The advent of democracy in the governance of most countries of the world, with America and other western nations in the lead, has really extended the domain of language use and research. Of paramount interest as a major area of language use therefore are the various speeches (addresses) of governors and presidents (major actors in politics) given whether as a campaign (or debate) speech, acceptance speech, or even an address at a public gathering. All these have been summed up as Political Discourse or Language of Politics. This study explored the effect of cohesion on such a political discourse exemplified in the address of the newly elected Nigerian President, Umaru Musa Yar’Adua, as delivered at a dinner organised by the Partnership Against Corruption Initiative (PACI) in Davos, Switzerland, on January 23, 2008. This speech, which was sourced from ‘The Nation’, one of the Nigerian dailies, was analysed using Halliday and Hassan’s approach to cohesion as a message-carrying linguistic aspect. It was discovered, through the cohesive analysis of the text, that the President was not only addressing the topical issues of national relevance like corruption and good governance, he was also very much selling himself and the agenda of his regime to the perceived stake-holders, on the one hand, and the general public on the other.

Introduction
The coming of a new regime into government brings with it mixed feelings of uncertainty in some quarters and hope from other people. At any given opportunity, questions are posed at the heads of government especially the governors of various states and the president whenever the occasion demands whether to clear the people’s doubt or to ascertain their hope. Hence, we have heard of catch phrases like ‘The President Speaks’, ‘Open Forum’ and so on in Nigeria creating opportunities for the people to know the mind of their leader. This is the case in the present study which concerns an interaction between the President, Umaru Musa Yar’Adua and a group of business executives outside Nigeria. This forum was organised a couple of months after the new regime of President Yar’Adua had been sworn into government in 2007. The caption of this speech clearly reflects the common song: ‘fight against corruption’ on the lips of the people both within and outside Nigeria.

It is interesting to note that many scholars have worked on speeches in political discourse like this. While some of these works focus on speeches of presidents in form of campaign debates or acceptance addresses (see for instance Friedenberg, 1996; Kraus, 2000; Benoit, McHale, Hansen, Pier, & McGuire, 2003; and Ayeomoni, 2004); some other studies dwell on the underlying principle and general description of the discourse as found in works like Chilton, (2004); and O’Regan, (2006). However, none of these works has a specific attention on the effect that cohesion has on a speech like this especially in an African setting, hence, this study. This study, therefore, shall be examining the cohesive ties employed by the speaker as well as their implication in
the text. It is therefore believed that exploring the cohesive strategies in a discourse like this will reveal the intended messages of the speaker.

Data and Method of Analysis
As mentioned earlier, the data for this study was the address given by the Nigerian President, Umaru Musa Yar’Adua (henceforth, UMY), at a dinner organised by the Partnership Against Corruption Initiative (PACI) in Davos, Switzerland, on January 23, 2008. The speech, a twenty-paragraph piece, was given a wide coverage in national dailies. The Nation, Monday 28, 2008, especially, had the speech on a full page (p.9) under the caption: “Yar’Adua: Corruption benefits a few”.

This text was subjected to the Halliday and Hassan (1976) cohesive theoretical analysis. The relevance of this theory to the current study is largely hinged on the emphasis that the understandability of a text is often signalled by the cohesive items therein (Yule, 1996). In this study, the items of cohesion employed by the speaker are analysed and discussed for the purpose of pinpointing every message they contributed to the discourse.

The Concept of Cohesion
Cohesion as a linguistic concept can be described as the grammatical and lexical relationship within a sentence, text or discourse. Ordinarily it can be defined as the links that hold a text together and give it meaning. This can be related to the broader concept of coherence. At this juncture, we can identify two main types of cohesion: the grammatical- referring to the structural content; and the lexical- referring to the language content of the piece. A cohesive text is created in many different ways. Halliday and Hasan (1976) identify five general categories of cohesive devices that create coherence in texts: reference, ellipsis, substitution, lexical cohesion, and conjunction.

Reference has different forms: Anaphoric reference occurs when the writer refers back to someone or something that has been previously identified, to avoid repetition. For examples, the phrase “the teacher” can be replaced with the pronoun "he" or "the two girls" with "they". Also important are the communication formulas such as "as stated previously" or "the aforementioned".

Cataphoric reference occurs when the audience is introduced to someone as an abstract, before later learning his or her name.

Exophoric reference can be used to describe generic or abstract situations in writing. It occurs when the writer chooses not to introduce a character (or group of characters), but instead refers to them by a generic word such as "everyone". Referential elements of these forms are contextually bound because of their close affinity with the content of the text at hand by showing or bringing out something. They are therefore described as being deictic (Saheed, 2003: 182).

Ellipsis is another cohesive device. It happens when, after a more specific mention, an expression is omitted when the phrase needs to be repeated. A simple example is: ‘My mummy bought all the ingredients and (my mummy/she) left’. Substitution occurs when, instead of leaving a word or phrase out, as in ellipsis, a word or phrase is substituted with another, probably a more general word (This is very
similar to the use of pronouns). For example, ‘one’ in this context: ‘I don’t want to touch the white gown; I would like the pink one’.

*Lexical cohesion* basically concerns itself with reiteration (or repetition) of the same lexeme especially of key words and phrases; words of similar meanings (synonyms) and words having contrary idea (most nearly opposite i.e. antonyms); the deliberate repetition of larger structures (i.e. parallelism); or general nouns (superordinates), or other lexemes sharing the majority of semantic features (also called hyponyms)

*Conjunctions* include *and, but* etc; conjunctive adverbs and transitional expressions or tags (Burchfields, 1996) e.g. *however, on the other hand*, etc. They all play sensitive role in coherence realization. For coherence to be established through the conjunctions as highlighted here, Burchfields warns that they have to be carefully and purposefully applied. This he hinges on the fact that conjunctions must appear naturally where they belong, otherwise they become redundant and ineffective.

Cohesion, in its differing manifestations, therefore helps in forming relational patterns in text in a way that links sentences to create an overall feature of coherence. Understanding how the content of sentences is linked helps to identify the central information in texts by means of a possible summary. This allows judgements on what the text is about as well as its acceptability by the ‘audience’. In the section below, we shall be discussing the interaction between cohesion and coherence.

**Cohesion and Coherence Interplay**

Cohesion and coherence constitute fundamental issues in discourse as a study. In various studies, coherence has been described as the way in which a text is sewn together, with pieces relating to other pieces. Mann and Thompson (1988) define it as the absence of non-sequiturs, i.e. a coherent text is one where all the parts form the whole and for every part of a coherent text, there is some function, some plausible reason for its presence, evident to readers, and there is no sense that some parts are somehow missing. Taboada (2008:125) describes coherence as “the connections which can be made by the reader or listener based on knowledge outside the discourse” or the sense in a text. This connection is also emphasised by Chandler (2008) in his description of coherence as having ‘two dimensions’ involving whether a text makes sense to a reader or ‘holds together well’ (p. 3).

Contextual meaning, at the paragraph level is referred to as “coherence” while the internal properties of meaning are referred to as “cohesion” and they work together. Coherence has “situational” coherence when field, tenor, and mode can be identified for a certain group of clauses and “generic” coherence when the text can be recognized as belonging to a certain genre. Cohesion relates to the “semantic ties” within text whereby a tie is made when there is some dependent link between items that combine to create meaning. When properties of both cohesion and coherence come together, texture is created within the text outside of the apparent grammatical structure of it. This opinion is supported by both Renkema (2004) and Yule (1996). However, in his earlier study, Renkema (2000) observes that coherence at some other times could depend on the listeners’ (or readers’) external knowledge. This could be the case especially in a conversational situation.
Although, this work focuses on the concept of cohesion, it still agrees in part with Louwerse and Graesser (2005)’s observation in support of earlier studies (Stubbs, 1983 and May, 2001) that cohesion alone cannot fully account for coherence in a discourse. But with this current study, the link between the duo of cohesion and coherence is once again established.

In this study, we shall be looking at the various cohesive strategies employed for message communication and (or) coherence realization in the presidential address chosen for discussion. Going by the content and period of this speech, we are mandated by the circumstances, the characters involved as well as the purpose of the address, to situate this discourse within the political discourse. The section below therefore, briefly discusses the language of politics.

The Language of Politics
Politics deals primarily with the manner in which people are ruled and language plays a very vital role in this situation. Equally, power is central to the concept of politics because it involves the manner in which people get what they want. Power does not only mean the ability to coerce or impose on others but also the ability to carry through policies and programmes geared towards the common good.

Language and politics are inseparable phenomena especially because of the integrative function attributed to language. Ali (1995) observes that language is the most important point of entry into habits of thoughts of a people and that it embodies within itself cumulative association derived from total experience of its people. Language in its regulatory function can be used for social mobilisation. Ayeomoni (2004: 202) reiterates ‘that language is the key factor in political behaviour concerning mobilizing people for support and acceptance’. Mobilising a people in this wise, simply refers to an attempt to increase their level of awareness of certain ideas and objectives with a view to internalizing those ideas in the people. These objectives may include nationalism, apartheid, and freedom of expression and so on. The efforts of the Chinese at building the Great Wall of China in 1949 and the French revolution of 1789 are examples of such situations where people were mobilised through language. Oyeleye (2004: 173) explains that via language, ‘one can issue threats, offer pleas or bribes (emotionally) or attract promises etc’. He goes further to identify three types of audience: the captive, the hostile and the monitor.

Since language is one of the outstanding characteristics of man, speeches form an essential instrument of ideological propagation as well as societal or political organisations. To this end, Harris (1979) avers that ‘in politics words have a powerful effect’ and politicians engage them a lot for the success of their aspirations. According to Idemili (1990), speeches form an integral part of written/printed media. Every speech is found in an area called ‘addressivity’ originally propounded by the Russian linguist and semiologist, Mikhail M. Bakhtin (1999:99). This he explains as denoting a constant quality of speech that hinges on the fact that any given utterance or speech is ‘dialogic’ since it is presupposed to be addressed to somebody. Bakhtin (ibid), therefore, emphasises that ‘addressivity’ is that ‘quality of turning to someone’ (whether real or imaginary) in a speech situation. Very notable in the business of political oration are the world names like Adolf Hitler of Germany (20 April 1889 – 30 April 1945) who was known for his ‘charismatic oratory and propaganda’; George
Washington of the USA (February 22, 1732 – December 14, 1799) who, as the first president and ‘Father of his country’ introduced the presidential inaugural address; Mohandas Karamchand (Mahatma) Gandhi of India (2 October 1869 – 30 January 1948), who was popularly regarded as the ‘Father of the Nation’ in India having successfully organised mass civil disobedience against tyranny in the land; and Obafemi Awolowo of Nigeria, (March 6, 1909 – May 9, 1987) who was known as the main opposition leader as well as the Asiwaju of Yoruba land (wikipedia, 2011) among others.

Generally, the language of politics is predicated on linguistic manoeuvring going to-fro by casting aspersion on perceived opponents on one hand and eulogizing ‘self’ (or acclaiming, Benoit et al (2003)) on the other. This same opinion that the acts, to which language is put are mainly of ‘praising and blaming’ is expressed by other scholars (see Chilton, 2004; Ayeomoni, 2004; and O’Regan, 2006). Thus, the need to investigate these prominent linguistic acts in political discourse has arisen. On his own part, Ayeomoni (2004) discusses the selected speeches of some Nigerian political elite alongside features like sentence, metaphor, liberal rhetorics, coercion, cohesion and lexical borrowings. He therefore concludes that political speeches have their unique features which have rendered them a variety of language.

As a result of linguists’ attempt at investigating the various linguistic acts in political discourse, the global politics through the local one has come under the searchlight of linguists as well as discourse analysts for the purpose of exposing and understanding the intrigues involved in the framing of issues and presentation of ideas. This view reflects much in Chilton (2004)’s position that political language dwells on persuasion and bargaining. He states further that in politics:

... we use a variety of techniques to get our own way: persuasion, rational argument, irrational strategies, threats, entreaties, bribes, manipulation, anything we think will work (p. 4).

Political discourse, as can be seen from the various submissions of scholars here, is therefore a study whose main goal is to establish a link between linguistic units, production/consumption dynamics and finally socio-cultural practices, which echo the immediate political context. To Orwell, this context is a situation in which “All issues are political issues, and politics itself is a mass of lies, evasions, folly, hatred and schizophrenia” (Orwell, 1957:185).

Speech-making, written or oral, is a ‘profession’ that every politician first ‘learns’ the very moment he steps into the act. A presidential speech is situated in the language of politics which according to Orwell (1957:181) is enshrined in ‘pretentious diction’ used to dress up simple statements and to give air of scientific impartiality to biased judgements. He claims further that the following adjectives are frequent in the registers of politics: “... epoch-making, epic, historic, unforgettable, inexorable, triumphant, age-old, inevitable, veritable” (p.181).

Most scholars have concluded that political discourse is an institutionalized language used by professional political power brokers who make use of the “institutional power that is invested in language, even when the institution as such is a ‘fake’ one” (Mey, 2001:326). Language of politics involves linguistic manipulation
(veiling) with the sole intention of making people behave in a certain way without their knowing why, even against their own wishes and best interests. A presidential speech, whether as an inaugural speech, valedictory address or lecture usually centres on societal oppression by means of manipulatory language (see Goffman, 1961:386 and Mey, 2001:308). This is true when the sole intention of the speaker is particularly taken into consideration.

While commenting on the ‘forms of address’ using language, Mey (p. 272) opines that different cultures and languages engage disparate and distinct ‘deferential’ forms used in addressing persons of higher social status or in order to mark distance. This is very characteristic of political speech-makers, especially presidents and other administrators who punctuate their speeches with markers of reverential distance to befriend their listeners.

Still on the regulatory role of language, users of language, especially politicians devise means of getting the average person mobilised or at least receptive to their agenda (or policies). Oyeleye (2004:174-5) captures the linguistic techniques in mobilising people most especially in politics as follows: Arousal: an appealing language meant to stir the emotion of the listeners; Transfer device: the use of virtuous or positive words or statements that listeners are familiar with; Appeal for conformity: using language showing one’s desires to be loved and accepted in the society (a bandwagon strategy); and Plan folks device: The politician speaks identifying with the aspirations of the audience in expressions like:

I strongly agree…,
I encourage….

Apart from those already cited above, there have been many other works on the political discourse and especially the presidential address aspect. For instance, Ayoola (2005:11) did a discourse interpretation of President Olusegun Obasanjo’s address of 2005. He concluded that “fears of ‘a hidden agenda’ in Nigerian leader’s political discourse are not completely unfounded”. Adetunji (2009) works on Presidential Inaugural Address (PIA). According to him, the speech at this stage has the purpose of indicating the direction of the leader’s administration’s subsequent actions. The PIA provides a new president with the opportunities for self and agenda presentation, audience-endorsement, among others. Furthermore, WAUDAG (1990) claims that a president, at a time like this, bares his ‘official voice’ on issues pertaining to both inter/national interest. Also, Cap (2002) studies pragma-linguistic features in JF Kennedy’s inaugural speech of January 20, 1961, and Cheng (2006) carries out a rhetorical study of two inaugural addresses of Taiwan’s president, Chen Shui-bian (delivered in 2000 and 2004) to gain an insight into the personality and ideology of the President.

Cohesion in ‘Corruption Benefits a Few’
The 20-paragraph presidential address considered for this work employs various items of cohesion as coherent markers to pass across to the readers/listeners its message. These coherence manifestations through cohesive items and discourse markers can be analyzed as follows:
Pronominal Realizations in the Text

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pronoun</th>
<th>Referent</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I/me</td>
<td>*UMY</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We</td>
<td>UMY+ the executives/companies</td>
<td>02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>UMY+ Nigerian government</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nigeria/ns+ government</td>
<td>06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You</td>
<td>The (private)executives</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You</td>
<td>(anybody= exophoric)</td>
<td>02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*UMY: Umaru Musa Yar’Adua

It should be noted that other pronominal items involved were engaged in the text for substitution. These involved the demonstratives this/these as found in the concluding paragraphs 17 and 18. In paragraph 17, ‘this’ refers anaphorically to the fraud of not having enough money to execute government project as mentioned by UMY, whereas ‘these’ in 18 embraces all the corrupt practices earlier enumerated in the passage by the speaker.

**Gloss:** The personal pronominal realizations in this speech can be grouped as follows:
All pronouns referring to the speaker, UMY, amount to thirty-four (34) while those including him (UMY) and others (the government officials, and Nigerians), are twenty-two (22), those exclusive of the speaker (UMY) amount to thirty-six (36) i.e. addressees (34) and anybody/exophoric personalities (02) totalling ninety-two. The distribution here underscores both the personality and attitude underlying his person especially towards his audience.

The sole aim of UMY at this gathering was to endear the listeners (as well as the public). The fact that his government came on board through what the public termed ‘an unfree/unfair election’ was enough for this political maneuvering. He portrayed much of this in the choice of pronouns highlighted above. Thus, of all the ninety-two items of pronouns in the text, the speaker (UMY) included himself in fifty-six (56) indicating the fact that he had come to sell himself (his policies or the government he represented) to the people. This was much demonstrated in how he chose time to recount and analyse his policies and programmes (most especially in the so-called fight against corruption) to impress the listening executives.

**Items of Cohesion (and Coherence) in President Yar’Adua’s Speech**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classification</th>
<th>Forms</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lexical items</strong></td>
<td>Synonyms</td>
<td>(par. 1) measures/steps (par. 1 &amp; 8) war against corruption/measures to combat corruption; (par. 8 &amp; 9) combat/fight, attack; (par. 7) money/wealth; (par. 1 &amp; 2) delight/excited; (par. 17) contracts/projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Antonyms</td>
<td>(par. 7 &amp; 19) respect, honour/Disrespect; (par. 7). people no longer cared/the society. cared, etc.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Repetitions | (par.1) corruption/corrupt; (par. 1-6, 8-16) PACI; ‘I'(virtually all) ; (par.1)beneficiaries /beneficiary
---|---
Discourse Markers (DMS) | Commenting | (par. 1) It is a delight; (par. 2, 3, 5) I think; I, in particular; (par. 6) I want to say, In fact; (par10) I am personally…
Organizing/ summarising | (par. 4) in the long run (par. 10) One of the, Another thing I..., One thing I have..., (par. 16-7) One of the Measures..., Another measure that...; (par. 20) Finally
Summarizing | (par. 4) in the long run; (par. 20) Finally
Reformulating | (par. 1)Let me not use…,
Addition | (par. 3) It also means; (par. 4) The other aspect, That is also; (par. 5) Let me, however, add; (par. 9) we have also;

**Gloss:** While the cohesive items above play a significant role in the comprehensibility of this text, the coherence of this address is further linked to the semantic relation holding between this text as well as the general sense attached to the political euphoria in the country (Nigeria) by the president. Having just assumed office as the President of the nation, he (UMY) was leaving no stone unturned in his bid to close rank with all stake-holders, especially the Nigerians in diaspora, who probably were perceived as skeptics/critics of his government. Obviously, UMY would not want to offend such sensitive groups as noticed in his deliberate double-standard and withdrawal of allegation in the opening of the speech:

But I must say that some of your companies have been, let me not use the word beneficiaries, because corruption itself dehumanises the human being. (The Nation: Para. 1, sentence2)

One would, therefore, not be surprised if eventually there are sacred cows in various aspects of the nation even while the ‘battle’ against corruption rages on: this is clearly evidenced in the excerpt above.

**Conclusion**

The general understanding emanating from this study is that coherence refers essentially to the relations of sentence and paragraphs within a given text. It therefore refers to the relations holding among the various components of a discourse, ‘within and across sentences and paragraphs’. As seen above, the relations are signalled by certain grammatical and lexical features (cohesive ties) which have been found to reflect textual structure in the semantic region thereby resulting in connectivity that aids the readers’ comprehension of the discourse.

The claim that coherence is not necessarily signalled by cohesive devices may not be applicable in this context after all. At every point in time, cohesive items are found in different parts of this text engineering its sense. Whether these ‘connectors’ are now explicit or inexplicit in some other situations is another thing entirely. In other words, where there are no surface cohesive devices in a text like this, they are to
be applied by the readers or speakers using their interpretive ingenuity, after all, no writer or speaker can express himself fully using words alone.

It is therefore recommended that language teachers, especially in post secondary level of education, begin to distinguish and emphasise discourse genres in which cohesive items have to necessarily signal coherence. In addition, scholars and discourse analysts should beam more of their searchlight on those discourse genres having coherence yet without cohesive ties, if any.
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