (Fairclough, 1989). He further maintains that there are six dimensions of what constitutes the processes of interpretation. These processes are: situational context, inter-textual context, surface utterances, meaning of utterances, local coherence and text structure and point. The most important part for our analysis in the present study are the situational and inter-textual contexts. The event where the speech took place is actually a political gathering. An inauguration ceremony that took place at Ekwueme Square, Awka, Anambra State on Saturday, March 17, 2018. The people involved in the speech event are the people of Nigeria from Anambra State and mostly members of the ruling party APGA. The relationship between the

producer of the text and the immediate audience certainly influenced the careful choice of pronouns and texts to use in getting his political ambition achieved. Here both the speaker and the listener are influenced by the context in the production and interpretation of the overall message to be delivered because they both know the reasons why they are there.

Fairclough (1989) suggests that presuppositions do not belong to texts, they are an aspect of the text producer's inter-textual context. In the present study, there is no explicit mention of political opponents but there are many cases where they are presupposed. For instance, "We have taken back our cities and communities from brutal armed robbers and kidnappers who once made our beloved state a dread to decent people and a taboo to investors. We have turned the table on our collective enemies and turned our adversities into advantages. We are Nigeria's safest state today." The use of "taken back our cities and communities from brutal armed robbers and kidnappers..." presupposes a continuum of decisive tendencies by an undisclosed 'they.' Thus, Governor Willie Obiano claims he has actually changed and made Anambra State safe for all. The decisive tendencies according to Bello (2013) is passed as a truth situation, while in the real sense it captures the governor's own ideological interpretation of the past situation of Anambra State when it was being governed by his predecessors. Through this, one can clearly see the ideological thrust of the speaker especially in areas where facts are presupposed and the subtle construction of his predecessors as negative and his simultaneous construction of his own potential administration as positive.

Also, Governor Obiano drew upon the essence of religion in the Nigerian society by invoking God and making allusion to prayers chiefly as a strategy. For instance, we have "God bless Anambra State". "God bless Nigeria." Thus, Bernard (2002) is of the view that the political sphere of Nigeria is highly influenced by religion and that political leaders use religion as a means to mobilize the people. So, in the above excerpt, the governor simply makes use of religious sentiments to reflect the subsisting religious sensibilities and also in appealing for more support and solidarity.

## Conclusion

The analysis provided in this paper was based on the assumption that personal pronouns perform a variety of functions in political speeches achieving divisive interactive effects and reflecting the relationship between the speaker and the listener. It has shown that personal pronouns used to envision self-representation are 'I' and 'My'. 'My' simply shows alignments with positive realities of achievements, humility, authority, personal decision and personal integrity all geared towards political acceptance and support. The use of 'We' and 'our' creates multi-faceted dimensions and group identification serving different political purposes. The 'we' used involving all the people of Anambra State is purposefully applied to earn further trust, confidence and solidarity. The use of 'They' is deliberately deployed to separate 'self' from 'others' that are negative. 'You' is tactically used to establish what Fairclough (1989) refers to as "synthetic personalization," that is to emphasize that air of personal closeness and relationship with the addressee with the primary aim of obtaining their confidence and friendship. 'We' is the most frequently used personal pronoun in the speech. Thus the Governor uses 'we' as well as its possessive form 'our' intentionally to integrate his administration with the people of Anambra State which has a strong impact on the listeners. It creates such an impression that the government will fulfil its obligation with the joint efforts from all the people of Anambra State in order to create the greatest benefit for the whole state. Significantly, Governor Willie Obiano's speech is an embodiment of political discourse where the speaker's intention is to sway the audience to believe what is being said. A discourse structure therefore portrays the identity for their users and the context from which they speak and write determines their linguistic choices. These linguistic choices have formed and reshaped ideologies, and created identities in day-to-day discourse.

## References

- Allen, W. (2006). Australian political discourse pronominal choice in campaign speeches. *Linguistics and applied linguistics*, 2, (13).  
 Beard, A. (2000). *The language of politics*. Routledge.  
 Bello, U. (2013). "If I could make it, you too can

- make it"! Personal pronouns in political discourse: A CDA of President Jonathan's presidential declaration speech. *International journal of English linguistics*, 3, (6), 84.  
 Bramley, N. R. (2001). Pronouns of politics: the use of pronouns in the construction of 'self' and other in political interviews. *Thesis*.  
 Chilton, P. A. (2004). *Analysing political discourse: Theory and practice*. Routledge.  
 De Fina, A. (1995). Pronominal choice, identity and solidarity in political discourse. *Interdisciplinary Journal for the Study of Discourse*, 15, (3), 379-410.  
 Eyisi, J. (2011). *A grammar of English: the student's companion*. Rex Charles publication.  
 Fairclough, N. (1989). *Language and power*. Longman.  
 Fairclough, N. (1992). *Discourse and social change*. Polity Press.  
 Fairclough, N. (2002). *Critical discourse analysis*. Longman.  
 Feng, H. & Yuhui, L. (2016). Analysis of interpersonal meaning in public speeches- A case study of Obama's speech. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, 1, (6), 826.  
 Gbedegesin, V. O., & Onanuga, P. A. (2019). The enactment of ideology and self-representation in political campaign videos of the 2015 general election in Nigeria. *Political Science Discourse, Context & Media*, 28, 121-130.  
 Halliday, M. K., & Hasan, R. O. (1976). *Cohesion in English*. Longman London.  
 Irimea, S. (2010). A rhetorical and comparative study of the victory speeches of Barack Obama and Mircea Geona. Babes Bolyai University. *Jolie*, 3.  
 Kamalu, I., & Agaagan, R. (2011). A critical discourse analysis of Goodluck Jonathan's declaration of interest in the PDP presidential primaries. *Language, Discourse and Society*, 1, 31-54.  
 Karapetjana, I. (2011). Pronominal choice in political interviews. *Baltic Journal of English Language, Literature and Culture*, 1 (1), 36-45.  
 Laberge, S., & Gillian, S. (1980). *Anything you can do*. New York: Academic Press.  
 Lerner, G. H. (1996). On the place of linguistic resources in the organization of talk-in-interaction: Second person' reference in multi-

- party conversation. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 6 (3), 228-294.
- Levison, S. C. (1983). *Pragmatics*. Cambridge University Press.
- Lyons, J. (1977). *Semantics*. Cambridge University Press.
- Makutis, T. (2016). First person pronouns in political speeches; United Nations on situation in Ukraine. Thesis, Vilnius University, 16.
- Mulhausler, P., & Rom H. (1990). *Pronoun and people: The linguistics construction of social and personal identity*. Oxford, Blackwell.
- Murthy, J. D. (2004). *Contemporary English grammar*. Hodder Education.
- Oluremi, T.A. (2018). A pragmatic study of pronouns in Nigerian's president Muhammadu Buhari's 2017 budget speech. *Papers in English and Linguistics (PEL)*, 19 (3,4), 278-303.
- Schaffner, C. (1991). Editorial: political speeches and discourse analysis. *Current issues in language and society*, 3, (3), 201-204.