

UNIVERSITY OF CAPE COAST

LANGUAGE, POWER AND IDEOLOGY: A CRITICAL DISCOURSE
ANALYSIS OF JERRY JOHN RAWLINGS' JUNE 4 SPEECHES

BY

EMMANUEL YAW APPIAH

Thesis submitted to the Department of English of the Faculty of Arts,
University of Cape Coast, in partial fulfilment of the requirements for award
of Master of Philosophy degree in English

JULY 2015

DECLARATION

Candidate's Declaration

I hereby declare that this thesis is the result of my own original work and that no part of it has been presented for another degree in this university or elsewhere.

Candidate's Signature:..... Date:.....

Name: Emmanuel Yaw Appiah

Supervisors' Declaration

We hereby declare that the preparation and presentation of the thesis were supervised in accordance with the guidelines on supervision of thesis laid down by the University of Cape Coast.

Principal Supervisor's Signature:..... Date.....

Name: Professor Dora F. Edu-Buandoh

Co-Supervisor's Signature:..... Date:.....

Name: Professor Lawrence K. Owusu-Ansah

ABSTRACT

With the insight from critical discourse analysis (CDA), there have been many attempts at revealing the ideology and power that reside in many discourses. As a result, there has been a keen interest in the study of political discourse, particularly presidential speeches. This study is intended to contribute to those studies in political discourse, specifically presidential speeches, by using CDA and Halliday's transitivity to explore Ft. Lt. Jerry John Rawlings' June 4 speeches. The study has two objectives. The first objective is to explore the transitivity patterns of the June 4 speeches. The second objective examines the transitivity patterns associated with the key participants and how Rawlings uses that to enact power and ideology. The study shows that with respect to the transitivity patterns of the June 4 speeches, the material processes predominate. This indicates that presidential speeches reflect the actions and events of the political actors. As regards the ideology and power of the key participants, the patterns of transitivity demonstrate that the President exercises constitutional and legal powers while the opposition possesses destructive power that is detrimental to the state. The study demonstrates that the use of CDA and Halliday's transitivity is able to reveal power and ideology that reside in texts. The study has implications for further research in Rawlings' other speeches.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I wish to express my sincere thanks to a number of people who assisted me in completing this thesis.

First, I express my deepest gratitude to my supervisors, Professor Dora F. Edu-Buandoh and Professor Lawrence K. Owusu-Ansah, both of the Department of English, University of Cape Coast (UCC), for their contributions to this work. I sincerely thank you for your patience, encouragement and constructive criticisms. I shall never forget your warm welcome whenever we met to discuss this work.

I must also place on record the contributions of the staff of the Information Services Department, Accra. I highly appreciate the assistance offered me. Special thanks go to the librarians, especially Samuel Mensah, for readily providing the materials I needed.

Finally, I wish to thank Mr Augustine Gyamfi of Effah-Nkrabeah and Associates, Mrs Joyce Gyamfi, Mr Anthony Owusu, Mr Kwabena Prempeh Bandoh of FORIG and Mr Collins Kankam for the encouragement and the numerous forms of assistance you offered me.

DEDICATION

In memory of all those who died in the name of June 4.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Pages
DECLARATION	ii
ABSTRACT	iii
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	iv
DEDICATION	v
TABLE OF CONTENTS	vi
LIST OF TABLES	xi
CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION	1
Background to the Study	1
Motivation to the Study	5
Biography of Jerry John Rawlings	6
Statement of the Problem	9
Research Questions	11
Limitations	12
Delimitation	13
Organisation of the Study	13
CHAPTER TWO: LITERATURE REVIEW AND THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK	15
Introduction	15
Theoretical Considerations	15
Definition of Discourse	15
Definition of Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA)	19
Approaches of Critical Discourse Analysis	22
Justification of Critical Discourse Analysis	25

Principles of Critical Discourse Analysis	28
Systemic Functional Grammar	31
Relevance of Transitivity	35
Transitivity Model	37
Material Process	37
Mental Process	38
Relational Process	39
Verbal Process	40
Behavioural Process	41
Existential Process	42
Concept	43
Social Theory of Power	43
Ideology	50
Previous Studies	53
CHAPTER THREE: RESEARCH METHODS	
Introduction	61
The Historical Context of the June 4 Revolution	61
The Justification of the Use of Rawlings's June 4 Speech	63
Research Design	65
Data Source	67
Sampling and Sampling Technique	68
Procedure for Data Analysis	70
Conclusion	71
CHAPTER FOUR: RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS	73
Introduction	73

Transitivity Patterns	73
Transitivity of Participants	86
Speaker	85
Material Process	85
Relational Process	86
Verbal Process	91
Discussion	95
Collective Group: Speaker and Unidentified Participations	98
Material Processes	99
Relational Processes	104
Mental Processes	107
Verbal Process	111
Behavioural Processes	113
Discussion	114
Identified Groups	116
Material Processes	117
Relational Processes	119
Mental Processes	122
Verbal Processes	125
Behavioural Processes	127
Existential Process	128
Discussion	129
Ideology	129
Power	129
Opposition	130

Material Processes	131
Relational Processes	137
Material Processes	140
Verbal Processes	144
Existential Processes	145
Discussion	146
Ideology	146
Power	147
CHAPTER FIVE: SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	
RECOMMENDATIONS	149
Introduction	149
Summary	149
Conclusions	152
Recommendations	154
REFERENCES	155
APPENDICES	
A Full text of the 1989 June 4 speech	167
B Full text of the 1991 June 4 speech	169
C Full text of the 1993 June 4 speech	176
D Full text of the 2000 June 4 speech	180

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Pages
1	Transitivity Patterns of the Four Speeches	74

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

Background to the Study

Political discourse is viewed not only in terms of discourse structures, but also in consideration of political contexts (van Dijk, 2004). Van Dijk stresses that it will not be enough to characterise political discourse solely on the basis of the analysis of the political pronoun 'we' which predominantly features in political discourse. He recommends that in defining political discourse "It is crucial to relate such use to such categories as who is speaking, when, where, and with/to whom, that is, to specific aspects of the political situation" (p.13). It implies that the definition of political discourse should take a particular note of such a feature and relate them to the context since political actors take advantage of political situations in obtaining the ultimate value in politics; that is, power.

Van Dijk (2004) proposes that political discourse is very ideological because the social organization in the domain of politics and its actors, that is, the politicians and their political groups are primarily based on ideological differences, alliances and commonalities. The complete organization of social beliefs as a struggle between different groups is an outcome of the underlying polarisation of political ideologies that run deep in a society. Van Dijk clarifies the significance of ideology in political discourse with the claim that political ideologies not only help in producing or understanding political discourses and other practices, but are also produced or reproduced by them. In this vein, discourses make ideologies explicit, largely because it is only in

discourse that they may overtly be expressed and formulated. Other political practices only completely show or experience ideologies, for instance, in practices of discrimination on the basis of sexist, racist or political ideologies (van Dijk, 2004). Thus, it is important to note that it is through discourses that one will be able to detect the ideologies of a political institution or a politician. Discourses are then indispensable, especially, in making ideologies open to the any observer.

Most politicians, in particular presidents, use language to convey a specific ideology. It is important to study political discourse because it helps in understanding how language is used to exercise power over people.

Presidential speeches are a form of political discourse. According to Schaffner (1996), political discourse such as presidential speeches can be based on two parameters: function and themes. When political discourse is functional, it fulfils different functions due to different political activities, promotes different political ideas and seeks different political relations. It is considered thematic because the topics that it deals with are related to political activities, political ideas and political relations. Chilton and Schaffner (1997) give an example of an approach to political discourse analysis in terms of its strategic functions and point out that political action can be linguistic, and a political action will include a presidential speech which involves power or its inverse, resistance. Analysing political action like presidential speech in terms of power and resistance, Chilton and Schaffner distinguish four categories of strategic functions of discourse. The first strategic function is coercion which is speech acts backed by sanctions such as commands, edicts, laws, and setting agendas, selecting topics, censorships or access control. The second is

resistance, opposition or protest. The third strategic function is legitimization and delegitimization which is the expressions that create a climate for obedience and control such as appeals to voter's will and legality. The fourth strategic function is representation and misrepresentation which is characterized by representations of reality, events and information.

For Windt (1986), presidential power lies in presidential speeches when they are used for a number of purposes, namely to argue, reason, sustain the ideas of the president, to continue staying in power, to oppress people and nations, to establish and perpetuate ideas, to defend people in their needs and to promote civil rights and peace. Lim (2002) characterizes five trends that greatly have impacted the presidential speaking methods. The first trend is that presidential speech is anti-intellectual because the speeches make few references to cognitive and evaluative processes and states and ignore formal word choices for more colloquial ones. The second is that presidential speeches are abstract as they rely significantly on religious, poetic and idealistic references. When a presidential speech is assertive, the third trend, then it is activist and adopts a realist preoccupation with the language of power and is very confident. Another trend is that the speech can be democratic, and in that case, the speech is enthusiastically people-centred, compassionate, inclusive and egalitarian. The last trend is that the presidential speech can be conversational, which means that it uses language that brings about a close relationship between the speaker and his audience, focuses on the trustworthiness of the speaker and it is also anecdotal. On how these trends relate to power, Lim states that they have an implication not only of the claims

of institutional transformation but also for the larger issue of presidential leadership.

Campbell and Jamieson (1990) distinguish eight genres of presidential speeches: Inaugural Address, State of the Union Address, Veto Message, War Rhetoric, Rhetoric to Forestall Impeachment, Rhetoric of Pardoning and Farewells. Lim (2002) mentions Inaugural speeches and State of the Union Address as the principal genres of obligatory speeches because they are powerfully constrained by custom and ritual.

In Ghana, Article 67 of the Constitution mandates the president to deliver a message on the State of the Nation to Parliament only at the beginning of each session of Parliament and before the dissolution of Parliament. Apart from this, there are other speeches by presidents that are constrained by custom and ritual. Examples are Inaugural speeches, Independence Day speeches, Farmers' Day speeches, May Day speeches, Christmas and New Year Messages and until 2000, the June 4 speeches.

Regardless of the type and purpose of presidential speech, Fairclough (2006) notes that the use of language

is unquestionably an important element of politics” and that it “can misrepresent as well as represent realities, it can weave visions and imaginaries which can (with consent and feasibility) be implemented to change realities and in some cases improve human well-being, but it can also rhetorically obfuscate realities, and construe them ideologically to serve unjust power relations (Fairclough 2006, p.1)

Language use in a presidential speech is not only a medium of communication, but also a social phenomenon by which reality is socially constructed. In this case, the analysis of language use in the presidential speech will reflect the worldview, values, system of beliefs of the participants in discourse. Language is then regarded as an important tool to observe ideological, social and political issues in a text. In this light, one way of examining language use is by applying the system of transitivity, an aspect of Systemic Functional Linguistics proposed by Halliday. The June 4 speeches by Jerry John Rawlings have been considerably powerful in propagating not only the ideals of the June 4 revolution but also perspectives that occasioned the revolution, and many Ghanaians have come to accept these ideals and perspectives. These speeches by Jerry John Rawlings, therefore, offer rich political material for linguistic analysis.

Motivation for the Study

The motivation for the study stemmed from two front-page news stories I read from a Ghanaian newspaper, the Daily Graphic of May 31, 2001 and June 8, 2001. In the first story in the May 31, 2001 issue titled 'Bill to abolish the celebration of June 4' with a sub-title 'NDC threatens to go to court if...' a quote in the story attributed to Mr John Akologo Tia, then Minority Chief Whip and an NDC MP, said 'Mr Speaker, June 4 is a special day and if the day is expunged, a lot of Ghanaians will be denied the opportunity to celebrate the virtues for which the revolution was launched' (p.1). In the same story, a different statement in support of its abolition was reported. The then Minister of the Interior, Alhaji Malik Yakubu Alhassan, is

reported to have said that the deletion of June 4 from the national calendar was an attempt to reconcile the nation.

The controversy surrounding the June 4 celebration appeared again in the Daily Graphic of June 8, 2001. On the front page story, the New Patriotic Party and the Ghana Bar Association regarded the utterances made by former President Jerry John Rawlings during his June 4 celebration as threats that were intended to undermine the government's efforts to rebuild the country. The desire to reconcile the controversy around the celebration and the reactions to Jerry John Rawlings' June 4 speeches with the language prompted me to undertake this study.

Biography of Jerry John Rawlings

The life of Jerry John Rawlings is as mysterious as the circumstances of his childhood. At birth, he was named Jerry Rawlings John. He was born in Accra, on June 22, 1947 to a Ghanaian woman called Madam Victoria Agbotui and a Scottish father. But Jerry was entirely brought up by his mother who was very strict, and according to Shillington (1992), his mother would sometimes beat Rawlings in order to instill in him some values of honesty, integrity and personal discipline. He was baptized by the Bremen Mission but after some time he was re-baptised a Roman Catholic.

Jerry's mother was poor and struggled to raise money to put her child through private schooling. But after sometime, Jerry had the opportunity to attend the Achimota School where he was very known and well-liked because of his strong and fun loving personality. His looks which were striking also earned him some friends but what is remarkable about his life in Achimota is that he was known not to have tolerated bullying and readily came to the

defence of the younger students who were mistreated (Shillington, 1992). He went through his academic work with zeal but his mother was disappointed when after ordinary level examinations he could not obtain admission into any university for further studies, because the mother wanted him to become a doctor.

He left home and life became very difficult for him and he had to engage in odd works to make ends meet. In August, 1967, his personal circumstances changed when he signed up as a Flight Cadet at Takoradi Air Force Station. When he signed his name as Jerry Rawlings John, the Air Force Administration assumed John was a second Christian name, so they recorded Rawlings as the surname and has ever since been known as Jerry John Rawlings (Shillington, 1992). However, his commission into the Ghana Army firmed up his childhood desire to make an impact in his society, as Shillington (1992) observes:

He had been brought up to believe that people in authority should display the highest level of integrity and yet everywhere he saw numerous examples of people in authority illegally enriching themselves at the expense of the poor and the helpless...

In his last year at school, the coup of 1966 had brought the military to power with a strong commitment to abolish the corruption of the previous regime. As yet unsullied by the corrupting influence of political power, the military had a reputation for honour, discipline and

integrity. It was this reputation,... which made the young man decide to join the Air Force (p.34).

In January 1977, he married his longtime friend, Nana Konadu Agyemang. But as the result of the predicament in the Ghanaian society and his passion to save the masses, Shillington (1992) remarks that “Rawlings had developed a strong moral awareness” and he was constantly searching for philosophical as well as practical answers to the questions which life posed. On the intellectual front, Richard Bach’s *Jonathan Livingstone Seagull*, which he read around that time, articulated very well Rawlings’ views on perfection and the quest for freedom. He was fascinated by the conflict between selfishness and selflessness which he found in Ian Rand’s *Fountain Head* and a book called *Rebel Priest* also struck a chord with him.

On May15, 1979, Rawlings led a small number of junior officers to stage a coup to overthrow the SMC II government headed by General Akuffo, but it was unsuccessful. As a result, he was arrested and tried.

On June 4, 1979, Rawlings was released from the cells and made the leader of the Armed Forces Revolutionary Council (AFRC) that governed the country for three months and handed over power to People’s National Party (PNP) after general elections.

On December 31, 1981, a little after two years of handing over to the PNP, Rawlings staged a coup to overthrow the PNP administration and composed both civilian and military members. Having resigned from the army, he formed the National Democratic Congress a political party which contested and won two successive elections in 1992 and 2000.

Rawlings' revolution has been presented by many analysts in different ways as moralist, essentially reformist, pragmatic, radical populist and "unideological" (Folson, 1993) but the AFRC took actions that strengthened the belief that he was socialist revolutionary. Rawlings maintained that the response to injustices in the society was his main motivation for taking over power. The admiration that Rawlings gained, according to Shillington, stemmed partly from his stand against corrupt authority and his great show of concern for the poor and the exploited and his declarations of the revolutionary power to the people.

Statement of the Problem

The study of speeches of political leaders and other powerful personalities has attracted the attention of many scholars. The literature on political speeches reveals that speeches of many presidents and other personalities have been studied. Various types of speeches have come under scrutiny and many frameworks have been applied. Weintraub (2007) using schema container of metaphor as an analytical tool, investigated the 'crisis' speeches of two American leaders, John F. Kennedy and George W. Bush. Relying on the tenets of language attitude and applying a sociolinguistic approach, Bayram (2010) examined interviews of Prime Minister Recep Tayyip Erdogan of Turkey. Shayegh and Nabifar (2012) discussed Barack Obama's speech, using the SFL theory, which included transitivity processes. These studies of the speeches of presidents have paid little attention to uncovering the processes and participant roles in transitivity analysis and how these are linked to ideology and power. Also, the studies had little to do with

revolutionary speeches and the speeches studied had been limited to the political leaders in the Western countries.

In Africa, the study of presidential speeches is recent and mainly limited to Inaugural speeches and speeches given at international fora. Alo (2012) dealt with sixteen selected speeches of contemporary African leaders such as President Robert Mugabe of Zimbabwe, President Mwai Kibaki of Kenya, President John Evans Atta Mills of Ghana, President Joseph Kabila of Congo while Chinwe (2013) analysed inaugural speeches of two Nigerian leaders, Alhaji Shehu Shagari and General Olusegun Obasanjo. Opoku Mensah (2008) examined some selected speeches of Martin Luther King Junior and Dr Kwame Nkrumah. These studies undertook a comparative analysis of two or more speeches of different presidents, thereby paying very little attention to speeches by one president. Again, in many of these studies, the central concern has been to unravel certain key elements of language that embody these speeches. The interest of these studies of presidential speeches has been to find the interrelation between discourse, power and ideology. Such an interest has been motivated by the assumption that discourse is socially effective and socially determined and that power affects discourse and discourse is affected by power and that these are achieved through critical discourse analysis.

Ghana has, since independence, had thirteen heads of state and, apart from Obeng's (1979) compilation of selected speeches of Kwame Nkrumah, Mackenzie's (1983) compilation of selected speeches of Dr Hilla Limman, Opoku Mensah's (2008) comparative study of metaphors of Martin Luther, US political activist and Kwame Nkrumah, and Ampong's (2011) examination

of an anecdote in Rawlings' speech at the NDC congress, studies to uncover the ideology and power in Rawlings' language use has not received attention from critical discourse analysts. This work adopts critical discourse analysis and transitivity to examine Rawlings' speeches, in particular his June 4 speeches.

One head of state who has made a significant impact on the Ghanaian political scene is Jerry John Rawlings who has been delivering speeches on every June 4. The study of presidential speech delivered by a president who was a military leader at one time and a civilian leader at another time constitutes a new dimension in the study of presidential speeches.

This study explores the language use in Jerry John Rawlings' June 4 speeches. The study specifically seeks to describe the transitivity processes and how Jerry John Rawlings represents the participants' roles, power and the ideology that the speeches provide.

Research Questions

The following research questions will guide the study:

- a) What are the patterns of transitivity in the June 4 speeches?
- b) What do the patterns of transitivity attributed to the key participants reveal about power and ideology in the June 4 speeches?

Significance of the Study

The study should open the gate for the great interest in the study of the speeches of presidents of Ghana so that a good understanding of the language use, in political discourse can be obtained. The study will enrich the scholarship on presidential speeches, in particular, because this is a study on

one of the many presidents of Ghana. Again, it is expected that the study will provide a new perspective on the language use of presidents and, in particular, an understanding about the linguistic strategies that President Rawlings used in entrenching his long stay in office. In this way, this language study will help political scientists, particularly those in political communication, in making political statements from the domain of language studies.

In addition to these, it is expected that the analysis will offer an understanding and interpretation of the relations of power that Ghanaians, the soldiers, the architects of June 4 and the opposition groups are engaged in. The study can also help us to understand the interests of the architects of June 4 and how these interests relate with those of the opposition and other values in the Ghanaian society. When these relations and underlying ideologies are revealed, we are then fully informed and equipped with what to say, whether we can agree or disagree with what are said in the speeches, this is because there is a great awareness of the interpretation of the reality that is being portrayed.

Limitations

A lack of time and inadequate access to the entire speeches by Jerry John Rawlings constituted the major limitations for the study. As the result, this study was limited to Jerry John Rawlings' June 4 speeches. The sampling was not extensive because it did exclude speeches that Rawlings has been making on other occasions. Again, for constraints of time and for the purpose of this study, the analysis was limited to only four speeches. It should be recognized that this may not represent the whole picture, but it is believed that it may give some ideas about Rawlings' speeches.

Delimitation

In the ideal situation, the researcher needs to collect the samples of speeches of Jerry John Rawlings made on all other occasions so as to examine all facets of language use. Regrettably, such a study is beyond the scope of the present work. The study was mainly concerned with using transitivity and CDA to unravel ideology and power embedded in the speeches. The study did not focus on the rhetorical structure and other language use associated with presidential speeches. The purpose of limiting the study to unraveling ideology and power, through the use of CDA and transitivity was to demonstrate Jerry John Rawlings' worldview and his relations with the people and the opposition.

Organisation of the Study

This thesis is organized into five chapters. Chapter One is the Introduction which has the motivation for the study, background of the study, statement of the problem, research questions, limitations and delimitations.

In Chapter Two which is the Theoretical Framework comprises the theories and some of the concepts that underpin this work and a review of previous studies that are connected with power and ideology. The theories dealt with are Michael Halliday's Systemic Functional Linguistics, in particular, transitivity and social theory of power and the concept of Critical Discourse Analysis CDA.

Methodology is the Chapter Three which deals with the data collection, sample size, biography of Jerry John Rawlings and the events surrounding the June 4 Revolution. The method of analysis is elaborated.

In Chapter Four which is the Analysis, I present the transitivity patterns of the speeches, bringing out the participants and processes. The participants and processes are analysed to reveal the ideologies and power relations that the speaker sought to establish.

Chapter Five is the Conclusion. In this chapter, I present the summary of answers to the research questions, final remarks and suggestions for further studies.

CHAPTER TWO

LITERATURE REVIEW AND THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

Introduction

This chapter presents the literature review and the theoretical framework. The key concepts within critical discourse analysis, transitivity system, power and ideology are explained. I also present a review of studies of presidential speeches.

Definition of Discourse

The theoretical and methodological framework for this study is critical discourse analysis. Critical discourse analysis (CDA) is a branch of language study that has developed from discourse analysis (DA). The existence of CDA cannot be divorced from DA.

The attempt at giving the precise definition of discourse has remained an illusion. This is so because, according to Badran (2002), the term 'discourse' has been used in different contexts and this situation has diversified its meaning. So how discourse is defined depends on the area of meaning the term is made to cover. In spite of this, it is important to explore the meaning of discourse so as to get the sense in which it will be used in the present study.

A popular view from Stubbs (1983) is that discourse is "the language above the sentence or above the clause" (p.1). This view reinforces the view of discourse as a subset of language that has to do with the study of units "larger than the sentence" and which constitutes a coherent unit such as a sermon, argument, joke or narrative (Crystal, 1992, p.25).

According to Brown and Yule (1983) discourse is language in use and this view is shared by Fasold (1990). This definition puts the analyst's work at just examining how discourse or a text (oral, written or visual) is used in particular contexts to make meaning, rather than examining the abstract use of language.

For Link (1983:60), discourse is "an institutionally consolidated concept of speech inasmuch as it determines and consolidates action and thus already exercises power." Habermas (1984) integrates the notion of action into discourse because he sees it as a communicative action which is expression of rationality. This view limits discourse to only communicative action, thereby excluding non-communicative action and inaction in discourse. Similarly, McGregor's (2003) reference to discourse as using words to express one's self ignores the non-verbal cues that have meaning in discourse.

In addition, there are views from scholars like Macdonell (1986) that discourse is a process of social exchange of language which is organised around rules and regulations that involve social intercourse and the discourse. According to Fiske (1987), discourse aims at making and circulating a particular and coherent set of meanings about a very important topic. These views imply that discourse relies on rules and regulations, but this is not so because discourse examines or studies any exchange of language or the absence of it, whether the language is unstructured or organized. Again, it is clear that language may not always be coherent, but such forms could have meaning.

Another view on discourse held by Parker (1992) is that discourse is a system of statements that constructs an object. This view is true to some

extent, but the description of objects constitutes a very small portion of discourse analysis.

There are other definitions that broaden the field of study of discourse. Jager (1999 as cited in Wodak et al. 2001 p. 34) sees discourse as either the flow of knowledge or all societal knowledge stored throughout all time. Discourse then is responsible for the production of knowledge, taking cognizance of what is said, whether it is natural, normal and unquestioned and how it is used in particular contexts. On the same reasoning, Du Gay (1996) argues that discourse constitutes a group of statements which offer a language for talking about the topic and a way of producing a specific kind of knowledge about a topic. Discourse, in this way, has a role in the production of knowledge through language and representation and the way that knowledge becomes institutionalized and shapes social practices and sets new practices into play.

With this array of definitions of discourse, it is important to stress that Link's (1983) view of discourse as institutionally consolidated concept of speech inasmuch as it determines and consolidates action and thus already exercises power; Jager's (1999) view of discourse as the flow of knowledge which pervades the society at all time; Brown and Yule's (1983) view of discourse as constituting a part of language use; and finally Habermas' (1984) view of discourse as communicative action give an understanding of discourse not only in terms of the material realities, but also make discourse a social communication that involves power and ideology. In another way, Wodak (1995) summed up that discourse should be seen as a form of social action, always determined by values and social norms, by conventions and social

practices and always delimited and influenced by power structures and historical processes.

Aside these definitions, Johnstone (2002) refers to discourse as playing a role in the creation of subjects and the structuring and shaping of realities and societies. This role comes about as a result of linguistic choices that are made. The choices discourse producers make are in four areas: choices about the representation of actions, actors and events; choices about the representations of knowledge status; choices about naming and renaming and finally choices about incorporating and representing other voices. This implies that an analysis or a study of how linguistic choices are made in a speech can uncover hidden meaning within the text.

According to Eisenhart and Johnstone (2008), DA has been exploring “what can be learned about language and about speakers by studying language in use” (p. 8). Discourse analysts do this by examining written texts or transcripts of spoken or hand written discourse rather than depending on the analysts’ intuitions about grammatical possibilities. The authors point out that DA is primarily concerned with the structure and function of the pieces of talk or text that are larger than a single sentence and also about how the structure of the sentences is influenced by how they function in the linguistic and social contexts in which they are used. This implies that the meaning of discourse only resides in or is limited to the precise occurrences of talk, writing or linguistic communication that occurs in the medium. With this in mind, McGregor (2003) intimates that DA challenges the analyst to see words as having meaning in a particular historical, social and political condition. Even more significant, words, whether written or spoken, are used to convey a

broad sense of meanings and the meaning conveyed with the words is identified by immediate social, political and historical conditions.

Definition of Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA)

According to Jorgensen and Philips (2002), critical discourse analysis (CDA) sets itself off from DA by providing theories and methods for the empirical study of the relations between discourse and society. Fairclough (1996) sheds light on what is meant by *critical*:

Critical is used in the special sense of aiming to show up the connections between language, power and ideology. CLS analyses social interactions in a way which focuses on the linguistic elements and which sets out to show up their general determinants in the system of social relationships, as well as hidden effects they have upon that system.
(Fairclough, 1996, p 5)

The key link of language as it relates to ideology and power or the influence of language in society has been a guide in the definition of CDA. Rogers (2004) defines CDA as the study of power relations. She points out that CDA deals with a critical theory of the social world, the relationship of language and discourse in the construction and the representation of the social world. For Rogers, any study in CDA should have a connection with an analysis into the relationship between language and social context.

In Huckin's (1997) view, CDA is about the close analysis of texts, which can be written or oral and such texts are considered to be very important politically and culturally to the society. The analysis of the text is not separated from the broad context of society in which the text has been

produced. Again, the analysis of the text requires the analyst to take a political stance that enables the analyst to bring out the features in the text that go against the oppressed and the marginalized.

Another definition by Gee (2004) sees CDA as “the study of the ways in which either or both language –form correlations at the utterance-type level and situated meanings are associated with social practices” (p.32). Language is one of the social practices. In this case, CDA does not just examine social practices in terms of social relationships, but looks at social practices that have implications for things such as status, solidarity, distribution of social goods and power.

Similarly, Fairclough and Wodak (1997) refer to critical discourse as the language that is used in speech and writing, meaning-making in the social process and a form of social action that is “socially constitutive” and “socially shaped.” In simple terms, discourse has an influence on social context in the same way as social context has an influence on discourse. Van Dijk (1993) notes that CDA is “an intricate account of the relationship between text, talk, social cognition, power, society and culture” (p.253).

From these perspectives, CDA places great emphasis on the social nature of discourse and makes language, whether spoken or written, a key component of CDA. These perspectives have informed analyses in educational and other social settings. However, with the exception of van Dijk’s approach, these views have rarely been applied in the study of political speeches.

A suitable definition of CDA is offered by Fairclough (1992) and this is particularly useful for studying political speeches because it condenses all

other definitions of CDA (Horvath, 2007). Fairclough (1992) says CDA is the study of

often opaque relationships of causality and determination between (a) discursive practices, events and texts, and (b) wider social and cultural structures, relations and processes: to investigate how such practices, events and texts arise out of and are ideologically shaped by relations of power and struggles over power and to explore how the opacity of these relationships between discourse and society is itself a factor securing power and hegemony. (Fairclough, 1992:132-3)

In effect, Fairclough proposes that CDA's objective is primarily an attempt at removing what obscures the ideological assumptions that are made in a spoken or written text. The study of the obscurities in language is useful because it helps us to know what causes or determines the exercise of power relations and how it can be countered. In very simple terms, CDA aims at making transparent the connections between discourse practices, social practices and social structures, and other connections in language that are not very obvious to the lay person. CDA, in political discourse, has been attractive because of its influence in unveiling the way social power abuse, domination and inequality are enacted, reproduced, resisted in text and talk in social and political contexts (van Dijk, 2001 as cited in David & Dumanig 2011) and "plays an important role in manifesting political wills and accompanying actions" (Kamalu & Agangan, 2011, p 35).

Approaches of CDA

In spite of the consensus that CDA as a discourse analytical research examines “the way social power abuse, dominance, and inequality are enacted, reproduced and resisted by text and talk in the social and political context” (Van Dijk, 2001, p.352), it does not have a unitary theoretical framework. However, there are various approaches that are available to the critical discourse analyst who is able to take an explicit position to understand, unveil and resist social inequality (ibid). In the view of van Dijk (2001), the significant feature of CDA is to provide a kind of “mode” or “perspective” of theorizing, analysis, and application and this separates CDA from other areas such as pragmatics, sociolinguistics, rhetoric or media analysis. CDA is not a particular direction or a specialization that is akin to other approaches in discourse studies (van Dijk, 2001). Wodak (2008) points out that the approaches in CDA emerge from different theoretical backgrounds and make use of different data and different methodologies. There is a considerable variation that exists within the set of approaches to the study of discourse. According to Lukac (2011), there are six different approaches: Discourse-Historical, Corpus Linguistics, Social Actors, Dispositive Analysis, Socio-cognitive and Dialectical Relational. Van Dijk (2007) identifies four approaches, while Fairclough et al (2011) elaborate on six approaches.

However, the groundwork for CDA as the popular area of study was started by critical linguists. Critical linguistics (CL) as a new research paradigm came into the limelight during the 1970s. Citing Fairclough (2002), Chinwe (2013) lists CL scholars such as Roger Fowler, Robert Hodge, Tony Trew and Gunther Kress whose works have had a great influence on the CDA.

This approach was linked to systemic linguistic theory which stressed the practical ways of analyzing text. But their early works used transformational grammar as the analytic methodology. The proponents of this approach such as Fowler, Kress, Hodge and Trew (1979), Fowler (1991), Kress (1985) and Kress and Hodge (1979) gave serious attention to the role of grammar as it related to ideological analysis. By that, CL alerted researchers to the ideological power of some grammatical features like passive constructions and nominalisation. Again, CL provided the guide that some linguistic forms and other features like metaphors, argumentative fallacies, rhetorical devices and presupposition are a fertile starting point for critical analysis of social injustice and inequality. The main point of the proponents was relying on the transformations to make it easier for analysts to reveal the intentions and deceptions that are cleverly covered up in complex structures. This approach of CDA is seen as an attempt to read off ideological analysis from such forms in order to make the description of the object under study easy. The snag is that CL does not link the critical interpretation of ideology to the social context.

But a precise approach in the study of discourse is Fairclough's (1989) views on language and society. This approach by Fairclough (1996) recognizes language, whether written or spoken, as a form of a social practice. Therefore, this CDA approach places language and society at the centre of the discussion. Fairclough (1996) outlines three tenets upon which this concept of CDA hinges.

First, language is part of society. Linguistic phenomenon is also social phenomenon. At the same time, social phenomenon is also partly a linguistic

phenomenon. Language, whether in speech or in writing, cannot be divorced from the society. When individuals or groups engage in writing or speaking, they are involved in social relationships. Language therefore cannot only be seen as a measure of the relationships, but also a yardstick of how the language affects the individuals in their maintenance or change of the relationships. Social phenomenon is linguistic phenomenon implies that language activity in the social context does not just project or express social processes or practices, but it is a significant part of those practices and processes.

Second, language is a social process. Language becomes substantial only when it is in the form of text, spoken or written. In CDA, text is not discourse, but it is seen as a product of text production and the means of interpretation. In producing and interpreting text, speakers and analysts rely on what they have in mind, which will include knowledge of language, natural and social worlds, values, beliefs and assumptions and many others. In simple terms, Fairclough (2001) points out that text shows or connects with the productive process and interpretative process.

Third, language is a social practice determined by other factors in the society, that are not necessarily linguistic (Fairclough, 1989). Ordinarily, people imbibe what is socially produced and made available to them. They make use of what they acquire in their social practices, of which discourse is part. Those who produce and interpret text rely on what they have in their mind and then what is socially generated and transmitted. What participants have in mind in producing and interpreting text are Member's Resources and

they have cognitive and social features because they are generated from mind and society (Shayegh & Nafibar, 2012).

The central point of this CDA approach is to blend the analysis of discourse within linguistic theory and social theory. Again, it seeks to make the context of language use a very important part of CDA (Fairclough, 1990). This study takes a critical perspective of not only of abstract use of language but social and context of the June 4 speeches.

Fairclough's approach moves across other disciplinary areas to make use of the understandings of disciplines that are in contact. Having acquired the analytic methodology from the grammatical tools of Halliday's Systemic Functional Grammar, this approach does not limit its analysis to only texts and specific discursive practices, but emphasizes the text as the result of the process in which discourse is interconnected to social structures in production and interpretation. This study follows the approach explained by Fairclough.

Justification of the Use of CDA

Henderson (2005) observes that Fairclough's (1989, 1992, 1995) work in CDA led to "an alternative orientation" of doing discourse analysis because social and textual world is constantly changing and that doing CDA required the need for a theory that would be able to respond to and work with those changes. This alternative orientation is the social theory of discourse that is able to draw in together linguistically-oriented discourse and social and political thought relevant to discourse and language (Henderson, 2005). Hence Fairclough's CDA does not restrict itself to the study of abstract language.

Fairclough (1992, 1995, and 2000) notes that discourse is shaped by relations of power and ideology. In particular, CDA recognizes the connection between

language, power and ideology. This framework has been used in many forms and in political speeches, particularly by Horvath (2007), Martins (2007), Kamalu and Agangan (2011) in reinforcing the view that in CDA, language is the material form of ideology. CDA as a framework affords the present work a number of advantages. It ascertains the view that linguistic relations establish relations of power and ideology.

Fairclough's (1989) model recognizes that CDA operates first with a dialectical relationship between micro structures (linguistic features) and the macro structures of society (societal structures and ideology). In this vein, the micro-structures of discourse are a measure of macro- structures of society since the micro structures are able to reproduce larger social and ideological structures. The oppression, marginalization and other inequalities that are experienced by the vulnerable in society are reflected in the language of the powerful in society.

In addition, CDA sees language as a form of social practice, and as such critical discourse studies show how language mediates and represents the world from different points of view. Fairclough (2000) says that language is not separated from sociological, psychological, and physical elements, but all have an influence on each other. According to Fairclough, the sociological elements have institutional and organizational structures, procedures and rituals but include the institutional aspects of a political system. The psychological elements have to do with the set of knowledge, beliefs, attitudes and feelings that are expressed. The physical elements are the bodily actions that accompany the discourse and the environments within which the discourse is found. The last element of social practice is that language includes

semiotics that has gestures and bodily actions and language itself, which can be written or spoken.

One important feature of the Fairclough's approach to CDA is that it underscores the importance of the close analysis of texts. According to Jorgensen and Philips (2002), using Fairclough's toolbox makes it possible to discover a way of beginning the analysis. Also, many features that may go undetected in the ordinary reading can easily be identified in the text. This is because Fairclough's approach posits that any ideological analysis should rely on the evidence that will be drawn from the analysis of the text. One of the tools recommended by Fairclough is the systematic linguistic analysis of the text.

Chinwe (2013) notes that CDA scholars, in their work, take political stance explicitly and apply critique to the analysis of the oppressive, manipulative and repressive propaganda in language use. Such CDA studies, Martins (2007) claims, rely on the concept of social practice to examine language and its connection with power and ideology, and the language of those in power. CDA helps to question the language of the people responsible for the existence of inequalities and those who have the means to change the status quo. It evaluates how the exercise of power is effected through language since the production and reproduction of the social order is dependent on practice and processes of cultural nature, of which language is part and language as a social practice. In the sense, CDA sees language use as not divorced from physical, sociological and psychological underpinnings.

Principles of CDA

Rogers (2004) emphasizes that the principles of CDA developed by Fairclough and Wodak (1997) provide a useful starting point for any discussion in CDA. These principles are specifically relevant for the present study.

The first principle, for Fairclough et al (2011), is that CDA has a specific role in society because it addresses social problems by seeking to analyse linguistic and semiotic aspects of social processes and problems. Within the context of CDA as addressing social problems, important social and political processes such as power abuse, injustice and inequality, and movements have a partly linguistic-discursive character. This implies that any social and political changes in modern society, such as the events surrounding the June 4 Revolution will mainly involve “a substantive element of cultural and ideological change” (p.368).

The second principle is that power relations are discursive. In this connection, CDA throws light on “the substantively discursive nature of power relations” (p.369). What this means is that power relationships between politicians and their audience are exercised and negotiated in discourse. In particular, the dimension of power relations in discourse which is important for this study, is what Fairclough et al call rhetorical power or ‘cultural capital,’ a term they attribute to Bourdieu (1991). This cultural capital is explained as the prerogative of professional politicians in contemporary societies. For the present study, it is pertinent to note that every year since the launch of the June 4 Revolution, Flt. Lt. Rawlings has had to speak about the positive things of the revolution to usually a sizable crowd. In the view of

Fairclough et al, this power is exercised by professional politicians over their audience and is realized through the linguistic devices which organized the contributions of the politicians.

Fairclough et al describe the third principle of CDA as “discourse constitutes society and culture.” They point out that the value of discourse in contemporary social process is the reckoning that discourse and society or culture are mutually constitutive. This principle takes account of the fact that “every instance of language use makes its own small contribution to reproducing and/or transforming society and culture, including power relations. That is the power of discourse, that is why it is worth struggling over” (p.370) Three areas of social life which are representations of the world, social relations between people, and people’s social and personal identities are found in discourse. With regard to representations, discourse may incorporate a narrative which gives a representation different from what might have happened. Social relations between people in discourse may show the speaker and other participants in ways that may be contradictory; sometimes showing relations of solidarity and other times relations of authority. Within this principle, it is viewed that discourse provides terms for the constitution of identities. It again constructs persons and communities in the way that includes or excludes those who have been identified. For example, there is a reference of distinction between those who perpetuated injustices and the common people who suffered from those injustices in the era before the June 4 Uprising (Folson, 1993).

Further, Fairclough and others observe that discourse does ideological work. They define ideologies “as particular ways of representing and

constructing society which reproduce unequal relations of power, relations of domination and exploitation” (p.371), but ideology is not just a matter of representing social reality. It can also be seen as a process which brings together particular representations of reality and particular constructions of identity. Through CDA, some ideologies may be normally implicit, and at the same time, some linguistic features may bring up some implicit ideological sets of assumptions. The authors stress that in determining whether a particular discourse or discursive event does ideological work, only analyzing the texts will be not sufficient, but considering how the texts are interpreted and received and the social consequences that the texts have will be important.

Discourse as historical is another principle that underlies CDA and this situates discourse within a particular context since discourse can only be understood when due consideration has been given to the context (Fairclough et al., 2011; van Dijk, 2008). There are connections between discourses produced and those that have been produced earlier. This implies that no discourse is entirely new.

Apart from CDA being historical, Fairclough et al mention that CDA sees discourse analysis as interpretative and explanatory, mainly because discourse can lend itself to many different interpretations and the key factors responsible for varied interpretations are the context and the audience.

Interpretation and understanding of discourse is realized through feelings, beliefs, values and knowledge, sometimes described as member resources. Since these features are not the same for all analysts, interpretation and understanding will most likely differ from one analyst to the other. A fundamental remedy for correcting these differences is how much contextual

knowledge will be required to throw light on the opaque meanings of the text. They stress close examination of not only the linguistic features, but also ways in which the discourse is embedded in its social conditions and the connections to other texts and social practices, ideologies and power relations.

No less important is the principle that discourse is a form of social action. This highlights the application of CDA in society, because it seeks to uncover “opaqueness and power relationship” (p.373). CDA then functions, within the context of the social action, as a wider critique of the status quo and this can be used or applied as a basis for expert opinions in any social area. CDA can also be successful in changing discourse and power patterns within institutions.

In conclusion, the use of written texts in the day-to-day affairs of social institutions, including political organizations led by Flt Lt Jerry John Rawlings continues to entrench the mediation between ideology and power. Since the main aim of the critical discourse analyst is to uncover the hidden power structures in texts, thereby bringing up and questioning some textual representations and ideologies implied in their representation of the individuals and groups within a specific social setting, CDA serves as a convenient framework for this work.

Systemic Functional Grammar and Transitivity

The present study relies on the analysis of the transitivity system, an aspect of Systemic Functional Grammar. Systemic Functional Grammar (SFG) constitutes one of the frameworks used in CDA in analyzing language to uncover the linguistic features of a text as they relate to their social context. The transitivity system in the present study follows the discussions of this

concept from Halliday's Systemic Functional Grammar (1994), Halliday and Matthiessen (2004) and additional information from Downing and Locke (2006) and Eggins (2004). According to Martins (2007), SFG is a very important tool for explaining linguistic choices. SFG has to do with the choices that the grammar offers to speakers and writers. The choices made by a speaker or writer connect with the grammar or the content of the language used.

In very precise terms, Coffin (2001) notes that SFG deals with the traditional questions about the structure of language, and the social role of language which seeks to provide answers to the issues of social identity. SFG also concerns itself with how language is used in constructing ideologies and establishing the relations of power.

According to Temitope (2013), SFG takes into consideration how speakers generate utterances and how writers create texts to produce their intended meanings. He outlines the basic assumptions of SFG; that language is functional, the function of language is to create meaning, the meanings are determined by the context in which they are exchanged and that language use is a semiotic process that is based on choices.

Within SFG, three types of meanings or metafunctions have been identified (Haratyan, 2011; Shayegh & Nabifar, 2012). These are ideational, interpersonal and textual. The ideational function has to do with language use to the expression of experiential meaning, that is, the representation of experience or the expression of content. The interpersonal function refers to interpersonal meaning; that is, how language is used to set up interactions between people using the language. The textual function makes for the

organisation of the information in the discourse or the construction of the message. These three functions are manifested in the linguistic structure of discourse. The ideational function manifests itself through transitivity system of grammar, the interpersonal function shows itself in the mood system and the textual function is about the theme system (the organization of the message in rheme and theme).

Since the focus of this study is on how experiential or ideational meaning is realized through the system of transitivity, the attention will be on how transitivity is used as means of representing reality in the linguistic system. The transitivity analysis and how the analysis will be applied in this work will follow Halliday's theoretical framework.

Transitivity as Ideational Function

One of the methods used in critical discourse analysis in studying language is transitivity. Transitivity is a part of ideational function of the clause and a structural concept that has to do with the clause as a grammatical means of encoding patterns of experiences (Halliday, 1994). Halliday and Matthiessen (2004) describe the clause as the "grammatical energy" which constitutes the unit where the meanings of various kinds are fused into a single structure. As an ideational function of the clause, transitivity is concerned with the transmission of ideas. For Downing & Locke (2006), transitivity helps a speaker or writer to conceptualise and describe his or her experience, whether of actions and events, people and things of the external or internal world of his or her thoughts, feelings and perceptions. According to Figueredo (1998), the choices made in the system of transitivity show how the writer or speaker sees the world around him or her.

Referring to transitivity analysis as the organization of the clause to realize ideational meanings, Eggins (2004) mentions that ‘the ideational strand of meaning, in fact, involves two components: that of experiencing meaning in the clause, and that of the logical meaning between clauses in clause’ (p. 206). In addition, through the system of transitivity or process type, experiential meaning can be expressed.

Figueredo (1998) says since transitivity is a part of the ideational function which portrays the writer’s or speaker’s worldview, many critical analysts have investigated discourse using transitivity as a means of uncovering the links that exist between language and ideology and which meanings are highlighted and kept at the background or not included in the text. Halliday (1994) identifies transitivity as having three elements in the clause. The first is a process that consists of an obligatory verb and it involves the event or the state of affairs that is described in the clause. The process is combined with one or more noun or noun phrases which indicate participants in the event or state of the affairs. In this, there are two participants, the doer of the action is called agent, and the persons or objects acted upon are affected participant or patients. The process may be accompanied by circumstance which is the third element in the transitivity system, and these may indicate the time, place, or manner of the event described in the clause.

The concepts of process, participant and circumstance are semantic categories which provide an explanation about how phenomena we experience are interpreted as linguistic structures (Halliday & Matthiessen, 2004). The processes expressed by transitivity are grouped into specific categories, according to what they represent. According to Halliday (1994), actions are

described as material process. Speech is described as verbal process, or process of saying. States of mind are called mental process. States of being are called relational processes or processes of being.

Again, Figuireido (1998) asserts that the notion of transitivity provides the explanation that every text could have different versions and will represent alternative views and that a process may be expressed linguistically in many ways where each signifies a different thing or a different way of seeing. For example, “The policeman killed the student” and “The student was killed” and “The student was killed by the policeman.” This is a single event, but it is reported in different ways to show the impossibility of neutrality.

Relevance of Transitivity

Transitivity is an aspect of functional grammar of Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL) and is a linguistic framework.

There is a solid tradition that connects transitivity to CDA. At the time SFL concept was developing, some CDA scholars such as Fowler, Kress, Hodge and Trew (1979), Fairclough (1989) and Fowler (1986) used transitivity as an analytical tool in uncovering ideological underpinnings of texts. In recent times, Iwamoto (1995), Naz et al (2012), Mwinlaaru (2012) and Chinwe (2013) used transitivity in exploring political discourse, news media discourse and literary discourse. These illustrate the solid tradition that connects transitivity in particular and CDA.

Another relevance of transitivity model is that it is able to offer a way of discovering how certain linguistic structures of text encode the particular worldview or ideological stance of speaker. In this connection, Stubbs (1998) and Fowler (1986) observe that linguistic codes or words do not show reality

in a neutral way. But the linguistic codes interpret, organize and classify the subjects of discourse because words “embody theories of how the world is arranged; worldviews or ideologies” (Fowler, 1986:27). Stubbs adds succinctly that an ideological position can be identified by the choice of a word. Matu (2008) affirms that linguistically, transitivity deals with propositional meanings and functions and the representations within the transitivity model are seen as signaling bias, manipulation and ideology in discourse.

Furthermore, Alameda-Hernandez (2006) points out that transitivity creates a strong relationship between grammatical structures and their social context. This relationship provides the appropriate grounds for an effective linguistic analysis. This is because analysis of the relationship between grammatical structures and their social context helps the analyst to bring out concerns with power and ideology in the detailed analysis of text as they unfold, clause by clause, in real context of language use (Alameda-Hernandez, 2006).

Finally, the transitivity model and other SFL aspects, according to Renkema (2004), approach the analysis of a discourse in a systematic way that helps the discussion to be devoid of the accusations of vagueness and the lack of objectivity that often characterize the discussion of CDA. Hence, one of the values of applying transitivity is its ability to provide detailed and rigorous analysis of texts and insulates the interpretation from the researcher’s ideological bias.

Transitivity Model

The next section elaborates on the various processes realised in the system and the participant roles that are involved in the processes.

Material Process

The material processes are processes that are about doing, about action and about happening (Halliday & Matthiessen 2004, Eggins, 2004). Eggins (2004) notes that the basic meaning of material process is that some entity does something or undertakes some action, usually concrete, tangible action. This is semantic definition of material process. Actions involve actors or participants and participants are realized by nominal group. There can be one participant or Actor or person doing the action, but not all material processes have to involve only one participant. The participants involved in the material process are Actor who performs the action, Goal which is affected by the action, and Beneficiary who benefits from the action. The participants may not always be human, but may be inanimate or abstract entities. The two most frequent participants in the material process are Actor and Goal, as shown in the example.

Actor	P:Material	Goal
The lion	caught	the tourist

(Adapted from Halliday and Matthiessen, 2004:182)

In the sentence, *The lion* is the Actor, *caught* is the material process while *the tourist* is the Goal. However, not all the material processes have Goal. Halliday and Matthiessen (2004) list other participants that are often linked to the material processes. They are Initiator, Scope, Recipient, Client and Attribute. The Initiator as a participant most often occurs together with

Actor in a situation where the agency of the process in the clause is influenced by an external participant that is the Initiator who is not directly involved in the process as the Actor is. Scope is a participant which is like Goal, but is actually not affected by the action. A participant that receives an entity, which may be concrete or abstract from another participant which is the Actor is called Recipient. The Client participant receives a service that is indicated by the process.

Transitivity reckons the distinction between active and passive construction and how they affect the participants. When the clause is active, and has one participant, the participant is Actor. On the other hand, in a passive construction, the Goal becomes the subject of the sentence, as shown in this example .

Goal	P:Material	Actor
The tourist	was caught	by the lion

(Adapted from Halliday and Matthiessen, 2004: 182)

In the sentence which is a passive construction, *The tourist* is the Goal which is the subject while the process *was caught and* Actor is *by the lion*.

Mental Process

Eggin (2004) and Simpson (1993) see mental process as dealing with mental reactions about thoughts, feelings and perceptions. The mental processes indicate meanings of thinking or feelings and these are grouped into three classes which are cognition, affection and perception. Cognition comprises verbs of thinking, knowing and understanding; affection has verbs

of liking and fearing while perception has to do with verbs of seeing and hearing.

Mental processes, according to Eggins (2004), must always have two participants and these are nominal type participants. Even if one participant is apparently absent, it will be possible to recover that participant from the context for the clause to be meaningful. In the mental process, one participant must be a conscious participant. This conscious participant is termed *Senser*. The *Senser* who thinks, feels, perceives must either be human or an anthropomorphized non-human. The second participant is called *Phenomenon*. This participant is non active and is thought of, felt or perceived by the conscious *Senser*. Below is an example;

Senser	P:Mental	Phenomenon
He	felt	the needle going in

(Adapted from Eggins 2004:229)

In this example, the process is *felt* which has the *Senser He* and the *Phenomenon the needle going in* which is a nominal.

Relational Process

Relational processes, according to Downing and Locke (2006), bear meanings that concern the state of existential beings and things and they “cover various ways of being; being something, being in some place/at some time, or in a relation of possession” (Downing & Locke, 2006: 144). Halliday and Matthiessen (2004) identify the main function of Relational process as characterizing and identifying things and people. The participants commonly found in the Relational process are Carrier- Attribute, Possessor-Possession and Token-Value (Identified and Identifier).

Relational Process expressing attribute

Carrier	P:Relational	Attribute
Their eldest son	was	a musician

(Adapted from Downing and Locke, 2006 : 145)

The relational process shows an attribute of a participant. The process *was* establishes the attribute *a musician* of the carrier *Their eldest son*.

Relational Process expressing possession

Possessor	P:Relational	Possession
The baby	has	blue eyes

(ibid, 147)

The sentence represents a relational process that expresses possession. *The Baby* is the possessor with the possession *blue eyes*. The process is *has*.

Relational Process expressing equivalence

Token	P:Relational	Value
The father-in-law	is	the club's secretary

(ibid, 149)

The example shows a relational process of equivalence which has the process *is* which establishes the equivalence between Token *The father-in-law* and value *the club's secretary*.

Verbal Process

Verbal process is the process of verbal action; that is, saying and all its related meanings such as telling, informing (Downing & Locke, 2006). Halliday and Matthiessen (2004) describe the verbal process as key to building up a narrative in which there is a dialogue and specify that the verbal process lies at the boundary between mental and relational processes. Three

participants which are Sayer, Receiver and Verbiage are typically associated with verbal process. The Sayer is the participant responsible for verbal process and may not necessarily be a conscious participant but what is important is that the Sayer must put out a signal. The Receiver is the one to whom the message is directed while the Verbiage is the nominalised statement or the content of the message. Below is an example of participant and verbal process.

Sayer	P:Verbal	Receiver	Verbiage
The police officer	told	him	what he knew

(Adapted from Downing and Locke, 2006: 151)

In this example, the verbal process is *told* which has the Sayer *The police officer* and the Receiver *him*. Verbiage which constitutes the content of the message is *what he knew*.

Behavioural Process

According to Halliday and Matthiessen (2004) behavioural processes have meanings of behaviour, attitude and conduct and these are specifically human behaviour arising from physiological and psychological behaviour that may include sneezing, smiling, yawning, staring, breathing, coughing. The Behavioural process is situated between Material and Mental processes. This process usually has one participant which is termed Behavior and is normally followed by circumstance.

Behaver	P: Behavioural	Phenomenon
George	sniffed	the soup

(Adapted from Eggins, 2004:234)

This behavioural clause has the process *sniffed* and the Behaver is *George* and Phenomenon is *the soup*.

Existential Process

Existential processes are processes of existing or happening (Eggins 2004). An Existential process, in effect, represents things and beings happening and existing in the world. Halliday and Matthiessen (2004) say that Existential processes lie at the border between relational and material processes. The basic structure of the Existential process, according to Downing and Locke (2006) consists of There + be + Nominal Group and the single participant is Existent.

An example of Existential process is illustrated below;

Existential Process	Existent
There was	a storm

(Adapted from Halliday and Matthiessen, 2004 : 259)

In this example, the process is **was** and the existent *a storm*. As in many existential clauses, this is introduced by ‘There.’

In this study, the main reason for my choice of transitivity is to analyse participants and their relevant processes so as to unravel the meanings or ideas conveyed by Rawlings in his June 4 speeches, thereby revealing the ideational features of the June 4 speeches. In specific terms, in studying the transitivity choices will enable me to understand how Rawlings constructed his ideas to evaluate the actions and contributions of the social actors and other actors. Again, through the analysis of the transitivity pattern, the work will not only consider how the participants are represented in June 4 speeches, but also assess how power relations and ideology influence the production of the June 4 speeches.

Concepts

In this section the concepts of power and ideology that will guide the study will be explained. These concepts are to supplement the theoretical perspectives that have been discussed.

Social Theory of Power

The influential French sociologist, Pierre Bourdieu's (1994) social theory of power will underpin this work and this is guided by Bourdieu's view of symbolic power and its linguistic manifestation. Bourdieu's framework provides two advantages. The framework of power can be used to provide a larger conceptualization of power. Second, the framework is able to cater for the sociological dimension which is the handling of the structure- agency dichotomy, and the linguistic dimension (Guzzini, 2006).

Bourdieu (1994: 164) defines symbolic power as "the power of constructing reality" and this power can be exercised only with the involvement of those who are not aware that they are subject to it. In constructing his theory of symbolic power, Bourdieu, according to Jenkins (1992), specifies the processes whereby, in all societies, order and social restraints are produced by indirect, cultural mechanisms other than by direct coercive social control. This implies that Bourdieu recognizes the fact that there are essentially other means by which power in the society can be exercised apart from the violence often used by the state.

In addition, Geciene (2002) observes that Bourdieu's symbolic power is subordinate power and it can be transformed. In that case, power is not recognizable and seems legitimated since they are changed into other different forms of capital such as economic, cultural or social, and these kinds of capital

are the resources of power. So, in order to investigate the nature of power, it is necessary to deconstruct the phenomenon and explore the links between power and the strategies.

Very significant for this work is Bourdieu's notion of social or cultural capital. In the view of Gauntlett (2007), Bourdieu's version of social capital is the overall resources which may be actual and virtual. They are given to an individual or a group on the basis that the group or individual has a lasting connection of institutionalized relationships of mutual acquaintance and recognition. What this means is that social or cultural capital places itself in the context of providing an explanation of the ways in which those at the top of the social hierarchies can hold onto their position through the various subtle techniques, this is because social or cultural capital is used to explain the realities or experiences of social inequality.

On the link between language and power, Bourdieu (1994) regards language not as just a means of communicating, but also constituting the main instrument of power. This is primarily because language determines the social space that an individual occupies and determines the relational position within the particular institution. The various uses of language have the tendency to emphasize the various positions of the participants in the discourse. In particular, linguistic interactions are demonstrable signs of the social position of a participant.

This makes this framework useful in evaluating the power in Rawlings' June 4 speeches. In the speeches, participants in the discourse assume various positions that determine their social space and the social space

is afforded by the cultural capital of professional politicians, such as Rawlings himself.

Besides this social theory of power by Bourdieu, there are views that are worth considering so as to throw some light on the concept of power as used in this study.

The study of power has been tackled in various ways and has provided many insights about social relationships. Giddens et al (2007) underscore the importance of the study of power in sociology and define power as “the ability of the individuals or groups to make their own interests or concerns count, even when others resist” (p. 393). They describe power as an important component of social structure and that power is exercised by human agents, created by human agents and influences them and limits them. They hold the view that, to some degree, social life is dynamic and ordered (Giddens et al, 2007). Power is in the actions of the powerful and is evident in almost all social relationships.

Lukes (1974), theorizing about social power, defines power as the ability to implant in people’s mind the interests that run counter to their own good. In dealing with social power, Lukes takes cognizance of three dimensional models, which are overt model, covert model and latent model. The overt dimension of power deals with declared political preferences and these show themselves in open political play. The covert dimension has to do with political preferences that reveal themselves through complaints about political non-issues. The latent dimension, according to Lukes, is the hardest of all to identify because it is hard for the people who are themselves influenced by this dimension to discover its existence. Lukes posits that the

analysis of power should take account of all the three dimensions (open decisions, non decisions and the entire political agenda) so as to have an adequate picture of the true interests of the various groups. It, therefore, means power is broad and encompasses various decisions and is in the interest of the groups that seek to exercise it.

Power, according to French and Raven (1957), is a social force which allows select persons to mobilize others or organize others to act in concert and to melt away resistance to leaders' authority. In this way, they see power as couched in the ability to influence others to believe, behave or to value as those in power desire them to or to strengthen, validate or confirm present beliefs, behaviours or values. French and Raven assert that expert power, reward power, legitimate power, referent power, coercive power, information power, traditional power and charismatic power are the forms in which power manifests itself.

Examining power in the context of the organization and its structures, Weber (1978) conceptualizes power as the probability that an actor within a social relationship would be in a position to carry out his will despite resistance to it. For Weber, the activation of power is dependent on a person's will, even in opposition to someone else's. Weber was interested in power as a factor of domination, based on economic and authoritarian interests. According to Green (2008), Weber identifies three sources of the formal authority that activates legitimate power and these are charismatic, traditional and rational-legal. The charismatic authority has to do with how a political order can be maintained by the force of the leader's personality and this rests on a devotion to the exceptional sanctity, heroism or exemplary character of

the individual and that there will be normative pattern or order revealed or ordained by him.

The traditional authority which is the second type is concerned with how a political order can be maintained by a constant reference to customs, traditions and conventions and this type of authority hinges on an established belief in the sanctity of time-tested or immemorial tradition and the legitimacy of those who exercise authority under rule.

The third type is rational-legal which has to do with how a political order is regarded as legal in the view of the people and, this relies on a belief in the legality of the enacted rules and the right of the person who has risen to authority to give commands. Weber's ideas on power are significant but are best applied in the workplace, but are less frequent in political speeches.

Social power, according to van Dijk (2008), is looked at in terms of control that is relevant to the operation and function of groups or institution. In this connection, institutions and groups have power if they are to control the acts and minds of other groups. This is so because the ability to control means there is privileged access to the limited social resources, which can be force, money, status, fame, knowledge, information, way of life or various forms of public discourse or communication. Van Dijk asserts that different types of power may be distinguished according to the resources used to exercise such power. For example, the coercive power of the military and violent men will be based on force; the rich will have power because of their money; the persuasive power of parents, lecturers or journalists will be based on knowledge, information or authority.

Power is not always absolute (van Dijk 2008). Groups may more or less control other groups or only control them in specific situation or social domains. Again, the dominated groups may more or less resist, accept, condone, comply with or legitimate such power and even find it 'natural'. The power of the dominant groups may be integrated into laws, rules, norms, habits and sometimes a quite general consensus. Another dimension of the notion of power is that power is not always exercised in obviously abusive acts of dominant group members, but may be enacted in many instances of actions that are taken for granted. From this then, van Dijk contends that access to specific forms of discourse establishes the relation between power and discourse. The discourse can be political, the media or scientific.

Fairclough (2001) makes a distinction between "power in" discourse and "power behind" discourse. Shayegh and Nabifar (2012) clarifies the point that, in terms of power in discourse, discourse is the site of struggle while with the power behind discourse, it is the stake in power struggle, that is for the control over orders of discourse is a powerful mechanism for sustaining power. Fairclough outlines three types of constraint which powerful participants in discourse can exercise over the contributions of non-powerful participants and these are constraints on contents, constraints on relations and constraints on subject.

But the notion of power that will be most suitable for this study is Fairclough's (1989) view of causality in which power is seen as "who is represented as causing what to happen, who is represented as doing what to whom" (p.51). In this way, it is obvious that "discourse has effects upon social structures and contributes to the achievement of continuity and social change"

(37). Again, discourse recognizes the importance of power relationships and power struggle. In effect, power will be looked at as hidden and as a capacity of the power holders, such as the leaders of the June 4 Revolution to exercise this power through the systematic tendencies in their speeches and through repetitive ways of causality and agency. Finally, the ability of the power holders to position the other participants in particular ways within the discourse will be a measure of their power.

From these observations, powerful institutions and individuals build and sustain their power through coercive means, that could be by the use of force, or through other indirect ways such as money or use of language. So individuals and institutions use language not only as a way of creating their power but also maintaining the power. Again, there is a recognition that apart from institutional power or power that is exercised by entities that are clearly recognised for holding a position of authority such as a president or head of state, there exists power relations, between government and opposition, between revolutionaries and anarchists, between the military and civilians. In this category of power relations, the individuals and groups may use language as the main tool for creating and maintaining status and power.

Power can rightly be the object of study of discourse analysis, from which it can be observed as an evolving process that is constructed through language since discourse and power are connected. In line with this, the critical perspective provided by critical discourse analysis offers the opportunity to examine and understand the social and cultural context in which power relations are constructed through language.

Ideology

Ideology plays a key role in many spheres of human life and “holds sway over people in different parts of the world” (Boateng, 1996, p.37). However, according to Lagonikos (2005), there is no single definition of the term “ideology” mainly because ideology encompasses many meanings and different functions. In view of this, there is the need to settle on a working definition of ideology for this work.

Jordan (2011) claims that the definition of ideology has travelled from when it was used to indicate the study of how sense perceptions form all the basis of general concepts to a more contemporary definition which might be close to the study of ‘common’ sense or at least what a person or a group perceives to be commonsensical.

In specific terms, according to Althusser (1971), ideology is a representation of the imaginary relationship of individual to their real conditions of existence and that ideology exists in an apparatus and always resides within a mechanism and practices. Althusser does not present ideology as the way people use their imaginations to represent the world, rather, as the representation of the way people use their imagination.

But van Dijk (2000) presents the notion of ideology as multifaceted which involves cognitive and social psychology, sociology and discourse analysis. When ideology is looked at in cognitive terms, then it is social cognitions that are shared by the members of a group. In this case, the social dimension provides clarity on what kind of groups and institutions are involved in the development and reproduction of ideology. Relevant for the current study is the discourse dimension of ideology. Van Dijk posits that the

discourse dimension of ideology provides explanations about how ideologies influence our daily texts and talk, how ideological discourse is understood and how discourse is involved in the reproduction of ideology in society. Discourse, according to van Dijk, has a fundamental role in the daily expression of and reproduction of ideologies. Ideology, in the view of Kress and Hodge (1979), can be seen as a situational context outside the factors that influence the process of discourse creation. Van Dijk sees ideology as having something to do with systems of ideas or beliefs and these could be social, political or religious ideas that are shared by a social group. The ideologies become the basis for their specific beliefs about the world and these ideas that are at the basis of the beliefs guide their interpretation of events and monitor their social practices. When ideology becomes negative, then it is mainly self-serving beliefs about the dominant group and, this results in the concept of polarization. As van Dijk points out, ideology can be the basis of social action, Althusser (1971) claims that ideology effaces its presence, but one of the main social practices influenced by ideologies is language use and discourse, which in turn also influence how we acquire, learn and change ideologies.

Gee (1996) echoes the view that language is bound up with ideology and cannot be analysed or simply understood from language. Gee considers ideology as a 'usually taken for granted' and 'tacit theory' of what is regarded as 'normal' person and the 'right' ways to think, feel and behave and that ideologies are explicit and most powerful when they are not visible. Again, for Gee, ideologies are inherently subjective and involve who gets to have the social and material goods, which go beyond financial wealth to include social and cultural benefits such as status and worth.

Gramsci (1971) gives a re-interpretation of ideology which he terms as “hegemony” which works to convince individuals and social classes to subscribe to the social values and norms of an inherently exploitative system. In simple terms, Gramsci views ideology as “the manufacture of consent” which results in domination, not only by means of repressive coercion, oppression and exploitation but also through the persuasive potential of discourse which leads to consensus and complicity. Hegemony then appears as the “common sense” that guides the everyday and even mundane understanding of the world.

Ideologies are inseparable from power since power is almost always accompanied by ideologies. Giddens et al (2007) see ideologies as providing justification for the actions of the powerful. Ideology becomes a determining factor within the society and power connection that is in the service of the ruling class (Gramsci, 1971).

From these perspectives, the relationship between language and ideology and ideology as commonsense provide a starting point for looking ideology in discourse.

The working definition of ideology for this study will be Fairclough’s (2003) definition of ideologies as “representations of aspects of the world which can be shown to contribute to establishing, maintaining and changing social relations of power, domination and exploitation” (p.9). In Fairclough’s view, ideology plays a very important role in representing people and has an effect on social relations, showing the powerful and powerless.

On the link between ideology and discourse, Fairclough (1995) opines that discourse is the language that is used in representing a given social

practice from a particular point of view and that ideologies are linked to language because language is the commonest form of social behaviour where we rely on the commonsense assumptions.

Previous Studies

Studies into Rawlings' speeches have been captured in Ampong's (2011) pragmatic analysis of speech in relation to an anecdote in that speech and Adjei-Fobi's (2011) analysis of metaphors of Rawlings and Kwame Nkrumah. Relying on the assumption that when we speak, there are things that are presented clearly and others that are implied, Ampong conducts an analysis of Rawlings' speech delivered at NDC congress to reveal the hidden meaning. He uses qualitative method of research by applying the theories of presupposition inference and argumentative orientation. Ampong discovers this study supports the assertion that whatever contains the unsaid, that is presupposed and inferred, and whatever we say are from a specific point of view. Although Ampong's study forms part of the studies on Rawlings' speeches, the speech he examined is the speech that Rawlings delivered when he had been out of office as the president of Ghana. The study, therefore, does not constitute a study of presidential speech, in spite of the fact that he was a key political actor in Ghana.

Adjei-Fobi (2011) undertakes a comparative study of the metaphors used in the speech of Rawlings and Nkrumah. Using the Burke's Theory of Dramatism, Aristotle Rhetoric's and Lakoff's Theory on Cognitive Model, he takes the view that Rawlings' military background has a big influence on his speeches and that his charisma finds expression in his speeches. He also discovers Rawlings' metaphors bring to the fore the injustices in Ghana and

show a sense of hope while Nkrumah's metaphors highlight the need for unity and the need to fight the colonialism. Like Nkrumah, Rawlings used metaphors as a vehicle for portraying his vision. These two studies are very important in so far as they touch on some aspects of Rawlings' speeches, in particular presupposition and inference and metaphors. However, these studies do not deal with June 4 speeches; neither do they specifically touch on the issues of ideology and power relations in the speech.

There have been some studies on presidential speeches and transitivity but the focus of the discussions has not always been the same. Looking at the transitivity choices in the speech "Democratization in Pakistan," Naz et al (2012) examine the linguistic spin in the speech delivered by Benazir Bhutto, the former president of Pakistan. They discover that through the material processes, Bhutto demonstrates her strong determination to re-establish democracy in Pakistan but the mental processes also demonstrate her agony and anxiety because of the despotism. The study finds that the relational and behavioural processes are used to win the heart of the people while the use of the spatial and temporal circumstances of manner make the arguments she presented in her speech very strong. Underlying Naz et al's study are the issues of the how language is used to shape power and ideology but these are not explicitly stated but their study dwells on the functions of the processes to make the speech a linguistic spin. Apart from highlighting the process types and how they relate to the meaning of the speech, they illustrate the frequency of the process types in the work. This study is based on a single speech but the present work will use ten speeches to uncover the relationship that language has with power and ideology.

Chinwe (2013) undertakes a study to confirm that lexico-grammatical choices of transitivity in the inaugural speeches of Presidents Alhaji Shehu Shagari and General Olusegun Obasanjo help in the interpretation of the experiential meanings of the speeches. Chinwe discovers that language used by these presidents is hegemonic; that is, it is geared towards manufacturing consent, and the real issues confronting the nation are left dangling. Chinwe's work and the present work share a number of characteristics. First, one of the leaders, General Obasanjo, whose speech Chinwe examined, was a military leader who changed to become a civilian president, like Jerry John Rawlings whose speeches are examined in this study. Again, both studies apply CDA and Transitivity and both deal with presidential speeches. However, there are some points of departure for the two studies and these are seen in the types of speeches under examination. Chinwe's follows the tradition of analyzing inaugural speeches of leader, but the present work examines anniversary speech. Also another difference is that Chinwe does not specifically situate the work in the context of power and ideology but the present work relates language to power and ideology.

Another work using transitivity to examine the speech of a president is Shayegh and Nabifar (2012). Focusing on seven interviews of President Barack Obama, Shayegh and Nabifar (2012) explore how ideological loading and socio-political relations of power manifest themselves in the discourse. The study dwells on the Hallidayan systemic functional grammar from the critical perspective as advanced by Fairclough but the study does not only restrict itself to transitivity analysis. The analytical tools include also modality, tense, pronouns. There are other elements that are used in the analysis and

these are persuasion, hesitation, threat, religious statement and illusively speaking. They conclude that through the analysis of the transitivity, material processes in the interviews signify what Obama's government has achieved, what the government would be doing and what they would do. Another finding about the transitivity is that interviews are seen as trying to rouse the American people's confidence toward the president and the government. Shayegh and Nabifar's (2012) analysis moves further to include other analytical elements, but this present work will be guided only by their use of CDA and its transitivity approach for the analysis.

There is a study by Nedashkivsha (2006) in which he examines the speeches by two Ukrainian presidents, Leonid Kuchma and Viktor Yushchenko. These speeches were made during the celebration of Ukrainian independence on August 24, in 1999, 2004 and 2005 and these years were election periods in Ukraine. Nedashkivsha's work focuses on the linguistic resources and discourse practices in relation to the social practice of the democratization process but the main concern is the discursive strategies in the political language by the two leaders. Relying on the theoretical approach proposed by Fairclough, Nedashkivsha discusses how identities are revealed through inclusive and exclusive pronouns, how the features of transitivity contribute to the promotion of an impersonal relationship between the speakers and audience, and how impersonal sentences, passives, nominalizations project low agency. He also applies modality in the analysis of these speeches and makes a distinction between objective or authoritative modality, personalized modality, high affinity modality and future modality. He makes the point that the nature of the modality usage renders the discourse

personified and personalized discourse. There is also an analysis of the elements of interdiscursivity which are revealed in various proportions and discourse types such as popular, metaphoric, Soviet, militarized and conversational discourse. Nedashkivsha concludes that there are different tendencies in the Ukrainian political language during different time frames within the six year period. This is comparative study of presidential speeches of two presidents and the analytical approach is broader than the present study. The present work will make use of only transitivity.

There are other works on the speeches of presidents; however, the analytical approaches differ from what have been discussed. In spite of this, some of them focus on uncovering the ideological underpinning of the speeches. For example, using presidential speeches during wartime and drawing on the work of George Lakoff and Mark Johnson, and Keenan and Dowd, Weintraub (2007) attempts to uncover the wars on ideological menaces that presented both opportunities and limitations to two American leaders, John F. Kennedy during the Cuban Missile Crisis and George W. Bush after the September 11 attacks. The pivot of the language as ideology is on Lakoff and Johnson's (1980) container schema which uses metaphor to divide the discursive space so that a group of people and ideas are included while others are excluded. It also relied on Graham, Keenan and Dowd's (2004) "Call to arms" and Chilton (2004). This study concludes that metaphorical expressions of presidential rhetoric do not only serve as defining the identity of the enemy, but also show the nation as an ideal foil. Although this work applies CDA and analyses presidential speeches, it differs from the present work uses transitivity in unearthing the ideology and power that are embedded in the

discourse. The huge reliance on the metaphorical meaning of words in the speeches is not the focus of the present work.

Bayram (2010) throws light on the ideological, cultural and language background of the Prime Minister of Turkey, Recep Tayyip Erdogan. Relying on Fairclough's assumptions in CDA that there is a link between discursive practices, text and events on one hand, and wider social and cultural structures, relations and processes on the other, Bayram examines the discursive strategies that are used in the speech. Bayram concludes that attitudes to language are significantly important and that perceptions of the characteristics of a person or a social group may be influenced by these attitudes. Bayram's work shares CDA approach with the present work and focuses on the speech of a political leader as this present work does but they differ because of the analytical approach. This work relies on transitivity.

Relying on Critical Rhetorical framework as an attempt to uncover the ideological disposition, Alo (2012) examines sixteen political speeches of eight African presidents from the major regions of Africa. Alo's definition of ideology is drawn from Eagleton's which sees ideology as the body of ideas that are peculiar to a social group and such ideas point to legitimating a dominant political power. Placing the analysis of ideology within the political and socio-economic problems, he discovers four ideological preoccupations from the speeches as economic growth and independence of Africa, national unity and nationalism, globalism and self-reliance. This study shares the context of the discussion of the political and social ideas with the present work. However, the application of the framework of Critical Rhetorical and

persuasion strategies has no place in the present work, because this work uses transitivity in examining how ideology and power are realized.

There is a strand of this review that has to do with other studies whose focus is not on presidential speeches but they use transitivity to uncover the ideology and power in the discourse they examine.

Haig (2009) applies systemic functional linguistic and critical discourse analysis to investigate ideology in the radio news bulletin. Haig's work addresses itself to the ontological question of the meaning of ideology and the nature of the influence that it exerts. The second is the epistemological question of how influence can be identified and described. The third relates to how to interpret and evaluate such influence. Haig's work looks at the role of transitivity in the representation of social actors and proposes a participant power hierarchy. The results of the analysis demonstrate that the participant hierarchy gives a useful indication of the grammatical power assigned to participants and that this can be related to actual degree of social power those participants have or are represented as having by the text producers. This present work also shares the recognition that transitivity is a fundamental concept in systemic functional linguistic which has proved to be a powerful tool for the analysis of representation in texts. The analysis shows how ideology reflects a text in the news bulletin but the current work deals with a political discourse and precisely presidential speeches.

With the aim of explaining that ideology on power is embedded in the language of students' blogs and how ideologies are expressed in the blogs, Polito (2011) examines forty blogs of fresh students. Polito applies more than one analytical approach of CDA in dealing with the ideology on power of the

blogs. He uses transitivity, presuppositions and deixis. The study finds that fifteen types of power are reflected through the language but through transitivity, Polito discovers seven ideologies on power are realized in the blogs and that parents especially the fathers are considered powerful because they motivate and affect their children's decision. Polito points out that the students' blogs are structured to accommodate the ideology of society in relation to power as a whole and that of bloggers as individuals in society and that blogging is avenue where power can be built and maintained. The relevance of Polito's work offers to this present is that transitivity as a method of CDA can be used to unravel ideology on power that is embedded in the language, but Polito's work any deep analysis of the application of transitivity.

Thus, these works have demonstrated that the transitivity system and CDA can be applied in the study of the presidential speeches and other discourses. These works which have similar theoretical and methodological approaches towards power and ideology in language can be useful examples and models that be relied on and can be used to compare and contrast in the analysis and findings.

Conclusion

In this chapter, I presented the theoretical framework and review of literature. The chapter dealt with the definitions of discourse and critical discourse analysis, principles of CDA, the notion of power and ideology, previous studies on presidential speeches and other works based on the transitivity system. The next chapter will describe the methodology.

CHAPTER THREE

RESEARCH METHODS

Introduction

The previous chapter examined the theories and concepts underlying the present work and how other works are related to the concerns of the present work. This present chapter deals with the research context and methods of the study. This chapter focuses on the historical context of the June 4 Uprising, the justification of the use of June 4 speeches, the research design, the description of the data source, the sample and sampling technique used in this study and the procedure for analyzing the data.

The Historical Context of the June 4 Revolution

The events of the June 4 Revolution that ushered in the Armed Forces Revolutionary Council (AFRC), the government which lasted one hundred and twelve days, are the culmination of anger and the subsequent uprising of the May 15, 1979. Ocquaye (2004) notes that the AFRC regime that was launched by the June 4 revolution marked the most traumatic and the biggest political upheaval in the country.

This major event had its roots in the disaffection the impoverished ordinary Ghanaian had harboured against the ruling elite. Shillington (1992) observes that the Supreme Military Council (SMC) II's failure to severely punish General Acheampong (former Head of State and leader of SMC I) and other top army officers who had used their official influence to amass wealth while the large mass of people experienced abject poverty, drove Flight Lieutenant Rawlings to stage a coup on the May 15, 1979. This attempt at

overthrowing the SMC II headed by General Fred Akuffo failed. Rawlings, together with six officers, was arrested and brought to face a military tribunal.

In court, the prosecutor explained that Rawlings' action had been motivated by his desire and determination to restore the image of the Armed Forces. The image restoration process was just to get the SMC II to use the final weeks in office to clear up the massive corruption that had permeated the top officials and also conduct investigations into the corrupt trading practices of foreign nationals such as Syrian and Lebanese businessmen. This is because many of them controlled the wholesale and import trade and had been milking the starving masses. In addition, it was Rawlings' resolve that the military should act quickly to clean the system, failing which the only solution to clean the rot would be going the 'Ethiopian way', an apparent reference to the Ethiopian Head of State, Mengistu Haile Mariam who had earlier summarily executed hundreds of his perceived opponents in the Ethiopian revolution that occurred in 1977 (Shillington, 1992). The court adjourned and this provided the opportunity for the sympathizers of Jerry John Rawlings to strategise.

During the trial, Flight Lieutenant Rawlings managed to strike a popular chord in the imagination of the rank and file of the army and the general population. As a result, on the dawn of June 4, 1979, junior officers of the Ghana Armed Forces toppled the SMC II headed by General Akuffo and broke jail to release Flight Lieutenant Rawlings. He was made the leader of the new government, AFRC. According to Folson (1993), the regime was a revolution of social conscience that was devoted to house cleaning. Awoonor (1984) narrates that soon after the takeover by the junior officers, some of the soldiers began to loot stores and private houses. There were reports of

Lebanese and Syrian merchants who were threatened with guns by soldiers and had their jewels, money, cars and other valuables looted by the soldiers. Again, large private departmental stores were broken into by soldiers and city lay-outs. Another nightmarish activity that was sanctioned by the new government was the search for hoarded goods. As a result of this directive, warehouses, stores and houses were broken into by some soldiers who were always armed to the teeth. Innocent people were dragged through the street and flogged. There were instances when soldiers stopped people “riding in their cars on the street, dragged them out and beat them up and drove off with the vehicles” (p.112). These, according to Awoonor (1984), were because the leaders of the June 4 did not appear to be in total control. The anarchy was climaxed by the execution of eight top military officers, including three former heads of state. What abated the execution and the looting was the AFRC’s insistence on keeping to the time table of the return to the constitutional rule (Awoonor, 1984). The AFRC then ended its work three months after the launch of the June 4 revolution.

The Justification for the Use of Rawlings’ June 4 Speeches

In looking for a person whose speech will be suitable for this study, the former President Rawlings’ June 4 speech was selected based on a number of reasons.

The June 4 speeches are made as part of the anniversary celebration of the June 4 Uprising. The speeches constitute not only the voice of Rawlings as an individual who played a key role in the June 4 Revolution but also the voice of the members of the revolution. Again, the speeches are a reflection of the feelings, attitudes and reactions to the many dimensions of the events

surrounding the June 4 Revolution. The day the speech is delivered marks an important epoch in Rawlings' life. It is anniversary of the day in which he was released from the military cells and made the head of state. The speeches represent the circumstances, conflicts and persons that played and continue to play a role in the June 4 Revolution.

Jerry John Rawlings is also a person who has exerted a huge influence on the politics of Ghana and this influence will remain for a long time to come. He ruled the country for almost twenty years. He first ruled the country for three months, after junior officers of the army toppled the SMC II on June 4 1979, and he became the Head of State. After three months, he handed over to a civilian administration. He overthrew the government he handed over to through a military coup and ruled as a military head of state for eleven years. Then he became the civilian ruler in a constitutional regime for eight years.

This work is based on power and ideology in language and investigating the speeches of Jerry John Rawlings will portray how ideology and power are enacted in the political discourse. This is because, according to Awoonor (1984),

Jerry Rawlings on the 4th of June was a moralist. His speeches betray very little of a general political program and little of political strategy or planning for the purposes of attaining specific goals. And as a moralist, he was unambitious. It is precisely this quality that has made him what he is – an almost simple religiously motivated fireball raw nerves and boundless energy, without guile, without a vicious bone in his body. He is the stuff of which

martyrs are made. Messianic in his basic impulses, represents the ultimate point of scale shifts in a moral system. His impulses almost seem to win, for he retains a vast humanity, a great sense of humour and a desire to achieve what is good. (117)

The ideological portrayal of Rawlings constitutes one of the reasons for my choice of his June 4 speeches.

Again, some of Rawlings' June 4 speeches have attracted serious controversies in the media and among the general public. In the *Daily Graphic* of June 8, 2001, the New Patriotic Party and the Ghana Bar Association expressed serious concerns about the utterances he made in his June 4 speech and they said those utterances amounted to threats that were intended to undermine the efforts of the government to rebuild the country. His speeches have a great social influence on social perception of the matters of the June 4 and other contemporary issues and, therefore, need to be studied.

Research Design

Qualitative research design is used in this study. The main thrust of qualitative research is its emphasis on exploring and understanding meaning individuals or groups ascribe to social or human questions (Cresswell, 2004). In qualitative research, the main aim of the researcher is to look into how people make meaning of their lives, events, experiences and their structures of the world. The descriptive nature of qualitative research provides a strong influence for this work. This is because the researcher is largely concerned with making meaning of a particular phenomenon and understanding its process by analyzing utterances of a president and head of state.

Another feature of qualitative research is that it is inductive. In this way, the researcher's initial questions about the phenomenon under investigation can change or be modified when new insights emerge from the data collection or during the analysis. In analyzing qualitative data, the researcher looks for the causal links and explores plausible explanations to build an explanation about the patterns. Because of the interpretative nature of qualitative research, the biases, values and judgement of the researcher become explicitly stated.

The main reason for the choice of the qualitative research design is its exploratory nature. As noted by Cresswell (2004), qualitative research has a flexible procedure and is a suitable design for exploring any phenomenon that is hidden to the researcher. The specific type of qualitative method used in this study is content analysis. Hsieh and Shannon (2005) describe content analysis as a research method for the subjective interpretation of the content of text data through the systematic classification process of coding and identifying patterns or themes. Qualitative research which uses content analysis pays serious attention to the features of language as communication with a particular focus on the content or the contextual meaning of the text. A very important aspect of doing content analysis is coding. Its importance lies in attaching meaning to the pieces of data. Content analysis represents a thorough examination of language for the purpose of organizing the data into specific segments in order to develop a general meaning of each segment.

Fraenkel and Wallen (2000) point out that the use of rigorous content analysis reveals a person's or group's conscious and unconscious beliefs, attitudes, values and ideas that are found in their communications. This study

hinges on the assumption that a political text such as the June 4 speech is ideologically composed to reflect a certain kind of thought or carry meanings of a particular social, cultural and political value. Using content analysis, this study reveals how the language is used to demonstrate ideology and power in the June 4 speech.

Data Source

The data for the analysis are the written versions of Jerry John Rawlings' June 4 speeches available at the Information Services Department of the Ministry of Information and at the University of Cape Coast main library. The recourse to the written version removes the time and effort needed to transcribe the speeches in its oral form. The written version removes the interference of phonetic features that are not required in this analysis.

I relied on the publications of the Information Services Department of the Ministry of Information and the bound volumes of two state newspapers, *Daily Graphic* and *Ghanaian Times* which are available at the main library of University of Cape Coast. My search at the library of Information Services Department of Ministry of information in Accra in December, 2013 revealed that there are ten volumes of compiled speeches of Jerry John Rawlings. These publications span from 1981 to 1991. However, only four volumes, *Picking Up the Pace of Progress* (vol. 6), *Unity is Strength* (vol. 8), *Freedom, Justice and Accountability* (vol. 9) and *Unity, Stability and Development* (vol.10) were found to contain the June 4 speeches of 1987, 1989, 1990 and 1991 respectively. The publications cover the speeches delivered when Jerry John Rawlings was the military leader and head of state.

The state-owned newspapers published June 4 speeches. The state owned newspapers, *Daily Graphic* and *Ghanaian Times* are the national newspapers. *Daily Graphic*, as a custom, and on important occasions, publishes the speeches of Heads of State. My examination of bound volumes of *Daily Graphic* at the University of Cape Coast main library yielded some of the June 4 speeches delivered by Jerry John Rawlings. The set had June 4 speeches delivered in 1989, 1990, 1993, 1994, 1995, 1996, 1997, 1992 and 2000. However, there are no publications of 1991, and 1992, 1998 June speeches in *Daily Graphic*. The publications covered the PNDC and NDC regimes.

Similarly, my search in the *Ghanaian Times* bound volumes also revealed that on a few occasions, the newspaper published the full text of the speeches delivered by Jerry John Rawlings. The *Ghanaian Times* published 1991, 1998 and 1999 June 4 speeches which were incidentally left out in the *Daily Graphic* publications. Thus, the total number of June 4 speeches recorded during both regimes (PNDC and NDC) amounted to twelve. These were delivered between 1987 and 2000. There was no record of June 4 speech in 1988.

Sample Size and Sampling Technique

For the purpose of this study, four speeches were chosen, using the purposive sampling technique. These were June 4 speeches of 1987, 1991, 1993 and 2000. Two speeches are from his era as the Chairman of the PNDC and the military leader while the other two are from the period of his reign as the leader of the NDC. The data for the analysis of presidential speeches have been varied, this is because as Hernandez (2006) notes, in such CDA studies,

there is no agreement in the way of selecting a textual corpus but “the process of data collection is always determined by the research questions posed by the investigation” (p.104). Martins (2007) used one speech of Tony Blair in a study, Chinwe (2013) used two speeches by General Olusegun Obasanjo and Alhaji Shehu, and Alo (2012) analysed sixteen speeches of eight leaders. The present study follows its own path by using four speeches to respond to the research questions. However, the choice of a particular speech was based on a number of factors enumerated.

I selected 1987 June 4, speech because it represents Jerry John Rawlings’ first public June 4 speech in commemoration of the June 4 Revolution. The speech consisted of three hundred and seventy two (372) words. This first public organized activity set the pace for the subsequent June 4 celebrations. The previous celebrations were marked by broadcasts on the radio and TV.

The second speech 1991 June 4 speech was the last June 4 speech given by Jerry John Rawlings in his capacity as the Chairman of the PNDC, the then ruling government and also as a presidential candidate of the National Democratic Congress (NDC). Significantly, this marked his transition from the era when he ruled with decrees to when he would start ruling with the Constitution. This speech had one thousand four hundred and ninety seven (1,497) words.

My selection of the June 4 speech of 1993 which had eight hundred and ten (810) words was because it was the first June 4 speech by Jerry John Rawlings as a democratic leader. He delivered this speech five months after he had been elected and sworn in as the first president of the 4th republic and on

the 1992 Constitution. As required by the Constitution, he had resigned from the Ghana Armed Forces and assumed the role of a civilian President who was guided in his conduct and office by the dictates of the 1992 Constitution of Ghana.

The June 4 speech of the year 2000 was selected because it marked the end of Jerry John Rawlings as the President of Ghana. This is after his eight year reign as the elected President and eleven years as military leader and Chairman of the PNDC. Again, the speech was made in the election year in which there was an intense campaign by various political parties to take over the mantle of power from the NDC ruling government led by Jerry John Rawlings. This speech was composed of one thousand nine hundred and sixteen (1,916) words.

Procedure for Data Analysis

Though this study is a predominantly qualitative research, it includes quantitative details. Some of the data are presented in the form of percentages and inferences are also made from the data. The texts of the June 4 speeches of 1987, 1991, 1993 and 2000 were analysed, using transitivity categories of Systemic Functional Linguistics developed by Halliday (1985, 1994), Halliday and Matthiessen (2004), Downing and Locke (2004) and Eggins (2006) to reveal the relations of power and ideology.

The first step was to label each text (speech) A, B, C, and D, indicating their chronology, from the earliest to the latest and then typed. Each line in a particular text was numbered from the first sentence to the last sentence (see Appendix). This first step provided a clue as to which text and from which line a process was detected.

The second step involved reading the texts thoroughly and repeatedly and recording the individual clauses and groups of clauses. The various processes in each text were identified and underlined. The entire processes were calculated and grouped into the process types. The percentages of the process types in each text were calculated. The formula for calculating the percentage of each process was the number of the process type divided by the total processes and multiplied by one hundred.

The transitivity patterns discovered in this study were compared with other studies on presidential speeches to enable me to answer research question one.

The second part of the analysis focused on transitivity pattern of the key participants in the text. The key participants identified were the speaker, the speaker with other participants, the identified groups and the opposition. The instances in which references to the speaker, the speaker with other participants, identified collective groups and the opposition appeared as participants were identified and their associated processes underlined. After identifying the process and the participant role of a key participant, the analysis of its processes were made to connect to the broader social context in which the speeches were made. This is achieved through the use of critical discourse analysis.

Conclusion

This chapter has given the historical background of the June 4 Uprising and explained the justification for the use of June 4 speeches. Again, the chapter has explained the rationale for the choice of qualitative research and outlined the data source, sample size and the sampling technique. Finally, this

chapter has provided the details of the procedure for analysis. The next chapter will deal with the analysis of the data.

CHAPTER FOUR

RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

Introduction

This chapter presents the results and the analysis of the data. The overall aim of the study is to discover transitivity pattern and how transitivity analysis reveals power relations and ideology in the June 4 speeches. The analysis starts with transitivity. Specifically, I provide the frequency of the occurrences of the various processes, material, verbal, mental, relational, existential and behavioural and a discussion of the nature of the participants associated with processes and how the processes found in this study relate to other patterns of transitivity in other studies of presidential speeches. In the second segment, the discussion focuses on how the various processes and their associated participants are used in realizing the power relations and ideology embedded in the speeches.

Transitivity Pattern

In looking at patterns of transitivity, I intend to point out the distribution of the processes in the speeches. Halliday and Matthiessen (2004) describe transitivity pattern as the model of experience which distinguishes between outer experience and inner experience. Downing and Locke (2006) add that the clause constitutes the most significant unit grammatical means of encoding the pattern of experience. The grammatical categories into which the transitivity pattern falls are material process clause, mental process clause, relational process clause, verbal process clause, behavioural process clause

and existential process clause. These ideas provide an important guidance for this analysis.

In this connection, I display the various processes and their corresponding occurrences and percentage as I found in the speeches. The speeches are coded A, B, C and D. Speech A, contains forty-six (46) processes, B has one hundred and sixty-six (166) processes, C also has ninety-six (96) while D has one hundred and eighty-six (186) processes. Table 1 shows the processes as they appear in the speeches.

Table 1: Transitivity Patterns of the Four Speeches

Process type	Speech A		Speech B		Speech C		Speech D	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Material	21	45.6	91	54.8	48	50	115	62
Verbal	4	8.7	15	9	9	9.4	19	10
Relational	13	28.3	32	19.3	23	23.9	35	18.9
Mental	5	10.9	23	13.9	12	12.5	11	5.9
Behavioural	3	6.5	1	0.6	2	2.1	1	0.5
Existential	0	0	4	2.4	2	2.1	5	2.7
TOTAL	46	100	166	100	96	100	186	100

The table shows various processes, material, verbal, relational, mental, behavioural and existential as they are found in the speeches A, B, C and D.

As shown in Table 1, material processes are the most numerous process type used in the speeches. Material clauses describe processes that are doing and happening (Halliday & Matthiessen, 2004; Eggins, 2004). The material processes in speeches B (54.8%) and D (62%) constitute more than half of the

total processes in the respective speech while speech C 50% is exactly half of the total processes. Speech A has 45.6%, which is almost half of the total process types. This implies that the speeches are primarily concerned with representing actions and events and the participants that are involved in them. The action processes are performed by animate actors and events processes are performed by inanimate actors. Below are examples of action processes and events processes and they are in bold;

Action processes

- i) ...we can only **reap** what we sow (A, 30)
- ii) Fellow citizens, we shall continue to be flexible and **accommodate** such people... (B,91)

Events Processes

- i) ...a new wind of change **is blowing** in the country today. (B, 85)
- ii) ...when the suppressed anger of the people finally **explodes** in the face of injustice, (C, 45)

The high incidence of material processes in the presidential speeches is not surprising. In analyzing the transitivity pattern of Bingu wa Mutharika's Inaugural address, Kondowe (2014) found the material processes as the most numerous type used in that speech. Similarly, in his examination of two Nigerian presidents' speeches, Chinwe (2013) discovered that the material processes dominated the process types used.

The second most frequently used process type in the speeches is relational process. Table 1 indicates that with the exception of Speech A which has 28.3 % as the relational process, representing more than a quarter of

the total processes but more than half of the material processes, the other relational processes in the speeches B (19.3%), C (23.9%) and D (18.9%) constitute less than half of the material processes in the respective speeches. The relational processes are concerned with classifying and identifying (Halliday & Matthiessen 2004). They show how one aspect of experience is related to another. From the data, the verb form **be** is commonly used in the relational processes but **remain**, **become**, and **have** also feature as processes. Also, a further distinction of this process is whether it is attributive or identifying (Halliday & Matthiessen, 2004). In the attributive mode, a participant has some class attributed or ascribed to it. The class is labeled Attribute and the entity to which it is ascribed is Carrier. In the case of the identifying mode, an entity has some identity assigned to it. This means that one entity called Token is being used to identify another called Value. These examples are illustrated from the data:

Attributive Relational Processes

- i) One is that the heat of rejecting that which **is** unacceptable... (C, 23)
- ii) We **are** aware of the hardships that many families are facing today... (D, 151)

The attributive relational processes in these clauses are **is** and **are**. In (i) the Attribute is “**One is that the heat of rejecting that which**” and the Carrier is “**unacceptable**”. In clause (ii), there is “**We**” as the Attribute and its Carrier is ‘**aware of the hardships that many families are facing today**’. When the Attributes and Carriers in the relational clauses are reversed in their positions, the clauses will be meaningless and as such they cannot be reversed (Halliday & Matthiessen, 2004).

Identifying Relational Processes

- i) ...what we have seen here today and the portrayal of our culture by the younger generation which we have witnessed in recent years during our Independence Anniversary parades **is** the beginning of the making of a Ghanaian... (A, 17)
- ii) The popular revolt of June 4, 1979 **was** part of our struggle for moral decency as well as for a democratic society (B, 16)

In these clauses the process is represented by ‘**is**’ and ‘**was**’. The Token is ‘... **what we have seen here today and the portrayal of our culture younger generation which we have witnessed in recent years during our Independence Anniversary parades**’ is a noun clause and in (ii), the Token is ‘**The popular revolt of June 4, 1979**’ is a noun phrase. The Value is represented by nouns phrases in both clauses: **the beginning of the making of a Ghanaian** and ‘**part of our struggle for moral decency as well as for a democratic society**’ in (i) and (ii) respectively. The Token and Value in the clauses can be reversed in their positions and yet the clauses can be meaningful (Halliday & Matthiessen, 2004).

Apart from these, there are occurrences of other relational processes, described as circumstantial and possessive processes. According to Halliday and Matthiesen (2004), circumstantial relational process can be spatial or temporal.

Circumstantial Relational Processes

The circumstance expresses the connection between two entities or participants, which may be related to each other in terms of time, place, accompaniment, role, matter or angle (Halliday & Matthiessen, 2004).

Example

- i) Fourteen years **is** long enough for a new generation of young men and women... (C, 2)
- ii) This year's celebration of the 21st Anniversary of June 4 **is** of significance in several respects. (D, 5)

Possessive Relational Processes

In this type of process one entity possesses another, thereby expressing sort of ownership relation between two elements. It is observed that possessive relational process is not realized by the verbs **has**, **have** only, but by **belong** also. The possessors are either animate or inanimate entities and in the same way, the possessed can be animate or inanimate entities. For example,

- i) I **have** every intention of celebrating future anniversary of June 4 with you. (D, 12)
- ii) My Fellow Warriors, Cadres of the Progressive Voluntary Organisations, June 4 **belongs to** you. (D, 167)

In all the speeches examined, relational process type comes after material process type in the terms of occurrences. This is in agreement with what Kondowe (2014) found in respect of relational processes in Bingu wa Mutharika's speech. However, in another study, Naz et al (2012) found that relational processes in Benazir Bhutto's were the third highest on the scale of the process types. By this reliance on the relational processes, the speeches sought to evaluate the significance and the key participants of the June 4 events.

The pattern for the rest of the process types, which are verbal, mental, existential and behavioural, does not present a stable picture within the

various speeches examined. Again, from Table 1 these processes constitute the minor processes ranging between 0% to 13.9%.

From Table 1, mental processes are the third highest processes used in A (10.9%), B (13.9%), and C (12.5%) and the fourth highest in D (5.9%). In speech D, where the mental processes ranked fourth, it comes after verbal process. According to Halliday and Matthiessen (2004), mental processes represent processes of sensing and also signify a quantum of change in the flow of events that are taking place in speaker's own consciousness. The trend of mental processes suggests that the June 4 speeches were not so much concerned with the things in participants' consciousness. In Naz et al (2012) mental process placed third but shared the same spot with behavioural process. Chinwe (2013) discovered that different positions of the mental process in the speeches he examined. In one speech, the mental process was the second highest while in another it was the third highest. In this study, the lexical items identified in this process type belong to the mental processes of cognition, perception, desideration and emotion. For example,

Mental process of cognition

- i) ...let us again **be reminded** that we only can reap what we sow.
(A, 30)
- ii) But a few of us at that time **realized** how long and laborious would be the painstaking and sometimes painful process of working toward that vision,.. (C, 28)

Mental process of perception

- i) ...what we have **seen** here today...(A, 15)

- ii) ...the criminal destruction of the conditions for national progress that June 4 and December 31 gave to this country **is observed** in the national fight against rampant civil lawlessness... (D, 105)

Mental process of desideration

- i) Let us remember today that the June 4 and 31st December linked together have created conditions in which the majority of our people **can look forward to** the future with hope. (B, 73)
- ii) They **glimpsed** a vision of a future of dignity and social justice. (C, 26)

Mental process of emotion

- i) I **wish** you well. (A, 33)
- ii) ...missionaries who **must cherish** and live by the ideals of June 4. (B, 118)

It can be observed from the examples that mental process can be realized in active form such as '**wish**' or in the passive form such as '**be reminded**' or '**is observed**'. Again, some of mental processes are preceded by a modal and this can be observed in '**can look forward to**' and '**must cherish**'. In many cases, the mental clauses have this pattern.

Senser + Process + Phenomenon

There is an array of phenomenon that has been represented in these mental processes. The phenomena are either animate or inanimate entities. In clause (i), the phenomenon is "**you**", a pronoun and which in this case indicates a group of persons. Also, ideas are presented as phenomena and they are realized as noun phrases and noun clauses. The examples of noun phrases that represent ideas are '**a vision of a future of dignity and social**

justice’ and **‘the ideals of June 4’**.The noun clauses are **‘how long and laborious would be the painstaking and sometimes painful process of working toward that vision...’** and **‘that we only can reap what we sow.’** The use of the mental process is viewed as a reflection of the positive psychological dimensions of the June 4 event.

Verbal process is the fourth dominant process in speeches A, B, and C and third in D speech with between 8.7% to 10% as shown in Table 1. In D, where the verbal process constitutes the third dominant process, it is followed by the mental process. In the data, the verbal processes are seen as resources for indicating the stance of the speaker that is Jerry John Rawlings and other participants such as the opposition and the ordinary people in the matters that related to the socio-economic development of the nation. Some of the lexical items used in the verbal process are **warn, say, vilify, condemn, interpret, thank, and explain**. In all the verbal clauses, the processes have sayers but in only a few cases are there verbiage and receivers or target. These examples illustrate the pattern in the verbal clauses.

A Sayer + Process + Verbiage

- i) But I **must express** reservations about the activities of those with perceived credibility... (D, 158)

B Sayer + Process+ Receiver

- i) I salute you and **commend** you. (B, 113)

C Sayer + Process + Verbiage + Target

- i) I **say** this to them. (D, 119)

The processes in the clauses are expressed in diverse forms. In the first sentence, the process is preceded by modal, and in the second and the third

clauses it is in simple present. The configuration of the processes is not the same. While all the verbal clauses have verbal processes with the Sayers, the other participants, Receiver and Target are represented. The 'you' is the 'Receiver' of the process '**commend**' while '**to them**' is the Target of the process '**say**'. These represent the second participants in the verbal process. Pronouns and nominal clauses are used as the verbiage.

Verbal processes in other studies do not conform to a specific pattern. In Kondowe's (2014) study of Bingu wa Mutharika's speech, the verbal process was the third highest of the process type but in Naz et al's (2012) examination of Benazir Bhutto's speech, there was no verbal process recorded. In the case of Chinwe (2013), verbal process appeared in different positions in the two speeches. While in one, it appeared in the fifth position, in the other it was the least used process. The amount of verbal processes in presidential speeches may be due to how much a president would like to indicate his or other political actor's stance on a particular issue.

In this study, behavioural processes present a stable picture in two speeches but not across the speeches. In the speeches A and C, behavioural processes constitute the fifth dominant process type while in the other two, B and D, verbal processes constitute the least process type recorded. In the case of C, the proportion of behavioural process 2.1% is the same as the existential process 2.1%. Behavioural processes represent physiological and psychological processes and from the data, these processes occur with Behavior and Phenomenon.

A) Behavior + Process+ Phenomenon

- i) ...as missionaries who must cherish and **live by** the ideals of June 4.
(B, 118)
- ii) ...the new generation has every right **to hold** us in contempt... (C, 19)

As illustrated from these examples, Behavioural processes occur with Behavior and Phenomenon. In the first example, there is Behavior which is ‘missionaries’ and Phenomenon is ‘the ideals of June 4.’ In (ii) the process **hold** has the Behavior “every right’ and ‘us’ as phenomenon. Behavioural process recorded the least proportion of process types. Relating the proportion of the occurrences of behavioural process in this study to other studies, there is no difference. The study records a low proportion of behavioural process. For example, Martins’ (2007) study of Tony Blair’s speech and Kondowe’s study of Bingu wa Matharika’s speech showed behavioural process as the least process found in those two presidential speeches. This suggests that behavioural process is less attractive in political speeches.

Similarly, existential processes also present a picture of a process that is less frequent in presidential speeches. In speech A, the existential process constitute the least process recorded (0%) but in B, and D speeches the existential processes recorded 2.4%, and 2.7%, higher than the behavioural processes in those speeches. From the data, these existential clauses present processes that construe something that happens, has been happening and likely to happen. These processes are introduced by the word **There** and according to Halliday and Matthiessen (2004), the word is not a participant nor

circumstance but only serves to indicate the feature of existence. Three distinct verb forms are used in the existential processes.

A) Verb form of 'Be' as Process

- i) However, there **are** some individuals and groups who want to advocate violence... (B, 44)

B) Modal+ Be verb form as Process

- i) If there **should be** another upheaval... (D, 85)

C) Other verbs as Process

- i) There **has been creeping** the canker of civil lawlessness, the politics of attrition, and other socially divisive and destructive tendencies...(D, 68)

There are different kinds of existents that are associated with the existential processes. On one hand, there is an Existent as an event which is '**another upheaval**' and on the other hand, there is Existent as the action engineered by an entity as illustrated in '**some individuals and groups who want to advocate violence**'. In a case where the Existent is an entity, it may be an abstract entity or concrete entity.

Looking at other studies, for example in Chinwe's (2013) study, the existential processes were fourth dominant process and in Naz et al (2012) and Martins (2007), it placed fifth. Thus existential processes constitute an insignificant proportion of the process types in relation to material and relational processes that are found in many presidential speeches.

Transitivity Analysis of the Key Participants

In this part, in order to address the questions of power and ideology in the speeches, I will do the transitivity analysis of the participants, namely, I, We, Identified groups and the opposition. Specifically, I will look at the various processes in which the participants occur. The processes are Material, Relational, Verbal, Mental, Behavioural and Existential.

Speaker

In this section, an analysis of the transitivity pattern of the speaker will be undertaken. In this case, I will analyse the processes where **I**, **me** and **my** appear as participants. In the data, this participant occurs in the Material, Relational, Verbal and Mental Processes. There are no instances in the Existential and Behavioural processes where **I**, **me**, **my** occur as a participant.

Material Processes

In the data, there are only two instances in which **I** or the speaker as the participant is engaged in material processes. The Actor is underlined, the Goal is italicised and process is in bold.

- i) ...I **am celebrating** *this momentous event* with you, ... (D, 7)
- ii) I **have not hesitated to invoke** constitutional procedures and **apply** *legal and administrative measures* against high-level government officials and other public officials... (D, 90)

In these clauses, the Actor (participant) as the speaker engages in material process. In (i), the process '**am celebrating**' carries "**this momentous event**" as its Goal (participant) and it is not a concrete entity but an event. In this case the action of the Actor does affect an entity. In clause (ii)

there are two processes **have not hesitated to invoke** and **apply**. The material process ‘**have not hesitated to invoke**’ is a verbal group complex and the material process is expressed by the second lexical verb, **invoke**. However, the first lexical verb provides additional information about the realization of the process (Halliday & Matthiessen, 2004). Both material processes have Goals, ‘**constitutional procedures**’ and ‘**legal administrative measures**’ respectively. The action undertaken by the Actor affects the Goals, rather than the Actor being affected by the Goals. In transitivity terms, the Goals **constitutional procedures** and **legal administrative measures** are not concrete entities, but in the social field such as politics, they cannot be underestimated. The processes and Goals depict the speaker or Rawlings as conforming to the right procedures in the addressing the issues of national concern.

Relational Processes

In these relational processes, I will deal specifically with the occurrences of the attributive relational process, identifying relational process, possessive relational process and circumstantial relational process in which the speaker is a participant. It will include the processes where the reference to the speaker appears as pronoun.

Attributive Relational Processes

The participants in relational process are specified as Carrier and Attribute. The Carrier is underlined while the Attribute is italicised.

- i) It *is my hope that this anniversary will refreshen the memories of those who were old...* (B, 7)

ii) It **is** also *my hope that those who were unborn or too young perhaps to understand the events...*

(B, 10)

iii) I**am** *aware of how committed you the officers are to defend the achievements made.* (B, 105)

In (i) and (ii), the Carriers are *It* and the Attributes of the relational processes are (i) **my hope that this anniversary will refreshen the memories of those who were old enough...** and **my hope that those who were unborn or too young perhaps to understand the events...** This type of clause is described as ‘thematic equative’ because the two constituents of the clause are linked by relationship of identity that is expressed by some form of the verb **be** (Halliday & Matthiessen, 2004: 69). In these clauses, “**It**” is the Carrier that construes something connected with the speaker. However, in (iii), “**I**” appears as a Carrier and it is the only instance where the Carrier is an animate being. In this clause, the Attribute is **aware of how committed you the officers are to defend the achievements made.** The Carriers used are within the semiotic domain of cognition which the speaker uses to express his inner experience and the semiotic domain of desideration to express his outer experience. These relational clauses express his sensibilities of the difficulties confronting the people and his experiences about the memories and the heroes of the June 4 events.

Identifying Relational Processes

i) ...the end of my term as the President **does not mean** *the end of my commitment to the progress of our country and the welfare of the people.* (D, 9)

- ii) In this regard, June 4 and its principles and achievements **are** *my everlasting creed.* (D, 11)

In clause (i), the Token is **the end of my term**. The noun phrase **the end of my commitment to the progress of our country and the welfare of the people** specifies the Value. The relational process used is **does not mean**. The presence of the adverb **not** expresses the negative relationship between the Token and the Value. In the (ii), the Token is represented by **June 4 and its principles and achievements**, but it is the Value **my everlasting creed** that is connected with speaker. In these clauses, the Tokens and Values are connected with the speaker but none is an animate beings. These identifying relational clauses establish the link of the speaker's dedication to the fortunes of people and to the values that June 4 espouses. This responds to his stance on the future commemoration of June 4 and his dedication to the fortunes of people at all times.

Possessive Relational Processes

- i) I **have** *every intention of celebrating future anniversary of June 4* with you. (D, 12)
- ii) But I still **have** *faith* in the common decency of the average Ghanaian. (D, 71)

In these two Possessive relational clauses, **have** specifies the possessive processes and **I** construes the Possessor which is an animate being, that is the President. But in (i) **every intention of celebrating future anniversary of June 4** specifies the Possessed, and in (ii) the Possessed is represented by **faith**. The possessed signify possessions of abstractions and they are not things that exist as realities. Again, the processes do not result in

any change of the possessor. The use of these possessive clauses denotes the idea of Rawlings' unwavering aim of commemorating the June 4 event every year. Again, it demonstrates the President's trust in Ghanaians.

Mental Processes

This part looks at the instances where the speaker appears in mental clauses. The speaker is engaged in cognitive and desiderative mental processes only. In this section the Senser will be underlined, the process will be in bold and the Phenomenon will be italicised.

Cognitive Processes

- i) I **would like to believe** *that what we have seen here today...*

(A, 15)

- ii) Let me **remind** *you all that on June 4, the people forced the door open for the ordinary man to assert his democratic right.* (B, 129)

The cognitive processes detected in these clauses are **believe** in (i) and **remind** in (ii). But in (i) there are two mental processes **would like** and **believe** and, these processes thus construe the experience as indeterminate because the desiderative process **would like** shades into cognitive process. But the Senser uses the process to offer his viewpoint or belief on the display put up by the children which is captured in the Phenomenon '**that what we have seen here today...**'

In (ii) the process is **remind**, and the speaker uses the imperative form '**Let me remind you all...**' and the sensing with this particular verb is construed from two angles (Halliday & Matthiessen, 2004). This is because the Phenomenon **that on June 4 the people forced the door open for the ordinary man to assert his democratic**' impinges on the consciousness of

the **you all** and the Senser **me**. This process does not construe a tangible experience. However, the use of the imperative and the mental process that impinges on the consciousness of the listeners are seen as the form of power, that Bourdieu (1994) describes as deriving from symbolic capital or social capital because they are perceived and recognized as legitimate.

Desiderative Processes

These are the desiderative processes in which the speaker serves as Senser.

- i) I **wish** *you* well. (A, 33)
- ii) I salute and **wish** *you* a happy anniversary. (B, 129)
- iii) I **wish** *you all* the best.(D, 177)

In these clauses, the verb realizing the desiderative processes is **wish** and this comes with implicit phenomenon in (i) **you well** (ii) **you a happy anniversary** and (iii) **you all the best**. On such occasions when the speeches are ending, the President finds the need to relate to the people, through the expression of positive desires for the people. This clearly shows that the Senser as the Head of State or the President, holds a *de facto* monopoly over the citizens of Ghana and has the desire to see the best for the people he rules. Again, it is a mark of his expression of the anticipation of the happy celebration of the June anniversary and health. Since mental processes in political speeches are understood to reflect the consciousness of speaker without concretising any actions (Chinwe, 2013), the use of desiderative mental processes such as those in the speeches are mainly used to relate to the people in an affectionate way.

Verbal Processes

This part deals with the verbal processes in which I (Rawlings) is a participant. The speaker is a Sayer in these verbal clauses but not a Receiver. I as a sayer is seen as a key source of information. First, the attention will focus on verbal clauses where ‘I’ is the Sayer (underlined) and the process (bold) has Verbiage (italics) and the Receiver (dotted line).

- i) I **wish to** first **express** *my appreciation to the children of Ghana*... (A, 3)
- ii) I **would like to extend** *greetings to all who have participated*... (B, 1)
- iii) And to you members of the Armed Forces and the Security Services, **may I** also **say** *a special thank you* for giving this country the gift of divine justice. (C, 70)
- iv) I **say** *this to them*. (D, 119)
- v) I **will entreat** *the noble elders, chiefs and queen mothers of this country to advise those involved on the need for sobriety for the sake of our common future*. (D, 129)

The clauses under consideration contain verbal processes in which the speaker is the Sayer. The verbal processes in (i) **wish to... express** and (ii) **would like to extend** constitute verbal group complex and Chinwe (2013) describes them as ‘lexically indeterminate’ processes. On the other hand, the verbal processes in (iii) **may I also say** and (v) **will entreat** have modals. But the process in (iv) is a direct process **say**. The Verbiage is expressed in many forms, as a pronoun, noun phrase and non-finite clause. They are **my appreciation, greetings, a special thank you, to advise those involved on the need for sobriety for the sake of our common future and this**. The verbiage represents his personal expression of gratitude and greeting and a

request. The other Receivers represent various institutions within the Ghanaian society; **you members of the Armed Forces and the Security Services, the noble elders, chiefs and queenmothers of this country but the children of Ghana and those who participated.** These represent the military, chieftaincy institution, children and educational institution and the participants at the June 4 parade. The Receivers represent the people in the Ghanaian society: the lowest in the society, that is, children; the highest such as the chief and queenmothers who are well placed in society; and the strongest, that is the soldiers and those who are in the opposition. The implication is that the President has the power to communicate with and to the broad masses of the people. Significantly, the processes **say** in clause (iv) and **entreat** in clause (v) draw the power distinction clearly between the Receivers. His assertiveness shows at different levels. While **entreat** shows deference to the chiefs, **say** emphasizes his authority to the opposition. He draws on the role played by State Apparatuses such as the Repressive State Apparatus (military) and Ideological State Apparatus (chieftaincy), because they are capable of promoting the ideology of the dominant and interest of the ruling class (Althusser, 1970). This clearly reflects the social position of the participants of the chieftaincy institution and the opposition.

In the next segment, I discuss the instances where the speaker is the Sayer in the verbal clauses in which there is Verbiage without Receiver or Target.

- i) I **say** *Ayekoo*. (A, 5)
- ii) Countrymen and women, let me **explain** *that constructive criticisms in an open society is not the same as the attempts being made to incite*

- violence and provoke disturbances to destabilize our national unity, peace and stability.* (B, 59)
- iii) **I wish to make it clear** *that there is a heavy price to be paid if violence is the way by which some wish to pursue their political agenda in the country.* (B, 63)
- iv) Once again, fellow countrymen, I would like to take this opportunity **to say a big 'thank you'** *for the massive votes in our favour.* (C, 67)
- v) But as I **stated** at the recent congress of the NDC, *the end of my term as the President does not mean the end of my commitment to the progress of our country and welfare of our people.* (D, 8)
- vi) But I still have faith in the common decency of the average Ghanaian and **will**, therefore, not **draw** *the hasty conclusion that we are incapable of learning from our past mistakes.* (D, 71)
- vii) At the same time, I **must warn** *that if we persist in interpreting our current democratic freedoms as a licence to cause civil and industrial unrest without reasonable cause, abuse and vilify decent people, none of us will survive the serious upheaval that will definitely come as the consequence.* (D, 74)
- viii) Fellow Countrymen and Women, I **have said** *before that the social, political and economic renaissance that June 4 created for our country did not come without the unfortunate loss of some innocent lives.* (D, 132)
- ix) I **have** personally **expressed** *regret for the excesses.* (D, 135)
- x) But I **must express** *my reservations about the activities of those with perceived credibility -...* (D, 158)

Here the speaker presents himself as the Sayer with Verbiage. With the verbal processes, some are used to emphasize his stance on certain national issues, these are in (ii) **explain**, (iii) **to make it clear**, (v) **stated**, (vi) **will draw a ... conclusion**, (vii) **must warn**, (viii) **have said**, (xi) **have...expressed** and (x) **must express**. But the saying verbs of the clauses (i) **say** and (iv) *to say* do have a suggestion of expressing gratitude. In (i) the Verbiage is ‘**Ayekoo**’, a Ga and Twi word which means congratulations. In (iv) the Verbiage is ‘**a big thank you for your massive votes in our favour**’ but the rest constitutes noun clauses. This allows the speaker to rephrase what he has already said or stated (Egins, 2004). In these clauses, the Verbiage appears very extensive. This maybe the way of making his voice reflect his desire to push his ideas forcefully and emphatically.

The next part looks at verbal clauses which have no verbiage but have a target.

- i) I **commend** you all for your distinguished achievements and sacrifices for peace in the world. (B, 110)
- ii) I **salute** you also and **commend** you for your immense contributions you have made... (B, 113)
- iii) On behalf of our fellow citizens, I **salute** you all and wish you a happy anniversary. (B, 129)

In the Verbal clauses, the Target construes the entity that has been targeted by the verb of saying and it is as if the Sayer is acting on the Target *you* (Halliday & Matthiessen, 2004). The verbs of saying identified are **commend** and **salute** which denote praise or acknowledgement. But the process **salute** is in line with the respect associated with those who have immensely contributed something in the military. In all these clauses, ‘**you**’ is

the Target of verbal processes and the **you** represents the targets of the praise. The **you** does not refer to only those who are present at the parade grounds but also those people who in one way or the other have provided the support for the sustenance and maintenance of his power.

All the categories of the verbal processes underlie the speaker's linguistic control since it is considered as an important aspect of exercising power over others and, according to Bourdieu (1991), in any interaction, the participants that have the broad choices of discourses are considered most powerful.

Discussion

Ideology

Looking at the transitivity pattern in respect of the speaker, the following picture of the position of the president emerges. The speaker (Jerry John Rawlings) creates a desirable impression of himself as the president who is devoted to ensuring the rule of law by adhering to the laid down procedures in governing the people and also is sensitive to the difficulties confronting the people. Through the combination of the material processes and relational processes, the president demonstrates that he is a president or the head of state who duly follows the constitution as a democratic leader and shows concerns to the people because of the difficulties they are going through. This is particularly important in highlighting his personal ideology as someone who has always been on the side of the down-trodden. It is interesting to observe that in the case of the speaker, there are fewer material processes as compared to the relational, mental and verbal processes. The material processes show

what Ocquaye (2004) describes as the legal power ideology of Rawlings. One reason for the low record of the material process for the speaker may be related to the fact that President Rawlings would like to reinforce the idea that events leading to and actions on June 4, 1979 and even governance of the state cannot be his personal actions, but a collective action at one time or the other of Armed Forces Revolutionary Council (AFRC), Provisional National Defence Council (PNDC) and National Democratic Congress (NDC) of which he was and had to be a part. Again, it may be an attempt to depart from the Messianic ideology. The ideology that regarded him, at the beginning of the June 4 Revolution, as a saviour who would redeem the masses from their economic and political oppression. These may account for the avoidance of the material processes in which the president will be seen as an active participant. This is to contrary to Adedeji's (2001) observation that Ghana's political and economic development had to do with the Rawlings factor.

Moreover, as an active participant in the June 4 Uprising, the speaker emphasized his dedication to the principles of June 4, memories of the experiences that led to the uprising, the future commemoration of the June 4 and his affection for the people. From the relational and mental processes, the main preoccupation of the speaker was how the people would continue to hold the legacies of June 4 and a desire to continue the celebration even after his tenure as the president. Since the fight against corruption, abuse of power and other social vices formed the basis of the launch of the June 4 Revolution, it is not surprising that he engages in a discourse that seeks to reinforce the idea of the continuous celebration of the events. His beliefs and determination about the future celebrations of the June 4 highlight the importance Rawlings paid to

the cleansing of society and its vices; a position that falls in line with ideas of the revolution. In spite of his determination about the events, the language divests Rawlings of explicit commitment to concrete actions.

Power

In terms of the presidential power, the language shows that the president has minimal powers in his actions but is very assertive in his utterances. The analysis shows the president as an Actor in a few instances where Rawlings is depicted as causing action on other entities. The processes the President is engaged in are applying the constitution and celebrating the future anniversary; these do not specify concrete Goals and, therefore, he is not powerful. However, in the context of the social field such as politics, the president's actions cannot be underestimated. According to Windt (1986), every president has a constitutional or statutory power conferred by the Constitution or law. This implies that the president's power of action on the constitution and laid down legal rules have consequences on all, particularly those who have committed crimes against the state. The action reflects Rawlings' exercise of his constitutional powers by virtue of his position as the president and head of state.

On the other hand, when Rawlings serves as the source of communicative events, his utterances have the varied strength and forcefulness of a president. There is a categorical forcefulness associated with the processes in which his utterances are directed at the opposition. The utterances are direct and pointed and they are mostly in the form of warnings. This is where Rawlings is seen as exercising utmost power against the opposition. This power against the opposition reflects the anger that had built up in Rawlings

against those he thought had mismanaged the system for many years or denied the people what was due them.

This forcefulness contrasts sharply with his moderation in his utterances to the people. Rawlings' utterances to the people are mainly explanations, reminders and exhortation. The reason why Rawlings as a president sounds less assertive may be curious but not far-fetched. With the people, this is so because he mainly seeks to restore the commitment of the people who have been disillusioned, hungry and alienated under the previous regimes. In this wise, his explanations of economic difficulties and expressions of remorse for past deeds are in moderation. Also, less assertive are Rawlings' expressions of commendation, appreciation and the plea for the intervention in the affairs of the state.

Collective Group: Speaker and Unidentified Participants

This collective group, specifically, refers to the speaker together with other unidentified group. They appear as **we**, **our** and **us** and are participants in the various processes. The focus will be on the occurrences of the processes where **we**, **our** and **us** are participants. This category of a participant appears in the Material, Verbal, Mental, Relational and Behavioural processes. There is no record of Existential process for this participant. By the use of **we**, **our** and **us** as a participant, the speaker Rawlings sets up the dichotomy between *We* and *They* and highlights the notion of collectiveness and inclusiveness of the people that are united.

Material Processes

In these material clauses, the Actor **we** refers to the speaker together with other unidentified group and there is the other participant that is the Goal of material process. The Goal is the opposition or those who are seen as working against the tenets which the “people” espouse.

- i) Fellow citizens, we shall continue to be flexible and **accommodate** *such people*,... (B, 91)
- ii) Fellow citizens, we shall continue to be flexible and accommodate such people and **give** them *opportunities*... (B, 92)
- iii) ...we **will not allow** *them* to turn the clock of progress back.
(D, 120)

In these clauses, the processes of doing are captured in **accommodate**, **give** and **allow** but it is **accommodate** and **give** that are tangible actions and these have ‘we’ as the Actor. The other participants connected with the processes are animate. In (i) the other participant is only one, a Goal which is **such people** and it is affected by the action of the Actor. In clause (ii), apart from the Actor, there are two other participants of the process. The first one is Beneficiary which is represented by **them**, and it is a pronoun that refers to **such people** in the preceding clause which benefits from the action of the Actor. The second is the Goal which is the **opportunities**. The process in clause (iii) is **will not allow** which is made up of a modal **will**, adverb **not** and the lexical verb **allow**. The process has the Goal **them**, but the process establishes a doubtful negative association with the Goal because of the modal **will** and adverb **not**. Despite that, the actions of the Actor affect the Beneficiary which is human beings, and therefore, the Actor ‘we’ is seen as

active in the unfolding process and therefore is more powerful than the Beneficiary that is **them**.

The following section discusses of the instances where **we** is the Actor in the material process. In this segment, however, the distinguishing feature is that the Goal is something other than the opposition.

- i) Unfortunately, we **have tended to suppress** and look down on *what is our own ...* (A, 8)
- ii) ...we **have sought to establish** *the conditions for the realization of democracy, freedom, justice and accountability.*
(B, 35)
- iii) Indeed, we **shall continue to pursue** *the policy of reconciliation* and... (B, 94)
- iv) Indeed, we **shall continue to** pursue the policy of reconciliation and **hold out a hand** to all... (B, 94)
- v) Once again, we **have gathered here to honour** *the memory of our fallen comrades...*(D, 1)
- vi) And we **have been working hard to rectify** *the situation.*
(D, 110)
- vii) ...we **have** not only unthinkingly **copied** *alien cultures...*
(A, 11)
- viii) ...we **have grafted** onto ourselves *the negative and destructive aspects of those cultures.* (A, 12)
- ix) ...we **have imposed** on ourselves *the standards which we must strive at all times to achieve ...*(B, 119)

- x) My Brothers and Sisters, we in government **have demonstrated** *our commitment to fight corruption and crime.*
(D, 89)
- xi) ...we **established** *constitutional government* with real democracy meaningful freedoms... (D, 66)
- xii) ...we **can** only **reap** *what we sow.* (A, 30)
- xiii) ...we **will not do** *anything that will create political uncertainty...* (D,126)
- xiv) ...we can only reap *what we sow.* (A, 30)
- xv) ...we **continue** *our determined struggle* for a just and democratic country. (B, 32)
- xvi) ...we **violate** *the code of the Revolution.* (B, 121)
- xvii) As we **celebrate** *this 14th anniversary of June 4 uprising...*(C, 60)

These clauses present material processes which refer to the actions of the speaker and others as directly involved participants in the actions specified in the clauses. Four categories of the material process are observed in this set. First, in clauses (i) to (vi) are the verbal group complex. In (i), the process **have tended to suppress** has the Goal **what is our own** which is the nominal clause. In (ii) to (vi) the Goals of the processes are **the conditions for the realization of democracy, freedom, justice and accountability, the policy of reconciliation, a hand, memory of our fallen comrades and the situation.** Apart from the Goal, **a hand** which is a concrete entity, the others are abstract entities. However, when **a hand** gains a metaphorical expression which means a touch of love, then it can be an abstract entity.

The second category of verbs realizing the processes is the present perfect. The Actor in these material processes is **we** and the process **have copied** has **alien cultures** as its Goal. In (viii) **have grafted** carries **the negative and destructive aspects of those cultures** as the Goal. The material process **have imposed** has the Goal **the standards which we must strive to achieve**. In (xii) the Goal of the process **have demonstrated** is **our commitment to fight corruption and crime**. The material process **established** in (xi) construes the action as past and has **constitutional government with real democracy meaningful freedoms** as the Goal which is an abstract entity. These material processes emphasize the immediacy of the actions and how relevant they are to the present. In all these, the Goals are not animate but abstract entities.

In this third category, there are modals and lexical verbs that construe the processes and the processes have nominal clauses as the Goal. These processes do not construe actions, but signify events. In (xii) the process is made up of the modal **can** and lexical **reap** and has the Goal **what we sow**. In clause xiii, the **will not do** is the process and is made up of modal **will** and lexical **do** and this has Goal **anything that will create political uncertainty**. The processes construe events rather than actions. The presence of modals give some doubt about the processes.

In another category, the processes are construed as simple present. The Actor of these processes is **We** that represents the collective people. The processes are **continue**, **violate** and **celebrate**. The material process **continue** has the Goal **our determined struggle**. This process construes an event as the Goal. In the case where there is the process **violate**, an abstract process, there

is the **code of the Revolution** as its Goal. This Goal is an abstract entity. But in the clause xvii, where **celebrate** is the process, the Goal is a noun phrase **14th anniversary of the June 4 uprising** which is an abstract entity. In this, the Actor is engaged in Goal-oriented actions but they are mostly abstract entities and events and the processes involved do not bring about any change. In the wider political terms, political participants need not exert force on the animate things or more specifically on other participants in order to make their power clear. The exercise of power, in the context of June 4, depends also on the intangible benefits that the people bring about through their actions. These material processes are used to underlie the government's and people's contributions towards their cultural regeneration, economic progress and democratic development. These could be achieved by abating corruption, relying on their own culture, adhering to the traditional beliefs and norms, building democratic institutions, seeking reconciliation and giving recognition to the June 4 fighters. The technique of blending processes in present perfect and simple present forms, modal and lexical verbs and verbal complex forms for the participant **we, us** and **our** demonstrates the capability of the collective group; that is the people, in undertaking action for their own benefit at all times.

This section provides instances where the indefinite pronouns refer to the people and are used as the Actor in the material process.

- i) If any of us **should fall into** *complacency*....(C,16)
- ii) If any of us should fall into complacency or **ignore** *the fact that our first duty is to the disadvantaged*... (C, 16)
- iii) ...none of us **will survive** *the upheaval*... (C, 76)

In this category, the processes **fall**, **ignore** and **survive** construe the actions of the collective group ‘the people’ which is represented by the indefinite pronouns **any of us** and **none of us**. In (i) and (ii), the actions, **fall** and **ignore** that the Actors ‘**any of us**’ are responsible for are limited by a conditional element **if** and the modal **should**. These create doubt about the realization of the processes. These processes are self-directed but **fall** constitutes a tangible process while **ignore** is abstract process. The actions affect abstract entities **complacency** and **the fact that our first duty is to the disadvantaged**. In (iii), **survive** construes the process but the process as an action gains some doubt because of the modal **will** that is associated with it. The Goal is **the upheaval**, but this is not affected. Here Actor is weak in these processes.

Relational Processes

This section looks at the relational processes in which the speaker together with unidentified participants appears in the text. **We**, **us** and **our** as participants appear in Attributive, Identifying and Possessive Relational processes.

Attributive Relational Processes

These clauses below represent the Attributive Relational Processes found in the data.

- i) ...what **is** *our own*...(A, 9)
- ii) ...we **are** *incapable of learning* from our past mistakes. (D, 73)
- iii) We **are** *aware of the hardships*... (D, 151)
- iv) We **have been** *truthful* to admit... (D, 152)

- v) In both June 4, 1979 and December 31, 1981, it was our soldiers who paid a price with their lives. (D, 84)

The clause (i) sets up the dichotomy between **our own** and **their own**, in this case, the Ghanaian cultural practices as against the foreign cultural practices. In (ii), (iii) and (iv), **We** construe the Carriers and these participants are animate beings. The relational processes in (ii) and (iii) are represented by **are** which is simple present and this ties in with Halliday and Matthiessen's (2004) claim that attributive relational clauses are mostly construed with the simple present. But in (iv), the process is **have been** and this shades into mental process. The Attributes **incapable of learning, aware of the hardships** and **truthful** are qualities that reveal the subjective attitude and cognition of the people. In (v), there is the thematic equative with **was** as the relational process and has **it** as the Carrier. The Attribute is **our soldiers who paid a price with their lives** which expresses the speaker's comment on the heroism of the people in the June 4 struggle. This situates the collective nature of the participant's acts. In these relational clauses, the participants and the processes do not bring about any change in their action, but the participants and the processes help to assign attributes to the feelings of the people and actions of the soldiers who were killed during the June 4 Uprising. Since the processes do not bring about the change in the participants, it is obvious that these are used to demonstrate the collective sensibilities about the problems in the country and the collective integrity in dealing with the situation that confront the people. The intention is to portray the collective uprightness and responsiveness as key characteristics in maintaining power.

Identifying Relational Processes

These are the Identifying Relational Processes for the participants in the data.

- i) The popular revolt of June 4, 1979 **was** *part of our struggle for moral decency as well as a democratic society...* (B, 16)
- ii) ...our first duty **is** *to the disadvantaged,...*(C, 17)

The clauses illustrate the identifying relational processes in which either the Token or Value is associated with the collective group. The processes in both are realized by the form of the verb **be**, in clause (i) **was**, the simple past form and in (ii) **is** the present form. In (i) the Token is **The popular revolt of June 4, 1979** and its Value is **part of our struggle for moral decency as well as a democratic society...** These are construed as acts that are in relationship with each other but it is the Value that is associated with the collective group. In (ii) the Token **our first duty** is construed as an act and the Value is expressed in the prepositional phrase **to the disadvantaged**. It is significant to note that in the relational processes, the participants involved either as Token or Value are not animate beings, but are acts. The processes are used to connect the people's responsibility to the poor and their justification for the June 4 Uprising.

Possessive Relational Process

The clauses show the possessive relational processes identified.

- i) ...we **had** *some of those anarchists, extremists, and confusionists* among us. (B, 48)

In (i), the past form of have, **had** expresses the relationship of possession between the Possessor **we** which is an animate being and the

Possessed **some of those anarchists, extremists and confusionists**. It is clear that the Possessor and the Possessed are all animate beings, but the Possessed is hugely invested with negativity. This is to show the level of tolerance of the government which has had to deal with the members of the opposition who have been extreme in their negative acts. These processes and attributions are only meant to characterize the opposition but do not result in the change in the opposition.

Mental Processes

The next section examines the mental processes in which speaker together with the unidentified group appeared. In this category, this participant engages in cognitive, perceptive, desiderative and emotive processes.

Cognitive Mental Processes

The clauses show the cognitive mental processes.

- i) ...let us again **be reminded** *that we can only reap what we sow.*
(A, 30)
- ii) ...because we refused **to condone** *their attempts to introduce anarchy in the name of revolution into the country.*
(B, 51)
- iii) ...we **deem** *it our duty to protect them from the careless and irresponsible adventures of political extremists and power hungry politicians.*
(B, 69)
- iv) Let us **remember** *today that the June 4 and 31st linked together created conditions...*(B, 71)
- v) ...we **must judge** *ourselves severely when we violate the code of the Revolution.*(B, 121)

- vi) Today we meet **to recall** *June 4* and **reflect on** *what it stands for in our nation's history*. (C, 1)
- vii) *The lesson of June Four*, as we **look back** after 14 years,...(C, 13)
- viii) But a few of us at that time **realized** *how long and laborious would be the painstaking and sometimes painful process*...(C, 28)
- ix) ...we are incapable of **learning from** *past mistakes*.(D, 66)
- x) We all **know** *that our Police Service is severely handicapped in the fight against crime*. (D, 109)

In the instances where “we” is the Senser, **be reminded, condone, deem, remember, to recall, to reflect, look back, realized, learn, remember, learning** and **know** appear as the cognitive mental processes. The common feature of these processes is that they reflect the intellectual ability of the participant. The clauses (i) and (iv) are imperative forms but the passive in (i) hides the Senser who is seeking to impinge on the inner consciousness of the ‘us’.The participant is imbued with this ability for many practical purposes. Clauses (iv), (v), (vi) and (vii) present ‘we’ as the Senser in the processes that are connected with the replay of all the dimensions of the June 4 Uprising, which are the causes, effects and the difficulties associated with ways of moving into the new political phase in the country. In (ii), (iii) and (ix), ‘we’ as a Senser is presented as cognizant of factual consciousness of the government responsibility of protecting its citizens, inadequacy of the police in performing their duties and disapproval of attempts to change power in the country.

In clause v, the process is **judge**. The Senser impinges on the consciousness of the Phenomenon **ourselves** and this is a reflexive pronoun. In

this case, the Senser and the Phenomenon are one and the same. Through this, Rawlings constructs the consciousness of ‘probity and accountability’ ideology within the entire fabric of the society. As noted by Chinwe (2013), mental processes show psychological states and have no change in the socio-physical context of situation. Through these mental processes, Rawlings attempts to project the people and government as intellectuals capable in not only recalling but also turning down ideas which are not in their interest.

Perceptive Mental Processes

In these perceptive mental processes, *we* as the Senser is engaged in the mental processes of perception. These are seeing, witnessing and observing.

- i) *...what we **have seen** here today and...* (A, 15)
- ii) *...the portrayal of our culture by the younger generation which we **have witnessed** in recent times...* (A, 16)
- iii) *...the criminal destruction of the conditions for national progress that June 4 and December 31 gave to this country **is observed** in the national fight...(D, 106)*

The processes in (i) **have seen** and (ii) **have witnessed** are present perfect which gives the sense of immediacy. In the (iii) the process is in the passive construction **is observed** and there is an implicit **we** as the Senser of the process. This makes the Senser hidden in the clause but it is obvious from the context. However, the Phenomenon **the criminal destruction of the conditions for national progress that June 4 and December 31 gave to this country** is what is highlighted in the clause. The clause foregrounds the criminal actions of the opponents whose activities contribute to the

retrogression of the society. Through this, he pushes criminal deeds of the opposition into the consciousness of the people. These Phenomena in the clauses are abstract entities but form concrete images of Ghanaian cultural display and unlawful national practices. The participants have the ability to engage in mental processes but they do not change anything since these are mere projections.

Desiderative Processes

In following the desiderative processes, there is the representation of the wishes of the participant **we**.

- i) Therefore *the great future which we seek for* ourselves as a people,...(A, 31)
- ii) We will, therefore **need to persist in the struggle**...(D, 147)
- iii) As a government, we are committed to *listening and working*... (D, 156)

In the clauses, there are expressions of the wishes of the collective group. The clauses (i) and (ii) have the processes **seek for** and **will ...need** respectively. These two processes specify the aspirations of the people and what the people strive for. In clause (i) the Phenomenon **the great future** is highlighted. In clause ii, the Phenomenon **to persist in the struggle** is a non-finite clause. In clause iii, the Senser is '**we**' the collective group, but this **we** is made explicit and focused because of its specific reference to the government. The mental process is **committed to**, and the Phenomenon is non-finite **listening and working**... The Senses are engaged in the processes that do not bring any change but are involved in wishful thinking. Again the

Phenomena in these clauses do not result from the actions of the Senser, but only demonstrate what exists in the consciousness of the Senses.

Verbal Process

The words **we** and **us** in these verbal clauses represent the voices of the key participants in the political system.

- i) ..., let us **reaffirm** *our commitment to the non-negotiable principles which the turbulent..*(C, 60)
- ii) ...we **can say** *that the principles definitely go beyond revolutionary rhetoric.* (D, 61)
- iii) ...we have **detailed** the military units *to assist the crime fighting activities of the Police* (D, 111)
- iv) We have been truthful **to admit** *this* and... (D, 153)
- v) ...we **have explained** to you *the causes of these economic setbacks.* (D, 153)
- vi) We **can articulate** *our concerns...*(D, 161)

Rawlings used **We** in these verbal processes to represent his three notions of collectiveness which of he has been a key part. These are Ghanaians, ardent supporters of June 4 and members of government that hold power in trust for the people. The saying verbs realizing the processes are **reaffirm**, **can say**, **detailed**, **to admit** and **have explained**. The verbs realizing the processes emphasize the position of the collective group. The process **reaffirm** in (i) constructs a sense of dedication toward a cause and hence the verbiage **our commitment to the non-negotiable principles....** In (ii) the **we** represents the voice not only of Rawlings but also the ardent supporters of the June Uprising. The process **can say** is made up of a modal

can and saying verb **say**. The verbiage is **that the principles go definitely beyond revolutionary rhetoric**. The speaker uses **we** as a collective rejoinder to the critics who describe the probity and accountability tenets as mere rhetoric. Similarly in (iii), (iv), (v), the Sayer **we** includes Rawlings who is the speaker and other members of the government. **We** as a Sayer in (iii) embodies the collective group which includes senior officers in the military and the Ministries of the Interior and Defence who have the authority to instruct the police and the military. The process **detailed** points to firm and thorough instructions given to act on something. The Target **the military** connects with the Verbiage **to assist in crime fighting activities of the police**. The process **admit** in clause iv points to the admission of failure on the part of the speaker and his government. The Verbiage **this**, does not provide an elaboration. This is certainly a clear attempt not to repeat or mention the particular failure. The process in (v) **have explained** gives an indication that the elucidation of the economic problem has occurred at a point of time in the past. The Verbiage **the causes of the economic setbacks** does not provide any new dimension to the Receiver **to you** which refers to the entire population, but not only those present. This constructs the people collective's power in which they are concerned with the truth about the difficulties in the economy, the military's instruction to combat crime, admission of economic problems, and the proper description of the issues of the accountability and probity of June.

However, there is a shift in the treatment of the **we** in (vi). This **we** is a reference to the opposition, which does not include the speaker. The process **can articulate** has the verbiage **our concerns**. There is the modal **can** which

denotes ability and the speaker's use of **articulate** seems he provides the opportunity to the members of the opposition to offer their clear views or their grievances. This is reinforced by the Verbiage **our concerns**. The shift in the treatment of **we** and **our**, particularly its reference to the opposition is what Bourdieu (Wacquant, 2002) describes as 'symbolic power'. This is because there is the transformation of social reality by shaping its representation. The participant **we** here has become associated with the opposition.

Behavioural Processes

These are the Behavioural Processes relevant to the discussion of this participant, **we**, **us** and **our**.

- i) Unfortunately, however we have tended to suppress and **look down on** what is our own,...(A, 8)
- ii) As a government, we are committed to **listening** and.... (D, 156)

In these clauses, the Behaver **we** is distinguished in two aspects. In clause (i) it refers to Ghanaians and has the behavioural process **look down on**. The Behaver here is animate being but its process does not exercise any power on the Phenomenon which is the nominal clause **what is our own**...This is a particular reference to how Ghanaians as a people have conducted themselves by consciously rejecting what truly belong to them and accepting the things which are foreign. This attitude tends to separate from them from their traditional culture.

In clause ii, '**we**' as the Behaver refers to the government as an institution and has the process **listening**. The process has no Phenomenon and does not affect any an entity. But the use of **listening** is ideological when the listening is associated with the government. This is because such a practice is

located within specific rituals and practices of social institutions of Ideological State Apparatuses like the government (Hall, 1985). The government therefore keeps assuring the people that it is giving attention to their concerns in order to maintain its power.

Discussion

Ideology

The ideology of the collective group as having shared actions and other experiences at all the time is manifest in the speeches. With this collective group ideology, President Rawlings aligns himself with what the group does, says and thinks and how the group behaves. Looking at the processes, we can make three distinctions of alignment. First, he aligns himself with government. Then, there is an alignment with those who launched the June 4 Revolution. Finally, he aligns himself with the populace.

When he aligns himself with the government, their actions are geared towards protecting the citizens, the state and the democracy. These are achieved through the intervention of the security forces. Also, there is commitment towards good governance.

When aligned with those who launched the revolution, Rawlings outlines the actions of and consciousness for safeguarding the principles of the June 4 revolution.

When he aligns himself with the masses or the ordinary people, their actions affect the culture. This constitutes oneness with the people, whether in raising the image or dragging the image in the mud. This represents the collective ideology. This affinity with the under-class or common people is a populist ideology or strategy (Resnick, 2010).

Again, the language patterning shows that the ideology for social revolution or regeneration of the society depends on the collective group. For the complete national overhaul, particularly, in our cultural regeneration, economic improvement and political freedom, there is the need for the collective and committed action and consciousness. This is where people's power is translated into popular participation in undertaking and being conscious of the affairs of the state. In the context of this ideology, every citizen has the responsibility at all times in eliminating wasteful institutions, evaluating the conduct of public officials and judging offenders. Therefore, through the constant collective vigilance, inequality and exploitation of the people could be eliminated.

Power

As the analysis of the language shows, the power of the collective group directs not only towards the opposition but also other values that are necessary in any socio-political dispensation. The collective group acts upon the opposition but the opposition does not act upon the collective group. It is obvious that the power so exercised by the collective group has beneficial effects for the opposition. Clearly, this may be part of the agenda of seeking popular support, where there is the need to give a measure of tolerance to even the opponents or those who hold divergent views. In such circumstances, when the collective group exercises power, it does not have a detrimental effect; rather, there is a beneficial outcome for the opposition. On a minimal scale, there is the power of the collective group in restraining the opposition in some activities. This is particularly significant because the government at any

particular time has the power to halt political activities that are perceived to have the tendency to disturb the peace of the country.

Another dimension of the people's power is their ability to bring about intangible benefits in the political system. Many of the material processes, particularly, the lexically indeterminate processes suggest that the collective group is in the position to bring about a change, but the processes that can bring about these outcomes are weak. This does not make the collective group as powerful as they should be since the processes to bring about the desirable conditions and standards in socio political system seem indeterminate. Therefore, they are not as powerful as they seem to be. In the context of the political situation, the people have the power to bring about reconciliation, good economic fortunes and cultural emancipation, but the processes that lead to these outcomes have not been well defined.

This seems to indicate that the people have power in providing things that are of interest to the opposition, and also have the power in bringing about the values that are critical to the social, economic and political advancement of the country but their processes have left much to be desired. In spite of this, the collective group is clear in their communication but what they say are not rendered as powerful. The exception is when the government issues instructions to the military.

Identified Groups

This section analyzes transitivity patterns of the participants who have been identified. They form part of the collective group. In the data, they are referred to as **the people, Ghanaians, courageous men and women**. They also appear in their professional designations, such as **soldiers, traders and**

businessmen. Sometimes references to this collective group are in pronouns. This category of participant appears in the Material, Mental, Verbal, Relational, Existential and Behavioural processes.

Material Processes

In this part, I examine participants such as **Ghanaians, a new generation of youngmen and women** that appear as Actors in the material process but have various entities as the Goals.

- i) ...a Ghanaian who will not be afraid **to fetch** from deep inside himself or herself, *the essence of our culture,..*(A, 20)
- ii) ...a Ghanaian who will not be afraid to fetch from deep inside himself or herself, the essence of our culture, **to do things** in our own way. (A, 21)
- iii) The courageous men and women who **inspired** and **participated in the events...**(B,19)
- iv) Most Ghanaian families **have had to struggle for** *the little they now have...*(B, 68)
- v) Businessmen, traders and others **have recovered** *their sense of security...* (B, 79)
- vi) ...on June 4, the people **forced** *the door* open for the ordinary man. (B, 99)
- vii) Countrymen and women, as a people who **experienced** *the convulsions of June 4,...*(B, 121)
- viii) ...it important for each individual who **occupies** *a position of trust now...* (B, 122)

- ix) ...it important for each individual who occupies a position of trust now or those who may do so in the future bear the lessons and legacy of that era in mind. (B, 123)
- x) ...a new generation of youngmen and women to have arisen, full of eagerness **to combat injustice**, and **build new worlds**.(C, 3)
- xi) ...the hundreds of thousands of men and women all over the world who have quietly and tirelessly **worked** over these years.(C, 65)

This category of the Actor in the material process is the collective group which represents the identified groups such as **the people, courageous men and women, businessmen, traders and others, a Ghanaian**. They are involved in many material processes and these processes constitute an exertion of some energy or force. In (i), **a Ghanaian** as Actor is engaged in the process **to fetch** and has Goal, **the essence of our culture**. This process signifies a concrete action but Goal is an abstract entity. In (ii), the process is **to do**, and this process affects a Goal, **things**, which an abstract entity. In (iv), **Most Ghanaians families** as the Actor is engaged in the process **have had to struggle for**. This process denotes an action of using some energy which affects the Goal, **the little they now have** which is a nominal clause. This Goal is not a concrete entity. Similarly, in (vi) the Actor is **Business and traders and others** and the process is **have recovered**. This is a concrete process which has some amount of force but its Goal **sense of security** is an abstract entity, in this case, something that resides in the mind. The process, therefore, does not affect anything in the concrete world. The Actors are presented as powerful but not as powerful as to affect any concrete entity.

Another process in this category that denotes doing something with some energy is in clause vi and is **forced**. The Actor **the people** is engaged in the process **forced** and that affects the **door**. There is another participant that is the beneficiary of the process, which is **the ordinary man**. The clause vi is a metaphorical expression that signals the opening of socio-economic and political opportunities for even the common person as the result of the people's effort. Again, in (x) the Actor **a new generation of youngmen and women** engages in the processes that relate to development **have arisen** and effort, **combat** and **build**. The process **have arisen** does not affect any entity. But in the process **combat**, the action of the Actor affects the Goal **injustice**. The process **combat** is a dispositive process but is neutralized by the Goal, **injustice**, an abstract entity which has a strong negative meaning. The process **build** affects the Goal, **new worlds** which is also an abstract entity. In (xi), the Actor is **Hundreds of thousands of men and women** and the process is **worked**. This process is a tangible action and signals some amount of exertion of energy. However, this process does not affect any entity in the world, because it has no Goal. In this case, the Actor **Hundreds of thousands of men and women** is powerful but not as powerful as to affect any entity. These reflect the energy the professional group exercised in the course of and after the June 4 Uprising.

Relational Processes

Under this category of the collective group, these are the Attributive Relational processes and Possessive Relational processes.

Attributive Relational Processes

- i) ...a Ghanaian who will not be afraid... (A, 20)
- ii) ...those who were old enough to appreciate ... (B, 8)
- iii) ...the voice of each and every Ghanaian will matter in the decision-making process of government. (B, 18)
- iv) The courageous men and women who inspired and participated in the events of that era were militant and democratically minded citizens... (B, 20)
- v) ...for the first time their investments are safe in the country... (B, 80)
- vi) The conduct and image of cadres and the revolutionary organs are important at all times,... (B, 116)

In this segment, the Carriers in clauses (i), (ii) and (iii) are **who** and their antecedents are **a Ghanaian**, **those** and **The courageous men and women** respectively. In clauses (ii) and (iv), **were** is the process, denoting a characterization that is past. In (i), the Carrier **Ghanaian who** has the process **will not be** which is a combination of modal, adverb and verb **be**. In this clause, the presence of the adverb **not** expresses a negative relationship between the Carrier and the Attribute **afraid**. In these three clauses (i), (ii) and (iii), the Carriers are construed as individuals and their Attributes construe indefinite or abstract things. In clause (iii), the process **will matter** links the Carrier **the voice of each and every Ghanaian** to the Attribute **in the decision making process of government**. The Attribute has an element of circumstance and this agrees with Halliday and Matthiessen's (2004) assertion that certain circumstances may be common with attribution. In (v) and (vi), the

process **are** connects the Carriers **their investments** and **The conduct and image of cadres and the revolutionary organs** to the Attributes **safe** and **important** respectively. In these relational processes, when the Carriers are animate entities, they do not affect Attributes, because the processes serve to characterize the participants involved.

Possessive Relational Processes

- i) Most Ghanaian families have had to struggle for *the little* they now **have**,... (B, 68)
- ii) ...the new generation **has** *every right* to hold us in the same contempt... (C, 19)
- iii) ...*June 4* **belongs to** you. (D, 168)

In these possessive relational clauses, three different identified collective groups are construed as possessors. In (i), the possessor is **they**, a pronoun which refers to **Most Ghanaian families** which is fronted in the clause. This possessor is an animate being and has the process **have**. The possessed is **the little** which construes an abstract thing. In clause (ii) there is the use of **has** as a possessive relational process and **the new generation** construes the possessor which is an animate entity. The possessed is **every right** which is an abstract thing. In the social field such as politics, the possession of every right which is a democratic norm, constitutes a powerful tool in the hands of the participant and therefore make the participant very powerful. In (iii), the process used is **belongs to** and possessor is **you**, a pronoun referring to those present and beyond. The possessed is **June 4** which appears on the surface as circumstantial but construes an abstract thing. In all

these, the possessors establish relation of ownership or possession of the possessed, but do not affect any change on the possessed.

Mental Processes

The Senser and Phenomenon that will be under consideration in this category is the identified group which includes **Ghanaian, You, no one, unborn and young**. In this set, the Senser engages in the cognitive, perceptive, desiderative and emotive processes. Below are the clauses in which there are the mental processes.

Cognitive Processes

- i) As you know, today is the 12th Anniversary of the June 4 uprising...
(B, 4)
- ii) ...the memories of those who were old enough to appreciate the situation... (B, 8)
- iii) It is also my hope that those who were unborn or too young perhaps to understand the events have grown up **to appreciate what we have been through as a people.**(B,11)
- iv) However, no one must take the people of this country for granted or **imagine that essence of our struggles can be violated with impunity.**
(B, 97)
- v) ...you should see yourselves as missionaries (B,117)
- vi) ...individual who occupies a position of trust now or those who may do so in the future **bear the lessons and legacy of that era** in m
(B, 123)

The processes that appear in this category are **know**, **appreciate**, **understand**, **imagine**, **see** and **bear**. The Sensors in this category appear in many forms. In (i) and (vii), the Sensors are **you**. In (i), the Sensor is the immediate audience. However, **you** as a Sensor in clause vii, has a wider audience that includes the immediate audience and other members of the revolution who are not present. In (i), the process **know** tends to relay what is obvious in the consciousness of those present at the function; that is, the annual celebration of the June 4 and the recall of the events of that period. In (v), the Sensor **you** refers to those present and other members of the revolution and is engaged in the process **should see**. Its Phenomenon **yourselves as missionaries** is an attempt to raise the consciousness of the members of the revolution to live above reproach. The processes in (ii) **appreciate** and (iii) **understand** and **appreciate** are mental processes that are highly valued because they signify deep thinking. These processes are connected with the Phenomena **the situation** (ii), **the events** (iii) and **what we have been as a people**(iii). The Phenomenon in (iv) **that the essence of our struggles can be violated with impunity** carries some sense of continuity with the clause (vii) which has process **bear** and the Phenomenon **the lesson and legacy of that era**. These signal the main reason for and consequences of the June 4 Uprising. Through these processes, the Sensors do not bring about any change in the environment. However, what is clear from these is that the identified people exercise the power of their intellect, in analyzing and continuously keeping the circumstances surrounding the June 4 uprising in mind.

Perceptive Mental Processes

The processes in respect of this category are reflected in these clauses.

- i) Countrymen and women, as a people who **experienced** *the convulsion of June 4...* (B, 121)
- ii) ...most Ghanaians **feel** *secure* in their own country... (B, 75)

The two processes in this category are **experienced** and **feel**. The Senser in clause (i) is **who** which is a relative pronoun whose antecedent is **a people**. On the other hand, the Senser in clause (ii) is **most Ghanaians**, a noun phrase. These Senses engage in mental processes **experienced** and **feel** which construe Phenomena **the convulsion of June 4** and **secure** respectively. These Phenomena construe are perception of safety and dreaded experiences that accompanied the June 4 Uprising. These Senses and the processes are not changing anything. What is significant is these mental processes mirror the extent to Rawlings would want us to believe about the events of the June 4 and how things have changed.

Desiderative Processes

The clauses below illustrate the desiderative processes in which the identified collective group is a participant.

- i) *...conditions in which* the majority of our people **can look forward** **to** the future with hope. (B, 73)
- ii) They **glimpsed** *a vision of a future of dignity and social justice.* (C, 26)

These clauses have processes which express the expectation of the people. In clause (i) the Senser **the majority of our people** engages in the process **can look forward to**. This process is made up of the modal **can** and the phrasal verb **look forward to**. But it is important to note that the speaker

structures this clause to highlight the Phenomenon, the **conditions in which**. In (ii), there is a shift in the treatment of the identified collective group. Here the Senser is '**they**', which refers to the people on whose behalf the revolution was launched. **They** is the Senser of the process **glimpsed**. The Phenomenon **a vision of a future of dignity and social justice** projects the expectation that the people had in the wake of the revolution.

Emotive Mental Process

In this category, there is only one emotive process in which the identified collective group is the Senser.

- i) *...the peace of mind* which Ghanaians **have been enjoying** over the years. (B, 67)

This clause has **have been enjoying** as the emotive process with **Ghanaians** as the Senser. But it is the Phenomenon **the peace of mind** which is an abstract entity has been fronted. The process is present perfect continuous and this show the Senser's experience started in the past and continues till now. This is a positive emotional process for the identified collective group.

Verbal Processes

In following clauses, the identified collective group such as **the Ghanaian** and **ordinary people** are presented as engaging in the verbal processes that signal various communicative positions. The clauses illustrate this point.

- i) ...a Ghanaian who will not always look for the approval and acceptance from outside in order **to justify** *his or her actions and behaviour*,...(A, 19)
- ii) ... a Ghanaian who will not be afraid to fetch from deep inside himself or herself the essence of our culture, to do things in our way, the Ghanaian way, without **making apologies to anyone**. (A, 22)
- iii) Gone are the days when some **denied** *their Ghanaian identity*.(B, 77)
- iv) ...the people forced the door open for the ordinary man **to assert** *his democratic right*. (B, 100)
- v) In the heat of the uprising, the ordinary people **made it** abundantly **clear** *that they rejected cheating, injustice and oppression*.(C, 25)

In clauses (i) and (ii), the Sayers are **a Ghanaian** and in (iii) **some** is the Sayer and by inference is the Ghanaian and these are engaged in verbal processes **justify**, **making apologies** and **denied**. The process **justify** denotes an explanation about a just cause of action while **making apologies** indicates collective response and remorse to some wrongdoings. The verbiage in (i) *his or her own actions* and the Receiver (ii) *to anyone* connect with the processes to make the Ghanaian less powerful. This is because the Ghanaian is caught in providing justification and making apologies even when he or she adheres to his or her national culture. The worse form of the powerfulness of the Ghanaian is captured in the process (iii) **denied** and Target their Ghanaian identity. This **denied** is seen as a total renunciation of the Ghanaian values and identity. '**Ghanaian**' is a Sayer in the clauses in which the verbal processes and verbiage do not reflect the assumption of a social position that

enables the Ghanaian to have control over his culture and what he or she prefers to do.

On the other hand, the clauses in (iv) and (v) reveal how much the “**ordinary people**’ as participants are positioned in this discourse. The Sayers ‘**ordinary man**’ and ‘**ordinary people**’ are engaged in the verbal processes to **assert** and **made it... clear** and these point to the people’s firmness and insistence on what they say and want to have. The processes indicate unequivocal and emphatic stance on the demands of the people. The Verbiages in (iv) **his democratic right** and (v) **that they rejected cheating, injustice and oppression** also point to the ordinary people’s voice in claiming these benefits of the new political dispensation. Better still, speaker gives voice to the people to make a case that it was the ordinary people’s voice that ended all what was wrong with the bad political system. The manner and the substance of the people’s discourse are critical in determining their social position (Bourdieu, 1991) and their voice constitutes the power to reject cheating, to enforce their democratic rights and get what is due them in the new political era.

Behavioural Processes

- i) ...a Ghanaian who will not **look** for *the approval and acceptance* from outside... (A, 18)
- ii) the new generation has every right **to hold** *us* in the same contempt... (C, 19)

In this segment, the identified group is represented as Behavior in these processes. In (i), **who** which has ‘**Ghanaian**’ as its antecedent is the Behavior

and **look** is the behavioural process. In (ii), **the new generation** is the Behavior is engaged in the behavioural process **to hold**, but this clause has a second participant **us**, which behaves like the Phenomenon in the mental clause (Halliday & Matthiessen, 2004). In these clauses, the Behaviors do not make any changes to the realities that exist. However the realities reside in their minds and show in their conduct.

Existential Process

i) ...there **might be** *others who have not deceived the people...*

(B, 88)

In this Existential clause, **might be** construes the process. The process is made up of a modal **might** and the verb **be**. The Existent is the **others who have not deceived the people**. As noted by Downing and Locke (2006), the Existent in the existential process can be expanded and in this clause, **others** has been expanded by the addition of the clause **who have not deceived the people**. The **others** defines unknown group of people and its use distances the speaker and those present, However, in this context, it has a strong reference to the collective group supports the government and the June 4. The Existent in this process is not affected nor affects any change in the socio-physical world. The use of the modal **might** expresses the sense of possibility about the existence of the politicians who have not delivered their promises to the people. This is a clever way of the speaker excluding himself and those present from the accusations of deceit and misdeeds that the people leveled against the politicians.

Discussion

Ideology

There is the fusion of 'the can do ideology' of the ordinary Ghanaian and the professional (identified group) as the driving force for the transformation of the country. A picture that emerges from the processes, particularly material, emphasizes that the actions identified group has undertaken and will undertake require effort and therefore their processes bring about positive results. These outcomes of the particular efforts of the identified group are required for the advancement in the socio-economic condition of the people. These are exercised boldly and democratically. Similarly, there is also the collective expression of concern on the values that transform the socio-political conditions. In the context of the political situation, it is interesting to observe that the populist ideology of Rawlings' regime depended on the activism and the support of the large identifiable groups such as students, urban unemployed, farmers, petty traders, trade union members, and rural wage labourers. These groups constituted the disillusioned group and had a common goal that was to secure a large part in the social, economic and political fortunes that had eluded them in the previous regimes. Resnick (2010) observes, in Africa, it is a common populist strategy for political leaders to appeal to the urban poor and some sections of the rural population in order to gain the majority of national support.

Power

In connection with the actions of the identified group, the analysis reveals different levels of power available to this identified group. As the material processes show, when the group exercises the power of action, this

power does not subjugate a person or any group of persons. Significantly, however, the identified group's power is heavy on things such as the value of our culture, the people's sense of security, creation of opportunities and fighting injustice.

At another level, the identified group appears very powerful, even to the point of belligerence, but its actions do not impact on any entity. A similar picture emerges when the identified group communicates. The assertiveness of the identified group is pointed, but what they say have no targets or their messages are not directed at any named entities. In spite of these, the content of their messages relates to the values that are pertinent to the survival of the identified group in the socio political environment. What is obvious from this that is there is a clear attempt to distance the identified groups from the action and utterance against personalities and present them as acting and communicating to further the political democracy, economic liberation and social justice. The lack of verbal attacks is a clear response against the complaints that the architects of June 4 engineered the deteriorating social conditions in which verbal attacks were the order of the day.

Opposition

This section will deal with references to the opposition. In the data, the opposition appears as **they**, **them** and **their**. In other instances, the opposition appears as **anarchists**, **opponents** and **others**. The opposition appears in Material, Relational, Mental, Verbal and Existential Processes. There are no instances of the opposition as a participant in the Behavioural process.

Material Processes

The opposition occurs as an Actor in many types of the material clauses. The first part in this is where the opposition is the Actor in the intransitive or middle clauses. Below are the clauses:

- i) They **had to leave** because....(B, 51)
- ii) Many of such anarchists **are reappearing** this time **dressed** in the cloak as democrats. (B, 53)
- iii) Of course, they **have teamed up** with others in their political ambitions ... (B, 55)
- iv) ...the private media and political opponents, who are very loud in their criticism of the government's fight against corruption and crimes, are the very ones that **come** to the defence of the criminals. (D, 99)
- v) ...to make the country ungovernable so that they **can come** to power through the confusion...(D,117)

In these clauses the opposition represented as **They** or **Many of the such anarchists, the private media and political, that**, a relative pronoun which has an antecedent **the very ones**. These are the Actors in these material clauses. The actions the opposition engages in these clause are connected with movement, **had to leave, reappearing, and come**. The process **dressed** that has to do with putting something on one's body but in the sense it strongly suggests the Actor is disguising his appearance in order to carry out its subversive acts. The process **teamed up** has a sense of forming alliances, not for the fruitful actions, but to create confusion in the country. However, in all these, the actions of the Actors in these processes do not affect anything.

Halliday and Matthiessen (2004) describe verbs like **appear** as being in the creative category and signifying transformation. This is in hypotactic relation with **dressed** (Halliday, 1994) and it is the process **dressed** that is projected. The processes appear in intransitive clauses and according to Eggins (2004), such clauses can be probed with the question of what the opposition did. The action of the opposition does not affect any entity. But through the processes **reappearing**, **dressed** and **teamed up**, the speaker tries to emphasize the sinister ways and means the opposition prepares to come to power by changing its tactics and seeking association with other groups.

In the next section, I look at the transitive clauses in which the opposition is the Actor and the process affects a Goal. In this case, the activities of the opposition as the Actor affect other entities in the environment.

- (i) ...because they find it convenient to **do** *so*. (B, 54)
- (ii) Of course, they have teamed up with others in their political ambitions but who **have contributed** *nothing* nor **sacrificed** *anything* towards... (B, 56)
- (iii) ...a great cry of anger against those individuals and institutions which **had failed to stem** *the tide of all pervading corruption, ineptitude and injustice...*(C, 9)
- (iv) ... as shown to those who **created** *the conditions which brought about the eruption of the June Four.*(C, 20)
- (v) ...same principles and measures against private persons who **have stolen** *billions of Cedis* or violently abused the rights of others.
(D, 96)

(vi) ...same principles and measures against private persons who have stolen billions of Cedis or violently **abused** *the rights of others*.

(D, 97)

(vii) ... while they **create** civil strife or exploit *criminal activities and anarchy* as their only means of coming to power.(D, 121)

(viii) ... while they create civil strife or **exploit** *criminal activities and anarchy* as their only means of coming to power. (D, 121)

A look at these clauses reveals that the opposition is represented as a relative pronoun **who** and **which**, with varied antecedents and person pronoun **they**. It is engaged in material processes, construed as both events and actions. The processes can be distinguished in terms of their concreteness or abstractness. The processes that are concrete are **to do, contributed, sacrificed, created, have stolen, abused** and **exploit**. The process **had failed to stem** constitutes an abstract action. Some of the processes are expressed in the present perfect and simple past to indicate the recency of the actions of the opposition. Also, there are processes realized by present tense verbs to indicate these actions of the opposition is on-going. It is only **to do** that is realized by non finite verb which indicates the intent of the opposition. There are some of the processes which construe the actions of the opposition as negative and these are **have stolen, abused, failed to stem, exploit** while those with positive meanings are **do, contribute, create** and **sacrifice**. The processes are Goal-directed, but they do not affect any concrete entity in the environment. They have effects on abstract entities. The Goals affected are pronouns **anything** and **nothing**. Noun phrases as Goals are **rights of others, billions of Cedis** and **the tide of all pervading corruption, ineptitude and**

injustice and the noun clauses are **criminal activities and anarchy as their only means of coming to power** and **the conditions which brought about the eruption of June Four**. It is important to note that where the process is construed in the positive way, the Goal is in the negative, and where the process is construed in the negative, the Goal is conceived in the positive way. An example of this can be found in clause ii. The process **contributed** is conceived in the positive way but its Goal **nothing** has a negative meaning. The opposite is shown in clause vii. The process **create** has a positive meaning while the Goal **civil strife** (strife) has a negative meaning.

There are the instances where the opposition constitutes as Actors in the material processes where the processes consist of two lexical verbs with perfective ‘to’ and a Goal. These are found in the data.

- (i) ... if violence is the way by which some **wish to pursue** *their political agenda* in this country. (B, 64)
- (ix) They **seek to disrupt**, destroy, and vilify *whatever they dislike*. (C, 41)
- (x) They **seek to** disrupt, **destroy**, and vilify *whatever they dislike*. (C, 41)
- (xi) ...all these are indirectly a consequence of what some people **have set out to do to undermine** *the authority of government...*(D, 81)
- (xii) Our political opponents **have** irresponsibly **sought to turn** *this military assistance into a propaganda platform,...* (D, 114)
- (xiii) Our political opponents have irresponsibly **sought to turn** this military assistance into a propaganda platform, **to poison** *the minds* against the military (D, 115)

(xiv) Our political opponents have irresponsibly sought to turn this military assistance into a propaganda platform, first to poison the minds against the military and second and ultimately **to make the country** ungovernable ... (D, 116)

(xv) Yet, it is interesting that these people who **want to carry the cudgels of revenge to the point of political instability..** (D, 139)

In the clauses, the opposition is the Actor in material processes that have a Goal. The actions are presented in the processes, **wish to pursue, seek to disrupt, seek ...to destroy, have set out to do to undermine, sought to turn, sought ... to poison, sought ... to make and want to carry.** These actions of the opposition are directed towards the Goals and therefore the Actors affect many things in the environment, although what they affect are not concrete entities. These abstract entities are captured in noun clauses like **whatever they dislike**, and noun phrases such as **the authority of government, military assistance, the minds, the country and the cudgels of revenge.** The processes the Actor is engaged in are lexically indeterminate operational processes and they construe actions of the opposition as weak and, which therefore, cannot be realized or lead to any fulfillment. This is because the processes shade into mental ones which have weak propositions.

Again, there is a passive construction in which the opposition is presented.

i) ...criticism in an open society is not the same as *the attempts being made to incite violence and provoke disturbances to destabilize our national unity, peace and stability.* (B, 60)

In this illustration, the processes construed are expressed in receptive process types. The receptive process types as they so called in functional

grammar (Halliday & Matthiessen, 2004) are referred to as passive in traditional grammar. In the receptive process, the Actor can be omitted but usually the Goal is mapped on to the subject. In this case, two Goals are involved in the process **being made to incite** but the Actor is omitted. The first Goal is **attempts** and the second is **violence**. The process **provoke** has the Goal **disturbances** while **destabilize** has **our national unity, peace and stability** as the Goal. In fact, the Actor here is hidden and it is the opposition. In the receptive process, the speaker omits the Actor of the action in order to highlight the action of the opposition.

There is another group of clauses worth considering in the discussion of the opposition is the elaborating clause complex.

- i) Such people have nothing to lose by **forcing** *this country* along the path of violence. (B, 58)
- ii) ...some people have set out to do to undermine the authority of government by **encouraging** *civil disorder*.(D, 82)

These sentences contain two clauses each, an independent clause and dependent clause. Halliday (1994) refers to such structures as elaborating clause complex, where the dependent clause provides some description or comment on the things that have been mentioned. The dependent clause might refer to the whole primary clause or to a particular participant in the primary clause. In (i) the process is **forcing** and its Goal is **this country** but because the process and the Goal are located in the non-finite clause, its subject and Actor, **Such people** is omitted. Similarly, in clause ii, the Actor in the elaborating clause is retrieved from the primary clause, and is **some people** and the process the Actor engages in the elaborating clause is **encouraging**.

The Goal of the Actor's process is **civil disorder**. The absence of the Actors in both cases can be explained as an attempt to hide the power (Fairclough, 1989) of the opposition. Clearly, the process **forcing** indicates the exercise of control, in fact the power to exert energy in a specific direction. From this, the speaker, Rawlings, indicates the power of the opposition, particularly in taking the country through the violence. Again, clause ii has the process **encouraging**, and there is the obvious absence of its Actor. **Encouraging** also indicates some power or control, particularly the power or the control to affect **civil disorder**. Similarly, the speaker, Rawlings, reckons that the power of the opposition to cause disaffection for his government through civil disorder. But he does not acknowledge them since civil disorder is a form of legitimate of protest.

Relational Processes

In the Relational processes the opposition appears as a participant in the Attributive, Identifying, Possessive Relational Processes.

Attributive Relational Processes

- i) ...the negative and destructive aspects of those cultures – aspects that their owners themselves **are** *anxious* to get rid of. (A, 14)
- ii) With time and as the revolution matured, their slogans and clichés and their lunatic ideas **became** *irrelevant*. (B, 50)
- iii) Ironically, they **are** *the very ones whose greed, arrogance and disdain for the common man were responsible for the insecurity of their own brothers and sisters*. (B, 82)

- iv) ...all these **are** indirectly *a consequence of what some people have set out to undermine the authority of this government* by encouraging civil disorder. (D, 81)
- v) ...the private media and political opponents, who **are** *very loud* in their criticism of the government's fight against corruption and crime,... (D, 98)

The processes used in this segment are in (i), (iii), (v) and **became** in (ii). In (i) the Carrier **their owners themselves** as a human participant relates to the Attribute **anxious** while in (ii) an inanimate entity **their slogans, clichés and lunatic ideas** links with **irrelevant**. The clause (v) has the Carrier **who**, with the antecedent **the private media and political opponents** which is a combination of human and institutional participants. This Carrier relates to the Attribute **very loud**. According to Halliday and Matthiessen (2004), these characterizations often move towards qualitative attribution or are known as quality Attributes because they are realized by adjectives. It is clear that these attributions, **very loud** and **irrelevant** have a strong negative meaning.

In clause (iii), the Carrier **they** is an animate entity and links with the Attribute **the very ones whose greed, arrogance and disdain for the common man**. This Attribute is a nominal group and constitutes a class of the opposition members whose anti-social behaviour destroys the opportunities for the people. In (iv), **all these** which is Carrier and it is an inanimate participant and relates to the Attribute **a consequence of what some people have set out to do undermine the authority of this government**. The Attributes in (iii) and (iv) specify the outcome of the opposition's misdeeds and the category of

the opposition members whose conduct is detrimental to the needs of the people.

Identifying Relational Processes

- i) But those who think that Revolution is an end in itself **are** *agents of disorder.* (C, 37)
- ii) ...the private media and political opponents, who are very loud in their criticism of the government's fight against corruption and crime, **are** *the very ones that come to the defence of the criminals.* (D, 99)
- iii) *...partisan politics of attrition* that **has been** the strategy of opponents of government (D, 138)

In clauses (i) and (ii) **are** is the process. The Token in clause (i) has **those who think that Revolution is an end in itself** relates to the Value **agents of disorder**. The Value has a heavy sense of negativity. Similarly the Token clause ii...**the private media and political opponents, who are very loud in their criticism of the government's fight against corruption and crime**, has the Value which has a negative sense **the very ones that come to the defence of the criminals**. This Value defines the opposition as particularly abetting the other opposition members who steal from the nation. In (i) both Token and Value are animate beings but in (ii) the Token and Value are construed as institutions and individuals. In (iii) the process is realized in the present perfect **has been** and has the Token **the strategy of opponents of government**. This is linked to the Value **the partisan politics of attrition**. The process indicates the unchanging modus operandi of the opposition.

Possessive Relational Processes

- i) ...we **had** *some of those anarchists, extremists, and confusionists* among us. (B, 48)
- ii) Such people **have** *nothing* to lose by forcing this country along the path of violence.
(B, 57)

In these clauses, the verbs **had** and **have** represent the possessive processes. In clause (i) the Possessor **we** refers to the collective group and is related to the Possessed **some of those anarchists, extremists and confusionists**. From this, the opposition is in the possession of the collective group (adherents of June 4) and this makes the collective group gain control over the opposition. In clause (ii), the Possessor **such people** is the opposition and has possession of **nothing**. From these clauses, there is the balance of possessions between the collective group and opposition. The opposition has something in its possession and at the same time it is being possessed by a collective group. However, where the opposition is in possession of something, that thing is abstract whereas the collective group has animate entities.

Mental Processes

The opposition as participants appears in the cognitive and desiderative mental processes but does not appear in the perceptive processes. They are described as in the data as **opponents** and sometimes there is the use of the pronoun **They**.

Cognitive Mental Processes

- i) Such persons have failed **to realize** *that a new wind of change is blowing in Ghana today.* (B, 84)
- ii) They found it difficult **to realize** *the ideals and principles behind the processes initiated by June 4 and 31st Revolution are irreversible.* (B, 85)
- iii) And how soon they forget *that those live in the glass house do not throw stones.* (B, 90)
- iv) They regarded *the necessary change from dismantling what was unacceptable...*(C, 34)
- v) But those who think *that Revolution is an end in itself are the agents of disorder.* (C, 37)
- vi) There are some today who have not learned *that lesson.* (C, 40)
- vii) ...the same conspiracy by our political opponents and their media to aid, abet and **condone** *the criminal destruction of the conditions for national progress.* (D, 105)
- viii) Under no circumstance **should they entertain** *the notion that we will allow them to turn back the clock of progress.* (D, 119)

These clauses activate the opposition as Sensors for the expression of its inner consciousness. The opposition is referred explicitly to as **political opponents** in clause vii but in other cases the opposition becomes **Such persons** and **They**. This sets up the dichotomy between **We** and **They**. The **We** are seen as the adherents of the revolution and members of the government. The Sensors in these clauses engage in the processes **to realize**,

forget, regarded, think, have ... learned and entertain. The processes are mainly in the semantic domain of exercising one's intellect. It is interesting to note that these clauses present the Sensers (the opposition) in such a way that they are not in fact engaging in any intellectual exercise. The process **forget** in clause (iii), and the presence of the adverb **not** with the process **have... learnt** in clause (vi) emphasize an intellectual failure. The Phenomena represented, in the clauses, by the nominal group in (vi) **that lesson** and (vii) **criminal destruction of the conditions for national progress** denote 'a thing' which are abstract entities. According to Halliday and Matthiessen (2004), finite clauses signal facts and these facts constitute the contents of the consciousness of the opposition. The facts are captured in (i) **that a new wind of change is blowing in Ghana today**, (ii) **the ideals and principles behind the processes initiated by June 4 and 31st Revolution are irreversible**, (iii) **that those who live in the glass house do not throw stones**, (iv) **the necessary change from dismantling what was unacceptable** (v) **that Revolution is an end in itself are agents of disorder** and (viii) **that we will allow them to turn back the clock of progress**. Facts according to Halliday and Matthiessen (ibid), are of the higher level of abstraction. These facts are connected with the key values underlying the causes of the June 4 Uprising. The speaker presents the opposition as not only experiencing challenges in understanding the values and good intentions associated with the June 4 Revolution, but also encountering difficulties in the appreciation of the essence and the benefits that June 4 Uprising brought to Ghanaians. The opposition is represented as not intellectually powerful to understand the guiding principles behind the revolution.

Desiderative Mental Processes

- i) However, there are some individuals and groups who want to advocate a violent road to our political future. (B, 44)
- ii) They seek to disrupt, destroy or vilify whatever they dislike. (C, 40)
- iii) ... they can come to power through *the confusion* they hope to create. (D, 118)
- iv) Yet, it is interesting that there are those who want to carry the cudgels of revenge to the point of political instability and social disunity... (D, 139)

In the desiderative mental processes, there is the representation of the desires of the opposition. The Senses are relative pronouns *who* with antecedents **some individuals and groups** in clause i and **those** in clause iv. In (ii) and (iii) the participant role of Senses is reflected in the personal pronoun **They**. These verbs **want**, **seek** and **hope** are processes which are construed as the mental processes in these clauses. The Phenomena of the processes represent acts (macrophenomenal) and are realized by non-finite clauses (Halliday & Matthiessen, *ibid*). In (i) and (iv), the Phenomena are metaphorical expressions **to advocate a violent road** and **to carry the cudgels of revenge** respectively. These constitute acts of destabilizing and the speaker portrays the opposition as having these in their consciousness. In clause iii, prominence is given to the Phenomenon **confusion**, when it is placed in front while the Senses comes after it. The speaker puts the

consequences of the acts of the opposition above the processes of their inner consciousness.

Verbal Processes

This part examines the clauses in which the opposition is the Sayer. The clauses represent the voices of those who are against the revolution or the government and its policies.

- i) ...some individuals and groups who want to **advocate** *violent road to our political future.* (B, 44)
- ii) Such anarchists and confusionists sometimes **pretend to speak** in the name of democracy... (B, 46)
- iii) They have it difficult **to concede** *the possibility there might be others who have not deceived the people...* (B, 88)
- iv) They seek to disrupt, destroy or **vilify** *whatever they dislike...* (C, 41)
- v) ... if we persist in interpreting our democratic freedoms as licence to cause civil and industrial unrest without reasonable cause, **abuse** and **vilify** *decent people,...* (D, 75)
- vi) ... some who **claim** *to have been injured by the event...* (D, 136)
- vii) In as much as these people **condemn** *us,...*(D, 143)

In these clauses, the opposition is ascribed the Sayer role with various verbal processes. The Sayers are not specifically named but are labelled as ‘**some individuals and groups**’, **Such anarchists and confusionists**’ and **these people** and sometimes **They**. These labels of the opposition signal Rawlings’ attempt at separating what “they say” and what “we say”. The processes are **advocate**, **speak**, **concede**, **vilify**, **abuse**, **claim** and **condemn**. While they are mostly in the present tense form to indicate the habitual nature

of the communication of the opposition, there are hypotactic clause complex such as **want to advocate**, **pretend to speak** and **seek to ... vilify**. These hypotactic clause complexes shade from mental processes to verbal processes and are thus considered lexically indeterminate processes. These does not then make a clear distinction between what the opposition says and thinks. It is interesting to note that the Verbiage in the (iv) **whatever they dislike** is an abstract entity which signals a view that the opposition in their communication engages in trivialities. In (i) the process **advocate** shows the opposition's vigorous support and campaign for what obtains in the Verbiage 'a **violent road to our political future**.' At another level, the processes **claim** (clause vi) places a heavy doubt about the allegation that is found in the verbiage **to have been injured by the event**. Another significant point about the verbal processes is where the Sayers target their sayings. They find the targets **decent people** and **us** particularly in those circumstances where the verbal processes have a heavy negative sense, examples are **abuse** and **vilify** in (iii) and **condemn** in (vii). This is a form of resistance that the opposition puts up and, according to Lamb (2013), resistant discourses are prevalent in many fields of action, including the field of political control where the opposition makes statements to make their voices heard.

Existential Processes

This section takes a look at the instances where the opposition appears as Existents.

- i) However, there **are** *some individuals and groups who want to advocate violence to our political future.* (B, 44)

- ii) Admittedly, there **are** *others who have felt insecure* since June 4 and 31st December Revolution. (B, 80)
- iii) There **are** *some* today, *who have not learned that lesson*. (C, 40)

The existential processes used in these clauses are **are**. The participants are in (i) **some individuals and groups who want to advocate violence to our political future**, (ii) **others who have felt insecure...** and (iii) **some...who have not learned that lesson**. The Existents are indefinite, but in all the clauses, the Existents **some individuals and groups** in (i) **others** (ii) and **some** (iii) have been expanded by addition of relative clauses.

The Existents are animate beings but the processes do not bring about any change in the participants nor the participants effect any change through the processes. This is because the Existential processes construe the participants in their mental state. The opposition and its actions do not affect anything in the real world. This is shown by the verbs **want, felt, and learned**. In a real sense, the Existents denote the opposition's desire in campaigning and urging the use of violence in the political activities and its failure to fully grasp the causes and the essence of the June 4 Uprising.

Discussion

Ideology

As it can be observed from the processes, there is a clear anti opposition ideology that has been advanced. Rawlings shows the opposition as having caused, causing and intending to foment political troubles and socio-economic problems. In the predominantly material processes, the opposition

depicted as a force for destruction, is responsible for the violation of the people's rights, creation of anarchy in the country and engaging and aiding other members in corrupt practices. Again, the intentions of the opposition are detrimental to the stability of the country. In the real political context, in the view of Rawlings, the continuous subjugation of the country was the responsibility of external forces and the unscrupulous elites who were backed by the western powers and later by the local media. According to Pellow and Chazan (1986), this ideology was promoted by a strong group of Neo-Marxist who found themselves as advisors of Rawlings. It was their belief that the country's backwardness was as the result of the influence of retrogressive social forces that managed the affairs of Ghana since independence. This ideology constituted one of the bases for the strongest campaigns against these so-called retrogressive forces. Again, presenting the opposition as dangerous in action, thought and word is seen as placing the people as watchdogs of the activities of the opposition. With this, Rawlings stresses the point that the opposition, under any circumstance, should not be the right option.

Power

Rawlings highlights the power of the opposition at various levels. At the first level where the opposition is most powerful, the utterances of the opposition are most powerful to the extent of hurting innocent individuals and the people. Ironically, the utterances lack information. Opposition is then seen as most powerful in attacking the people. Again, when they are most powerful, their processes materialize and bring out the results that are detrimental to the socio-economic process of the country. As such, the material effects of the opposition's actions are a measure of their destabilizing power in the country.

Within this level, where the opposition is presented as most powerful, it exercises the power in some circumstances by hiding itself from view. Yet, the material effects of their processes are the same destabilizing things. Ocquaye (2004) observes that the struggle for democracy and against military dictatorships particularly the one instituted by the PNDC, and grievances over labour issues and protests over harsh economic conditions in the country by many professional bodies such as Ghana Bar Association, TUC, students constitute a force for Rawlings either as military leader or democratic leader to deal with. For this reason, Rawlings described them as saboteurs.

At a different level, when the opposition is seen as more powerful, their power is defined in terms of their movement, particularly towards mischief, towards defending the indefensible and a departure from the common good. Their actions do not affect any person in the society.

In the situation where the opposition has the least power, their power is seen in the processes, but not in what the processes bring about. This is because the processes are mainly indeterminate and vague. In this manner, there are number of processes that do not commit the opposition to the actions. Analysing the transitivity patterns in the text and the participants in the texts provides insights into how language is used to portray ideology and power in the June 4 speeches. I have attempted an examination of the transitivity patterns as they relate to these participants, J. J. Rawlings, The people and the opposition.

CHAPTER FIVE

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Introduction

This study has examined the language as it relates to the ideology and power in political speeches. The intention was to explore how the transitivity pattern reflected the power and ideology in the June 4 speeches delivered by Jerry John Rawlings. This chapter presents the summary, conclusions and recommendations of the study.

Summary

In this study, I have attempted to examine the transitivity patterns of the June 4 speeches of Jerry John Rawlings in order to reveal how power and ideology are enacted in those speeches. As a result, the following questions were posed to guide the study:

- a) What is the pattern of transitivity in the speeches?
- b) What do the patterns of transitivity attributed to the key participants reveal about power and ideology?

The data for the study comprised four June 4 speeches; two of which were made during the period of Rawlings' rule as a military leader while the other two were made during the period in which he ruled as a democratically elected leader.

The analysis comprised two parts. In the first part, relying on the transitivity system proposed by Halliday and Matthiessen (2004), I analysed the data to discover the transitivity patterns, specifically the material, mental, relational, verbal, behavioural and existential processes. The frequencies of the

processes were counted and their percentages found. In terms of the patterns of transitivity, the data revealed the predominance of material processes, followed by relational processes. Mental processes ranked third in three but fourth in one of the speeches. From the data, verbal processes, existential and behavioural processes were not as prominent in usage as the material and relational processes. The predominance of the material processes indicates that political texts are made to reflect more the actions of the political actors than any other process.

In the second part of the analysis, I looked at the key participants, **I** (speaker), the collective group (**we** and identified groups) and the opposition and how they appeared in the various processes.

The data revealed that the participant **I** that is President is associated with material, relational, mental and verbal processes. The material processes indicate his action on the constitution and the celebration of June 4 event. On the whole, the relational processes are associated with Rawlings' dedication, sensibilities towards the people and the aim of the June 4 Uprising, while the mental processes provide his viewpoint about national issues and desire of his continuous relations with the people and the June 4 events. The verbal processes express the president's commendation for the people, explanation of national issues, plea to some institutions and caution to the opposition.

Again, from the data, there were two types of collective group. The first is where '**we**' and its other manifestations are a participant. The second is where identified groups are presented as participants. In the '**we**' category, the participants engage in material, relational, mental, verbal and behavioural processes. In the material processes, the actions of the participants do not

affect only the opposition, but other entities also. While the relational processes underline the collective sensibilities, intention and responsibilities, the mental processes emphasize collective consciousness about national issues and collective desire and commitment towards the June 4 events. Similarly, the behavioural processes express the people's consciousness and the government's engagement with the people. The collective voice of the government as the representative of the people is seen in the verbal processes.

The second strand of the collective group represented the instances where the identified group was a participant in material, relational, mental, verbal, behavioural and existential processes. In the material processes, this participant is involved in processes in which there is the exertion of force but they do not affect any human being. The relational processes present the participants as having democratic values and other positive attributes. The mental processes highlight the identified group as participants with the intellectual capacity to reflect and understand the conditions in the country and causes of the June 4 Uprising. The mental processes show also a desire for good life for the people. The verbal processes reflect two communicative positions, the negative position where there are a rendition of apologies and justification for the people's action. On the other hand, positive position makes assertions and provides elucidations. The behavioural processes present the consciousness of disregarding their values and of getting approval in undertaking their acts. The existential process demonstrates the participants who have kept faith with people.

The last participant analysed was the opposition. The data shows that opposition is involved in the material, relational, mental, verbal and existential

processes. In the material processes, the opposition mostly is engaged in negative actions. However, where they are involved in the positive actions, the results of their actions are negative. In terms of the relational processes, the opposition as a participant has negative attributes and the opposition is in possession of the people. As the data indicate, the mental processes represent the opposition as weak in their intellectual capability and their desires as mainly negative, particularly involving acts that wreck the nation. In the verbal processes in which the opposition communicates, the opposition ignores issues, attacks personalities, urges violence and makes doubtful claims. In the existential processes, the opposition is engaged in acts that are directed towards the destabilization of the country. The opposition is represented as troubled and lacking intellectual capacity.

Conclusion

The study has been to uncover the transitivity pattern, thereby how power and ideology in the June 4 speeches are enacted. The study has revealed how the transitivity pattern of the participants **I**, the collective group and the opposition helped in the explanation of power and ideology in the June 4 speeches. It shows that language does not only help in shaping ideology and power in the society but also helps in maintaining ideology and power. This is because language reflects ideology and power (Fairclough, 2001).

In addition, Fairclough's (1989) CDA framework recognizes that there are certain assumptions behind the selections of discourse. These assumptions are never value-free and innocent because they are ideologically driven and motivated. This study has demonstrated that CDA provides a useful means of unpacking ideology and power in the June 4 speeches by Rawlings.

The study revealed various strands of power that is part of the ideology of Jerry John Rawlings and of the political system. The President, as democratically elected has the power within the constitution, and communicates in various forms to many people, from the children to highly-placed people and institutions in the society.

It was discovered that the collective group is considered powerful. This collective group represents Rawlings and his partners as agents of change since they not only act and communicate and reflect on things within the confines of the democratic and cultural space, but are able to affect the opposition in some ways. This is clearly in support of the call 'power belongs to the people' which is a semblance of the full public participation in the decision making, redistribution of wealth, a reduction of neo-colonialist influence and a crackdown corrupt practices in the country (Rothchild, 1985).

The opposition is powerful in the society but its power is to the point of contributing nothing and negatively to the country, particularly stealing and urging its supporters to bring chaos into the country. This fits Bourdieu's (1994) explanation that power can change into different forms of capital such as social and cultural, and these capitals constitute resources for power which invariably determines the participant's social space. However, this processes attributed to the opposition suit the anti opposition ideology of Rawlings.

Furthermore, the study showed that language can be used in the manufacture of consent, and in that case language becomes hegemonic. This is because most of the actions and what the actions bring about are abstractions and do not sufficiently represent what exists in the real world. They are mostly

unrealized ideas in the imaginations in the President, the people and the opposition.

Recommendations

These recommendations for further studies are offered.

- i) In order to get a full picture of Rawlings' speeches reflect power and ideology, research should be replicated in other speeches, such as May Day speeches, Independence Day speeches.
- ii) Researchers should conduct more investigations into political speeches that connect critical discourse analysis with systemic functional linguistics in order to better understand the relations of power.
- iii) Since this study involved the speeches delivered during Rawlings' regimes as both military leader and democratically elected leader, a study of the examination of speeches of one regime could be done to ascertain the power relations in that specific regime.
- iv) A comparative study of the June 4 speeches in Rawlings' two different regimes will be a guide for comparing and contrasting his ideology and relations in the periods of his military regime and democratic rule.
- v) Finally, a comparative analysis of political speeches of Jerry John Rawlings and other Ghanaian Presidents will be able to throw light on the differences of ideology and power relations.

REFERENCES

- Adedeji, J. L. (2001). The legacy of J. J. Rawlings in Ghanaian politics, 1979-2000. *Africa Studies Quarterly*. Florida: Center for African Studies.
- Adjei-Fobi, C. K. (2011). *A rhetorical analysis of political discourse: A comparative study of the use of metaphor in the speeches Nkrumah and Rawlings*. An unpublished M. Phil. thesis, University of Ghana.
- Alameda-Hernandez, A. (2006). *The construction of Gibraltarian identity in the printed press: A critical discourse analysis of editorial articles on the Gibraltar issue*. An unpublished Ph. D. thesis, University of Granada.
- Alo, M. A. (2012). A rhetorical analysis of selected political speeches of prominent African leaders. *British Journal of Arts and Sciences*, 10 (1), 87-100.
- Althusser, L. (1971). Ideology and ideological state apparatuses. In *L. Althusser, Lenin and Philosophy* (pp. 121-173). London: NLB.
- Ampong, B. (2011). *Le discours de l'Ex President Jerry John Rawlings prononce le 16 janvier 2010 lors de la conference du bureau executif du NDC a Tamale: Une anlyse pragmatique*. An unpublished M. Phil. dissertation, Kwame Nkrumah University of Science and Technology.
- Awoonor, K. (1984). *The Ghana Revolution: Background Account from a Personal Perspective*. Bronx, N.Y.: Oases Publishers.
- Badran, D. (2002). *Ideology through modality in discourse analysis*. An unpublished Ph.D. thesis, University of Nottingham.
- Bayram, F. (2010). Ideology and political discourse: A critical discourse analysis of Erdogan's Political Speech. *Arecls*, 7 : 23-40.

- Bill to abolish the celebration of June 4. (2001, May 31). *Daily Graphic*, p. 1.
- Boateng, E. A. (1996). *Government and the People: Outlook for Democracy in Ghana*. Accra: Buck Press.
- Bourdieu, P. (1991). *In Other Words: Essays towards a Reflexive Sociology*. Cambridge: Polity.
- _____. (1994). *Language and Symbolic Power*. Oxford: Polity Press.
- Bourdieu, P. & Wacquant, L. J. D. (1992). *An invitation to reflexive sociology*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Brown, G. & Yule, G. (1983). *Discourse Analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Campbell, K. K. & Jamieson, K. H. (1990). *Deeds Done in Words: Presidential Rhetoric and Genres of Governance*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Coffin, C. (2001). Theoretical approaches to written language – a Tesol perspective. In A. Burns and C. Coffin (Eds.), *Analysing English in global context: Reader* (pp. 93-122). New York: Routledge.
- Constitution of the Republic of Ghana. (1992). Accra: Assembly Press.
- Chilton, P. & Schaffner, C. (1997). Discourse and Politics. In T. A. van Dijk (Ed.), *Discourse Studies: Multidisciplinary Introduction* (pp. 206-230). Thomas Oak, CA: Sage.
- Chinwe, E. R. (2013). Analysis of experiential meaning in selected inaugural political speeches in Nigeria. *An International Journal of Language, Literature and Gender Studies*, 2 (1), 170-190.
- Cresswell, J. W. (2004). *Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative and Mixed Methods Approaches*. California: Sage.

- Crystal, D. (1992). *An Encyclopedic Dictionary of Language and Languages*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- David, M. K. & Dumanig, F. P. (2011). National unity in multiethnic Malaysia: A critical discourse analysis of Tun Mahathir's political speeches. *Language, Discourse and Society*, 1 (1), 11-31.
- Downing, A. & Locke, P. (2006). *English Grammar: A University Course*. (2nd ed). New York: Routledge.
- Du Gay, P. (1996). *Consumption and Identity at Work*. London: Sage Publications.
- Eggins, S. (2004). *An Introduction to Systemic Functional Linguistics*. (2nd ed.). London: Continuum.
- Eisenhart, C & Johnstone, B. (Eds.). (2008). *Discourse Analysis and Rhetorical Studies*. Amsterdam, Netherlands: John Benjamins Publishing Co.
- Fairclough, N. (1989). *Language and Power*. New York: Longman.
- _____. (1990). Critical Linguistics, New Times and Language Education. In R. Clark (Ed.), *Language and Power: Proceedings of the BAAL Annual meeting, Lancaster, 1989*. London: CILT.
- _____. (1992). *Discourse and Social Change*: Cambridge: Polity Press.
- _____. (1995). *Critical Discourse Analysis: The Critical Study of Language*. London: Longman.
- _____. (1996). Technologicalisation of Discourse. In C. Caldas-Coulthard & M. Coulthard (Eds.), *Text and Practices: Readings in Critical Discourse Analysis* (pp. 62-83). London : Routledge.
- _____. (2000). *New Labour, new language?* London: Routledge.

- _____. (2001). *Language and Power*. (2nd ed.). New York: Longman
- _____. (2003). *Analysing Discourse: Textual Analysis for social research*. London: Longman.
- _____. (2006). Tony Blair and language of politics. <http://www.opendemocracy.net/demo>.
- Fairclough, N., Muldering, J. & Wodak, R. (2011). Critical discourse analysis. In T. A. van Dijk (Ed.), *Discourse studies: A multidisciplinary introduction* (pp. 357-378). London: Sage Publications.
- Fairclough, N. & Wodak, R. (1997). *Critical Discourse Analysis: Discourse as social interaction*. London: Sage.
- Fasold, R. (1990). *Sociolinguistics of Language*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Figureido, D. D. C. (1998). Analysis of transitivity choices in five appellate decisions in rape cases. *Fragmentos*, 8 (1) : 97-113.
- Fiske, J. (1987). *Television culture*. London: Methuen.
- Folson, K. G. (1993). Ideology, Revolution and Development – The Years of Jerry John Rawlings. In E. Gyimah-Boadi (Ed.), *Ghana Under PNDC Rule* (pp. 74-99). Great Britain: CODESRIA
- Fowler, R. (1986). *Linguistic Criticism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- _____. (1991). *Language in the News: Discourse and Ideology in the Press*. London: Routledge.
- Fowler, R., Hodge, R., Kress, G. & Trew, T. (1979). *Language and Control*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- Frankel, J. R. & N. E. Wallen. (2000). *How to Design and Evaluate Research in Education* (4th ed.). U. S. A: McGraw-Hill.

- French, J. & Raven, B. (1959). The bases of social power. In D. Cartwright. (Ed.), *Studies in Social Power* (pp. 150-167). Ann Arbor: MI.
- Gauntlett, D. (2007). *Creative Explorations: New Approaches to Identities and Audiences*. London: Routledge.
- Geciene, I. (2002). The notion of power in the theories of Bourdieu, Foucault and Baudrillard. *Sociologija*, 2: 116-124.
- Gee, J. P. (1996). *Social Linguistics and Literacies: Ideology in Discourses*. (2nded.) London: Taylor and Francis.
- _____. (2004). Discourse analysis: What makes it critical? In R. Rogers (Ed.), *An Introduction to Critical Discourse Analysis in Education* (pp. 19-50). New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers.
- Giddens, A., Duneier, M. & Appelbaum, R. (2007). *Introduction to sociology*. London: W. W. Norton & Company Ltd.
- Graham, P., Keenam, T. & Dowd, A. M. (2004). A call to arms at the end of history: A discourse- historical analysis of George W. Bush's declaration of war on terror. *Discourse and Society*, 15 (2), 199-221.
- Gramsci, A. (1971). *Selections from the Prison Notebooks of Antonio Gramsci*. Translated by Q. Hoare and G. N. Smith. New York: International Publishers.
- Green, J. E. (2008). Max Weber and the reinvention of popular power. *Max Weber Studies*, 8 (2), 187-224.
- Guzzini, S. (2006). *Applying Bourdieu's framework of power analysis to international relations: Opportunities and limits*. A paper prepared for the 47th Annual Convention of the international Studies Association in Chicago.

- Habermas, J. (1984). *The Theory of Communicative Action- Reason and the Rationalization of Society* (vol. 1). Boston, MA: Beacon Press.
- Haig, E. (2009). *Applying systemic functional linguistics and critical discourse analysis to the investigation of ideology in a radio news bulletin*. Unpublished Ph.D thesis, Lancaster University.
- Hall, S. (1985). Signification, representation, ideology: Althusser and post-structural debates. *Critical Studies in Mass Communication*, 2 (2), 91-114.
- Halliday, M. A. K. (1994). *An Introduction to Functional Grammar* (2nd ed.). London: Hodder Arnold.
- Halliday, M. A. K. & Matthiessen, C. M. I. M. (2004). *An Introduction to Functional Grammar* (3rd ed.). London: Hodder Arnold.
- Haratyan, F. (2011). Halliday's SFL and social meaning. *2nd International Conference on Humanities, Historical and Social Sciences*, 17: 260-264.
- Henderson, R. (2005). A faircloughian approach to CDA: Principled eclecticism or a method searching for a theory? *Melbourne Studies in Education* 4 (2) 9-24. Melbourne: Melbourne University.
- Horvath, J. (2007). Pre 9/11 Inaugural address of President George W. Bush: A critical discourse analysis. *Topics in linguistics: Politeness and Interaction*, 1: 59-61.
- Hsieh, H. F. & Shannon, S. E. (2005). Three approaches to qualitative content analysis. *Qualitative Health Research*, 15 (9), 1277-1288.

- Huckin, T. N. (1997). Critical discourse analysis. In T. Miller (Ed.), *Functional Approaches to Written Text* (pp. 78-92). Washington CD: US State Department.
- Iwamoto, N. (1995). The analysis of war time reporting: Patterns of transitivity. *Edinburgh working papers in Applied Linguistics*, 6:58-68.
- Jager, S. (1999). *Kritische Diskursanalyse. Eine Einfuhrung*. Duisburg: Dissertation.
- Jenkins, R. (1992). *Pierre Bourdieu*. London: Routledge.
- Johnstone, B. (2002). *Discourse Analysis* (2nd ed.). Oxford: Blackwell.
- Jordan, H. L. H. (2011). *Portfolios and pedagogy: An examination of ideology and use*. Unpublished Ph. D. thesis, Michigan Technological University.
- Jorgensen, M & Philips, L. J. (2002). *Discourse analysis as theory and method*. London: Sage Publications.
- Kamalu, I. & Aganga, R. (2011). A critical discourse analysis of Goodluck Jonathan's declaration of interest in PDP presidential primaries. *Language, discourse and society*, 1 (1), 32-55.
- Kondowe, W. (2014). Presidents and ideologies: A transitivity analysis of Bingu wa Mutharika's inaugural address. *International Journal of Language and Linguistics*, 2 (3), 174-184.
- Kress, G. & Hodge, R. (1979). *Language as ideology*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- Lagonikos, I. T. (2005). *Ideology in editorials: A comparison of selected editorials in English medium newspapers after September 11*. Unpublished M. A. thesis, Rhodes University.

- Lamb, E. C. (2013). Power and resistance: New methods for analysis across genres in critical discourse analysis. *Discourse and Society*, 4 (3), 334-360.
- Lim, E. T. (2002). Five trends in presidential rhetoric: An analysis of rhetoric from Washington to Bill Clinton. *Presidential Studies Quarterly*, 32 (2), 328 -366.
- Link, J. (1983). *Elementare Literatur und generative Diskuranalyse*. Munchen: Fink.
- Lukac, M. (2011). Down to the bone: A corpus based critical discourse analysis. *Jezikoslovlje*, 12 (2), 187-209.
- Lukes, S. (1974). *Power: A Radical View*. Basingstoke: Macmillan.
- Macdonnell, D. (1986). *Theories of Discourse*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Mackenzie, K. (1983). *Democracy and Ghana: Selected Speeches of President Hilla Limann*. Accra: Westcoast Publishing House Ltd.
- Martins, J. C. (2007). *Prime Minister Tony Blair's speech at the annual Labour Party Conference 2003: An analysis of exigence and transitivity based on CDA and SFL*. Unpublished M.A dissertation, Universidade Federal de Santa Catarina.
- Matu, P. M. (2008). Transitivity as a tool for ideological analysis. *Journal of Ethnic Studies*, 25 (1), 199-212.
- McGregor, S. (2003). Critical science approach. *A primer*. Kappa Omicron Nu working papers series. (retrieved from kon.com/archives on 12-03-14)
- Mwinlaaru, I. N. (2012). *A stylistic study of characterisation in Chinua Achebe's Anthills of the Savannah: A functional-semantic approach*. Unpublished M. Phil. thesis, University of Cape Coast.

- Naz, S., Alvi, S. D. & Baseer, A. (2012). Political language of Benazir Bhutto: Transitivity analysis of her speech “Democratization in Pakistan.” *Interdisciplinary Journal of Contemporary Research in Business*, 4 (8): 125-141.
- Nedashkivsha, A. (2006). Presidential speeches and process of language democratization in contemporary Ukraine. *Asees*, 20 (1-2), 39-65.
- Obeng, S. (1979). *Selected Speeches of Kwame Nkrumah*. Ghana: Afram Publications Ltd.
- Ocquaye, M. (2004). *Politics in Ghana: Rawlings, Revolution & Populist Democracy*. Accra: Tornado Publications.
- Opoku Mensah, E. (2008). *The use of metaphor as rhetorical device in some selected political speeches of Martin Luther King Jnr and Kwame Nkrumah: A comparative study*. An unpublished M. Phil. thesis, University of Cape Coast.
- Parker, I. (1992). *Discourse dynamics: Critical analysis for social and individual psychology*. London: Routledge.
- Pellow, D. & Chazan, N. (1986). *Ghana: Coping with uncertainty*. Michigan: Westview Press.
- Polito, R. S. (2011). Language and power in blogging. A critical discourse analysis. *Society and Culture*, 21:282-286.
- Reactions to June 4 speech. (2001, June 8). *Daily Graphic*, p. 1.
- Renkema, J. (2004). *Introduction to discourse studies*. Philadelphia, PA: Benjamins.
- Resnick, D. (2010). Populist strategies in African democracies. *United Nations University working paper*, no. 114. Helsinki: UNU-WIDER.

- Rogers, R. (2004). An introduction to critical discourse analysis in education. In R. Rogers (Ed.), *An Introduction to Critical Discourse Analysis in Education* (pp. 1-18). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Rothchild, D. (1985). The Rawlings Revolution in Ghana: Pragmatism with populist rhetoric. *CSIS Africa Notes*, 42: 1-6.
- Schaffner, C. (1996). Editorial: Political speeches and discourse analysis. *Current Issues in Language and Society*, 3(3), 201-204.
- Shayegh, K. & Nabifar, N. (2012). Power in the political discourse of Barack Obama. *Journal of Basic and Applied Scientific Research*, 2 (4) 3481-3491.
- Shillington, K. (1992). *Ghana and the Rawlings Factor*. London: Macmillan Press.
- Stubbs, M. (1983). *Discourse Analysis: The Sociolinguistic Analysis of Natural Language*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- _____. (1998). Judging the facts: an analysis of one text in its institutional context. In J. Cheshire & P. Trudgill (Eds.), *The Sociolinguistics Reader*, Volume 2 (pp. 348-367). London: Arnold.
- Temitope, B. (2013). An investigation of the language of Nigerian People's Parliament. In A. D. Akoh & S. E. Ingebe (Eds.), *Arts, Culture and Communication in a postcolony: A festschrift for Lawrence Olanrele Bamidele* (pp. 229-243). United Kingdom: Alpha Crownes Publishers.
- Van Dijk, T. A. (2000). *Ideology and Discourse: Multidisciplinary introduction* (retrieved from [http:// www.discourse-in-society.org.org/ideo-dis2-htm](http://www.discourse-in-society.org/org/ideo-dis2-htm))

- _____. (2001). Multidisciplinary CDA: a plea for diversity. In R. Wodak and M. Meyer (Eds.), *Methods of critical discourse analysis* (pp. 95-120). London: Sage.
- _____. (2004). Politics, ideology and discourse. Retrieved on February 16, 2013 from <http://www.discourse-in-society.org/teun.html>.
- _____. (2007). Political discourse and racism: Describing others in western parliaments. In S. H. Riggin (Ed.), *The Language and Politics of Exclusions* (pp. 31-64). London: Sage.
- _____. (2008). *Discourse and Power: Contributions to Critical Discourse Studies*. Houndmills: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Wacquant, L. J. D. (1992). How to read Bourdieu. In P. Bourdieu & L. J. D. Wacquant (Eds.), *An Invitation to Reflexive Sociology* (pp. 261-264). Chicago: Chicago University Press.
- Weber, M. (1978). *Economy and Society: An Outline of Interpretive Sociology*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Weintraub, M. (2007). The formative power of wartime rhetoric: A critical discursive analysis of presidential speeches. *Gnovis Journal*, 8 (1): 47-63.
- Windt, T. O. (1986). Presidential rhetoric: Definition of a field of study. *The Media and the Presidential Studies Quarterly*, winter, 16 (1): 102-116.
- Wodak, R. (1995). Critical linguistics and critical discourse analysis. In *Handbook of Pragmatics* (pp. 204-210). Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Wodak, R. (2001). What is CDA about? In R. Wodak & M. Meyer (Eds.), *Methods of critical discourse analysis* (pp. 1-13). London: Sage.

Wodak, R. (2008). Introduction: Discourse studies- important concepts and terms. In R. Wodak & M. Krzyzanowski (Eds.), *Qualitative Discourse Analysis in the Social Sciences* (pp. 1-29). Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

APPENDIX A

Full Text of 1989 June 4 Speech

¹Members of the PNDC, Secretaries of State, Your Excellencies, Niimeɪ,

²Fellow Citizens and Youth of Ghana,

³I wish to first express my appreciation to the children and youth of Ghana for

⁴this gymnastic display, which this year, departed from the pattern set by

⁵previous ones by deriving its inspiration from our cultural heritage. I say

⁶Ayekoo.

⁷My brothers and sisters,

⁷Every people's greatness and progress are derived from their culture.

⁸Unfortunately, however, we have tended to suppress and look down on what

⁹is our own, and that which should sustain the very essence of our national

¹⁰character, in the blind and suicidal pursuit of that which belongs to others.

¹¹And in our desperate wish to be accepted by others, we have not only

¹²unthinkingly copied alien cultures, but we have grafted onto ourselves the

¹³negative and destructive aspects of those cultures – aspects that their owners

¹⁴themselves are anxious to get rid of.

¹⁵I would like to believe that what we have seen here today and the portrayal

¹⁶of our culture by the younger generation which we have witnessed in recent

¹⁷years during our Independence Anniversary parades, is the beginning of the

¹⁸making of a new Ghanaian – a Ghanaian who will not always look for the

¹⁹approval and acceptance from outside in order to justify his or her actions

²⁰and behaviour, a Ghanaian who will not be afraid to fetch from deep inside

²¹himself or herself, the essence of our culture, to do things in our way, the

²²Ghanaian way, without making apologies to anyone.

²³That is the spirit of June 4.

²⁴It is not merely about the principles of accountability, of social justice, of

²⁵participating in the decision making process. It is a call to rediscover our

²⁶own. To take inspiration from our past, to rely on what we have and to build

²⁷a future in which our social, economic and political relationships will reflect

²⁸the true essence, the values, and the beauty of our Ghanaian, African culture.

²⁹As we celebrate the 8th Anniversary of June 4 through these activities, let us

³⁰again be reminded that we can only reap what we sow. Therefore the great

³¹future which we seek for ourselves as a people, can only come about through

³²hardwork, discipline and orderliness.

³³I wish you well.

³⁴Mi ha Ghanabii fee omanyee.

APPENDIX B

Full text of the 1991 June 4 Speech

¹I would like to extend greetings to all who have participated in the route
²march and assembled here in this impressive show of militant solidarity
³between our security services and our civilian counterparts.

⁴As you know, today is the 12th Anniversary of the June 4 Uprising and it is
⁵appropriate once again to pay tribute to the memory of all those who laid
⁶down their lives for the cause of the noble ideals of June 4.

⁷It is my hope that this anniversary will refreshen the memories of those who
⁸were old enough to appreciate the situation in which our nation was and the
⁹events that triggered the explosive actions of June 4, 1979.

¹⁰It is also my hope that those who were unborn or o young perhaps to
¹¹understand the events have now grown up to appreciate what we have been
¹²through as a people. This will imbue in them the courage and determination
¹³to resist, even at the risk of their sacred lives, the recurrence of those
¹⁴conditions that allowed only a tiny group of people to take our country for a
¹⁵ride.

¹⁶The popular revolt of June 4, 1979 was part of our struggle for moral
¹⁷decency as well as for a democratic society in which the voice of each and
¹⁸every Ghanaian will matter in the decision-making process of government.

¹⁹The courageous men and women who inspired and participated in the events
²⁰of that era were militant and democratically minded citizens whose
²¹passionate desire was to the realization of true freedom and social justice.

²²That era has therefore come to constitute a new chapter in our history. It has
²³defined among others, new parameters and code of behaviour for those
²⁴entrusted with the responsibilities at the political, community, management
²⁵and workplace levels.

²⁶Those principles of probity and accountability which June 4 placed on our
²⁷national political agenda will remain yardsticks for measuring dedication to
²⁸the cause of our motherland.

²⁹Ladies and gentlemen, in response to the democratic yearnings of the June 4
³⁰era, the PNDC has since 31st December 1981 sustained a programme of
³¹democratic reforms intended to create new structures and institutions that
³²will give meaning to the aspirations of our people as we continue our
³³determined struggle for a just and democratic country.

³⁴Through our District Assemblies, the organs of the revolution, through
³⁵constant interaction with the people at durbars, seminars, etc. we have sought
³⁶to establish the conditions for the realization of democracy, freedom, justice
³⁷and accountability.

³⁸It is the passionate desire of the PNDC to ensure that the programme of
³⁹democratic reforms leads to the creation of an open society in which the
⁴⁰pluralism of ideas will be harnessed for national development. And in
⁴¹furtherance to this, the PNDC has announced measures to intensify the
⁴²democratic process and guarantee this country a peaceful transition peaceful
⁴³to constitutional rule.

⁴⁴However there are some individuals and groups who want to advocate a
⁴⁵violent road to our political future. Such anarchists and confusionists
⁴⁶sometimes pretend to speak in the name of democracy and yet their activities
⁴⁷betray them as real enemies of democracy.

⁴⁸When the 31st December Revolution was launched, we had some of those
⁴⁹anarchists, extremists, and confusionists among us. With time and as the
⁵⁰revolution matured, their slogans and clichés and their lunatic ideas became
⁵¹irrelevant. They had to leave because we refused to condone their attempts to
⁵²introduce anarchy in the name of revolution into this country.

⁵³Many of such anarchists are reappearing this time dressed in a cloak as
⁵⁴democrats because they find it convenient to do so. Of course, they have
⁵⁵teamed up with others in their own political ambitions but who have
⁵⁶contributed nothing nor sacrificed anything towards the modest
⁵⁷achievements we have made in the past nine years. Such people have
⁵⁸nothing to lose by forcing this country along the path of violence.

⁵⁹Countrymen and women, let me explain that very constructive criticisms in
⁶⁰an open society is not the same as the attempts being made to incite violence
⁶¹and provoke disturbances to destabilize our national unity, peace and
⁶²stability.

⁶³I wish to make it clear that there is a heavy price to be paid if violence is the
⁶⁴way by which some wish to pursue their political agenda in this country.

⁶⁵Those people must look elsewhere for another theatre of operation because
⁶⁶they will not be allowed to disturb the peace of mind which Ghanaians have
⁶⁷been enjoying over the years.

⁶⁸Most Ghanaian families have had to struggle for the little they now have, and
⁶⁹we deem it our duty to protect them from the careless and irresponsible
⁷⁰adventures of political extremists and power hungry politicians.

⁷¹Let us remember today that the June 4 and 31st December Revolution linked
⁷²together have created conditions in which the majority of our people can
⁷³look forward to the future with hope.

⁷⁴Out of the numerous opportunities created for the economic growth and
⁷⁵personal advancement, most Ghanaians now feel secure within their own
⁷⁶country.

⁷⁷Gone are the days when some denied their Ghanaian nationality because of
⁷⁸the level our nation had sunk to. Businessmen, traders, and others have
⁷⁹recovered their sense of security, and they acknowledge that for the first time
⁸⁰their investments are safe in this country. Admittedly there are others who
⁸¹have felt insecure since June 4 and 31st ⁸²December Revolution.

⁸²Ironically, they are the very ones whose greed, arrogance and disdain for the
⁸³common man were responsible for the insecurity of their own brothers and
⁸⁴sisters in Ghana. Such persons have failed to realize that a new wind of
⁸⁵change is blowing in Ghana today. They have found it difficult to realize the
⁸⁶ideals and principles behind the processes initiated by June 4 and 31st
⁸⁷December Revolution are irreversible. They have found it difficult to

⁸⁸concede the possibility there might be others who have not deceived the
⁸⁹people about their intentions as they did in the past. And how soon they
⁹⁰forget that those who live in glass houses do not throw stones.

⁹¹Fellow citizens, we shall continue to be flexible and accommodate such
⁹²people and give them opportunities to feel secure to contribute their quota to
⁹³national development.

⁹⁴Indeed, we will continue to pursue the policy of reconciliation and hold out a
⁹⁵hand to all who genuinely seek to contribute to the development, stability
⁹⁶and peace of this country.

⁹⁷However, no one must take the people of this country for granted or imagine
⁹⁸that the essence of our struggles can be violated with impunity. Let me
⁹⁹remind you all that on June 4 the people forced the door open for the
¹⁰⁰ordinary man to assert his democratic right to participate in the decision
¹⁰¹making process. That door will remain permanently open.

¹⁰²Gallant officers and men of the Armed Forces, the Police and other security
¹⁰³services, on this day, the nation salutes you and pays special tribute to those
¹⁰⁴who sacrificed their lives fighting a just cause for the people.

¹⁰⁵I am aware of how committed you the officers are to defend the
¹⁰⁶achievements made. Over the past twelve years you have played a unique
¹⁰⁷role in bringing about stability and peace in our country.

¹⁰⁸You have proved your commitment to ensuring stability, democracy and
¹⁰⁹peace not only in Ghana but in Lebanon and in Liberia; countries so far

¹¹⁰away from and or families and others. I commend you all for your
¹¹¹distinguished achievements and sacrifices for peace in the world.

¹¹²My brothers and sisters of the revolutionary organs, I salute you also and
¹¹³commend you for the immense contributions you have made towards
¹¹⁴consolidating the gains of June 4. This must be an occasion to search for
¹¹⁵ourselves and in the true spirit of self criticism put our own house in order.

¹¹⁶The conduct and image of cadres and the revolutionary organs are important
¹¹⁷at all times, and you should see yourselves as missionaries who must
¹¹⁸cherish and live by the ideals of June 4.

¹¹⁹By becoming revolutionaries as you know we have imposed on ourselves
¹²⁰standards which we must strive at all times to achieve, and we must also
¹²¹judge ourselves severely when we violate the code of the Revolution.

¹²²Countrymen and women, as a people who experienced the convulsions of
¹²³June 4, it is important for each individual who occupies a position of trust
¹²⁴now or those who may do so in the future bear the lessons and legacy of that
¹²⁵era in mind.

¹²⁶Let this be a day for sober reflection for each and everyone of us. And let
¹²⁷this be an occasion to rekindle the burning desire of June 4 to restore to our
¹²⁸people freedom, social justice, and a dignified role for the common man in
¹²⁹the affairs of the nation.

¹³⁰On behalf of our fellow citizens, I salute you all and wish you a happy
¹³¹anniversary. Long Live June 4. Long Live 31st December. Long Live the

¹³²solidarity that unites us. Long Live freedom, Justice and Accountability.

¹³³Long Live Ghana.

APPENDIX C

Full Text of 1993 June 4 Speech

¹Countrymen and women, today we meet to recall June Four and to reflect on
²what it stands for in our nation's history. Fourteen years is long enough for a
³new generation of young men and women to have arisen, full of the eagerness
⁴to combat injustice and build new worlds.

⁵The events of June 4, 1979 were a reaction against the failure of those who at
⁶that time, were the mature leaders in government, in the military, in positions
⁷of influence and power, to address the concerns of the common people.

⁸What took place on that day and the following three months was a great cry
⁹of anger against those individuals and institutions which had failed to stem
¹⁰the tide of all- pervading corruption, ineptitude and injustice which was
¹¹steadily strangling our people, or had pretended, from their secure and
¹²comfortable vantage-points, that it did not exist.

¹³The lessons of June Four, as we look back after 14 years, must be engraved
¹⁴on our hearts, and the principles of June Four must be evident in our actions,
¹⁵if we are to keep faith with the new generation.

¹⁶If any of us should fall into complacency or ignore the fact that our first duty
¹⁷is to the disadvantaged, the humble and those who have the simple dignity
¹⁸and work hardened hands of our farmers and fishermen, then the new
¹⁹generation has every right to hold us in the same contempt as shown to those
²⁰who created the conditions which brought about the eruption of the June
²¹Four.

²²Fellow Ghanaians, what are the lessons of June Four? One is that the heat of
²³rejecting that which is unacceptable cannot, of itself, build that which is
²⁴acceptable.

²⁵In the heat of the uprising, the ordinary people made it abundantly clear that
²⁶they rejected cheating, injustice and oppression. They glimpsed a vision of a
²⁷future of dignity and social justice.

²⁸But few of us at that time realised how long and laborious would be the
²⁹painstaking and sometimes painful process of working towards that vision,
³⁰of putting in place, the practical measures needed to build a truly
³¹participatory democracy, an orderly economy and a more equitable society.

³²Indeed, that task was not begun until after 31st December, more than two
³³years later, and it still continues.

³⁴Some of us did not learn that lesson. They regarded the necessary change
³⁵from dismantling what was unacceptable to constructively building the
³⁶foundations of a better society as a U-turn, a betrayal of the Revolution. But
³⁷those who think that Revolution is an end in itself are the agents of disorder.
³⁸Revolution means to turn around, to change to a new direction and pursue
³⁹that new direction.

⁴⁰There are some today, who have not learned that lesson. They seek to
⁴¹disrupt, destroy or vilify whatever they dislike, whether justifiably or not, but
⁴²without offering any workable alternative, even in theory, much less in
⁴³practice.

⁴⁴Countrymen and women, another lesson of June Four is that when the
⁴⁵suppressed anger of the people finally explodes in the face of injustice, the
⁴⁶anger for justice drowns the compassion for mercy.

⁴⁷In an ideal world, the empowerment of the people need not come from the
⁴⁸violent catharsis of mass uprising, but through peaceful change. But one way
⁴⁹or another, it will inevitably come. What matters is the recognition that with
⁵⁰the empowerment goes responsibility, and with responsibility hard work,
⁵¹criticism and little reward, except for the satisfaction of seeing the steady
⁵²growth of a more just and orderly society.

⁵³Fellow citizens, the flame that blazed on June Four is still alight.

⁵⁴That first fierce fire, that eruption of pent-up frustration and anger, has
⁵⁵cooled and its energies have been turned towards the development and
⁵⁶advancement of our nation.

⁵⁷But in the heart of each one of us must burn a small clear flame, the flame of
⁵⁸June Four, which must light our path and be ready to move in defence of
⁵⁹justice, integrity and the rights of our people.

⁶⁰As we celebrate this 14th anniversary of June Four Uprising, let us reaffirm
⁶¹our commitment to the non-negotiable principles which the turbulent events
⁶²of that time established in our collective memory.

⁶³Let us also remember all those who lost their lives, those who sacrificed, and
⁶⁴the hundreds of thousands of men and women all over the country who have
⁶⁵quietly and tirelessly worked over these years and without whose
⁶⁶commitment our nation could not have regained her dignity and pride.

⁶⁷Once again, fellow countrymen, I would like to take this opportunity to say a
⁶⁸big 'thank you' for the massive votes in our favour. This act absolves the
⁶⁹action of June 4.

⁷⁰And to you members of the Armed Forces and the Security Services, may I
⁷¹also say a special 'thank you' for giving this country the gift of divine
⁷²justice. Thank you.

APPENDIX D

Full Text of 2000 June 4 Speech

¹Fellow Warriors, Countrymen and Women, Once again we are gathered here
²to honour the memory of our fallen comrades who gave their lives in the
³struggle to re-define the principles and conditions for national development in
⁴our country.

⁵This year's celebration of the 21st Anniversary of June 4 is of particular
⁶significance in several respects.

⁷Firstly, this is the last time I am celebrating this momentous event with you,
⁸in my capacity as the Head of State of this country. But, as I stated at the
⁹recent Congress of the NDC, the end of my term as the President does not
¹⁰mean the end of my commitment to the progress of our country and welfare
¹¹of our people. In this regard, June 4 and its principles and achievements are
¹²my everlasting creed. I have every intention of celebrating future anniversary
¹³of June 4 with you.

¹⁴Secondly, our celebration today of the event this year demonstrates our
¹⁵determination to carry the June 4 principles of probity, accountability and
¹⁶social justice into the new millennium to underscore our determination to
¹⁷carry with us these valuable lessons into the challenges of the future.

¹⁸Ladies and Gentlemen, over the years, there have been deliberate press
¹⁹distortions and political propaganda about June 4, 1979. But one fact that
²⁰cannot be wiped away is that it was the revolt that brought about a decisive
²¹turning point in Ghana's long and difficult march towards real political

²²democracy, social justice, human dignity and economic welfare for all our
²³people.

²⁴My Brothers and sisters, every nation on earth has, at one time or another,
²⁵had to go through the cleansing experience that we undertook on June 4
²⁶1979. The very history of the world teaches us that whether it is Europe,
²⁷America, Russia, China, Latin America, the North or South Africa,
²⁸revolutions have taken place in the just struggle either for national political
²⁹independence in demand for class or ethnic or religious equality, or for the
³⁰majority's rejection of the gross abuse of power and exploitation at the hands
³¹of the privileged minority.

³²In Ghana, our gallant soldiers rejected the tradition of political instability,
³³moral decay and economic mismanagement that had been nurtured by years
³⁴of irresponsible governance. They rejected as unbecoming of a great Nation
³⁵like Ghana, its lost international stature and fast declining prospects for
³⁶socio-economic development.

³⁷Where such historic political events like the 28th February 1948 Osu Cross-
³⁸roads shooting incident and Osagyefo Kwame Nkrumah's positive action set
³⁹the scene for our struggle for freedom from British colonial bondage, the
⁴⁰June 4 Uprising and 31st December Revolution relocated the path of our
⁴¹nation building on the basis of concern for the welfare of the ordinary
⁴²Ghanaian.

⁴³Where our independence from British colonialism in 1957 was exploited by
⁴⁴our indigenous rulers in their own interests, June 4 reminded these rulers that
⁴⁵real power should rest in the hands of the ordinary people.

⁴⁶Where independence unleashed our insatiable thirst for freedom at the
⁴⁷expense of justice, as happened through the 1960s and 1970s, June 4
⁴⁸reminded us that social justice for the majority and the probity of leaders
⁴⁹should not be sacrificed for the privileges of a few. There can be no lasting
⁵⁰freedom without justice.

⁵¹Where, after independence, the institutions of State, the security agencies,
⁵²the public service and our economic production units were all systematically
⁵³destroyed through the corruption and mal-administration of the elite, June 4
⁵⁴and 31st December came to restore the security of persons and property,
⁵⁵disciplined conduct, accountability of persons in authority and the
⁵⁶productivity of our economy.

⁵⁷Ladies and Gentlemen, for today and for future, it is the principles of June 4
⁵⁸that provide the point of reference in our people's perception and judgement
⁵⁹of the conduct and performance of all public officials. And to the extent that
⁶⁰both critics and supporters of June 4 use these principles to judge our strides
⁶¹in the nation building, we can say that the principles definitely go beyond
⁶²revolutionary rhetoric. They have become the bedrock of Ghana's moral and
⁶³political philosophy. Therefore, our celebration of the 21st Anniversary of
⁶⁴June 4 should direct our attention to the forces that are strenuously trying to
⁶⁵erode those principles.

⁶⁶Fellow Warriors, Brothers and Sisters, ever since we established
⁶⁷constitutional government with real democracy and meaningful freedoms
⁶⁸that have been enjoyed in our political history, there has been creeping the
⁶⁹canker of civil lawlessness, the politics of attrition, and other socially

⁷⁰divisive and destructive tendencies that spelled the doom of previous
⁷¹governments in the country. But I still have faith in the common decency of
⁷²the average Ghanaian and will, therefore, not draw the hasty conclusion that
⁷³we are incapable of learning from our past mistakes.

⁷⁴At the same time, I must warn that if we persist in interpreting our current
⁷⁵democratic freedoms as a licence to cause civil and industrial unrest without
⁷⁶reasonable cause, abuse and vilify decent people, none of us will survive the
⁷⁷serious upheaval that will definitely come as the consequence.

⁷⁸The lawlessness on our roads resulting in the death of people, the general
⁷⁹level of indiscipline, disrespect for authority and disregard for social values –
⁸⁰all these are indirectly a consequence of what some people have set out to do
⁸¹to undermine the authority of this government by encouraging civil disorder.

⁸²In both June 4, 1979 and December 31, 1981 upheavals, it was our soldiers
⁸³who paid a price with their lives. If there should be another upheaval - and
⁸⁴God forbid- the civilian front will pay too heavy a price. This is why a
⁸⁵review of some aspects of our laws and constitution is necessary to address
⁸⁶the injustices and indiscipline which are weakening our social fabric.

⁸⁷My Brothers and Sisters, we in government have demonstrated our
⁸⁸commitment to fight corruption and crime. I have not hesitated to invoke
⁸⁹constitutional procedures and apply legal and administrative measures
⁹⁰against high-level government functionaries and other public officials
⁹¹against whom allegations of corruption and abuse of office have been made
⁹²and substantively established.

⁹³Ironically, when I have called for the application of the same principles and
⁹⁴measures against private persons who have stolen billions of Cedis or
⁹⁵violently abused the rights of others, the private media and political
⁹⁶opponents, who are very loud in their criticism of the government's fight
⁹⁷against corruption and crime, are the very ones that come to the defence of
⁹⁸the criminals. Indeed, any time that the saboteurs of our economy and other
⁹⁹criminals have been found out, their defence strategy has been to lobby
¹⁰⁰the private press to publish articles and run editorial comments that
¹⁰¹whitewash the criminals as saints. For how long should we tolerate this?

¹⁰²The same conspiracy by our political opponents and their media to aid, abet
¹⁰³or condone the criminal destruction of the conditions for national progress
¹⁰⁴that June 4 and December 31 gave to this country is observed in the national
¹⁰⁵fight against the rampant civil lawlessness that has been creeping since
¹⁰⁶1992.

¹⁰⁷We all know that our Police Service is severely handicapped in the fight
¹⁰⁸against crime. And we have been working hard to rectify the situation.
¹⁰⁹Meanwhile, to prevent the degeneration of the situation, we have detailed
¹¹⁰military units to assist the crime-fighting activities of the Police, whenever
¹¹¹the situation demands such assistance.

¹¹²Our political opponents have irresponsibly sought to turn this military
¹¹³assistance into a propaganda platform, first to poison the minds of the
¹¹⁴public against the military and, second and ultimately, to make the country
¹¹⁵ungovernable so that they can come to power through the confusion they
¹¹⁶hope to create.

¹¹⁷I say this to them. Under no circumstance should they entertain the notion
¹¹⁸that we will allow them to turn the clock of progress back. There is no way
¹¹⁹that we are going to stand idle while they create civil strife or exploit
¹²⁰criminal activities and anarchy as their only means of coming to power. If
¹²¹they will not join us in fighting the social evils and would not stand aside
¹²²for those willing to fight, then they must be prepared for the fallout.

¹²³As a government that has worked hard to achieve peace and stability to this
¹²⁴nation for almost twenty years, we will not do anything that will create
¹²⁵political uncertainty and undermine the confidence of the international
¹²⁶community in our country. For this reason, we have remained tolerant in the
¹²⁷face of downright provocations from the opposition. I will entreat the noble
¹²⁸elders, chiefs and queenmothers of this country to advise those involved on
¹²⁹the need for sobriety for the sake of our common future.

¹³⁰Fellow Countrymen and Women, I have said before that the social, political
¹³¹and economic renaissance that June 4 created for our country did not come
¹³²without the unfortunate loss of some innocent lives. I have personally
¹³³expressed regret for the excesses.

¹³⁴It is, therefore, very unfortunate that some persons who claim to have been
¹³⁵injured by the event have allowed themselves to be used as tools in the
¹³⁶partisan politics of attrition that has been the strategy of opponents of the
¹³⁷government.

¹³⁸Yet, it is very interesting that these people who want to carry the cudgels of
¹³⁹revenge to the point of political instability and social disunity have been

¹⁴⁰found out to be the indulging in the nefarious acts of bribery, corruption, etc
¹⁴¹which precipitated June 4.

¹⁴²In as much as these people condemn us, they must realise that posterity will
¹⁴³absolve us through the evidence of their own crimes against our nation.

¹⁴⁴My dear countrymen and women, a revolution is a process. It is not a one-
¹⁴⁵time act that suddenly removes all economic and social problems that the
¹⁴⁶nation faces. We will, therefore, need to persist in the struggle to overcome
¹⁴⁷the economic problems we face as the result of several factors, including the
¹⁴⁸drastic fall in the price of our export commodities and the sharp increases in
¹⁴⁹the price of our crude oil imports.

¹⁵⁰We are aware of the hardships that many families are facing today on the
¹⁵¹account of the economic difficulties the country is going through. We have
¹⁵²been truthful to admit this and we have explained to you the causes of these
¹⁵³economic setbacks. We are implementing appropriate measures to stabilize
¹⁵⁴the situation particularly in respect of the cedi.

¹⁵⁵As a government, we are committed to listening and working together with
¹⁵⁶organized groups which have useful suggestions to offer and whose views
¹⁵⁷are dictated by the wider national interest.

¹⁵⁸But I must express reservations about the activities of those with perceived
¹⁵⁹credibility - and unfortunately so – in reality have nothing to offer this
¹⁶⁰country except to capitalize on the economic setbacks to plunge this country
¹⁶¹into political darkness.

¹⁶¹We can articulate our concerns and seek redress for our grievances without
¹⁶²breaking down society.

¹⁶³My Fellow Warriors, Cadres of the Progressive Voluntary Organizations,
¹⁶⁴June 4 belongs to you. We found ourselves at the forefront of the uprising
¹⁶⁵because you placed us there.

¹⁶⁶June 4 deserves a medal in the list of Ghanaian historic events. It has
¹⁶⁷become an institutional event and must remain so. The commemorative
¹⁶⁸medal you will receive today, therefore, must serve as constant reminder to
¹⁶⁹preserve the best that June brought out in us.

¹⁷⁰For you cadres of the PVOs, your medals will come in the form of
¹⁷¹certificates which will serve as the symbol of our covenant to protect the
¹⁷²ideals of June 4.

¹⁷³I wish you all the best. God bless us all.