Review Article

Interactional Linguistic Resources in Concession Speeches: An appraisal of Selected Political Leaders in Ghana and the United States of America

Jerous Smith Mesu [1,*], Joseph Amonoo Sekyi [2], Daniel Arkoh Fenyi [1], Diana Asiedu [3]

[1] Department of languages, Enchi college of education, Enchi, Ghana

[2] Department of languages, Komenda college of education, Komenda, Ghana

[3] Department of languages, St. Louis college of education, Kumasi, Ghana

*Correspondence: bordohlity@yahoo.co.uk

Abstract: The purpose of the study was to examine the interactional linguistic resources in concession speeches of Selected Political Leaders in Ghana and the United States of America. The past three decades have witnessed an increasing scholarly interest in political discourse. Despite this, concession speeches have received limited scholarly attention. This study, therefore, comparatively analyzed the concession speeches delivered by John Dramani Mahama and Nana Addo Danquah Akuffo-Addo of Ghana and Hillary Clinton and Al Gore of the United States of America. Speech Act and Metadiscourse Interactionist Theories were used to examine the interpersonal linguistic resources found in the speeches. The speeches, were analyzed qualitatively. The study concluded that speakers of CSs in the two different cultural contexts use similar statements, as has already been discussed earlier in this study. For instance, the four losing candidates used almost the same interpersonal linguistic resources (*hedges, boosters, self-mention, attitude markers, and engagement markers*) to establish a bond between them and their interlocutors and supporters. It is recommended that, concession speeches (CSs) to be studied from other theoretical perspectives, this will allow for a detailed analysis of a wider range of linguistic resources such as noun phrases, verb phrases, and the use of adjuncts, beyond the SAs in CSs in order not to treat them as mere rhetoric in politics.

Keywords: Linguistic Resources, Concession Speeches, Political Leaders

1. Introduction

Language is used in performing various functions during pre-elections, elections, and post-elections in various democracies. On election days, citizens of democratic countries vote for their preferred candidate or party. Whether their decision goes along with a political conviction or not, it is most likely to be based on communication through language. All political systems, from autocratic, through oligarchic to democratic, leaders have relied on the spoken word to convince others of the benefits that arise from their leadership [1]. During election campaigns, the ideas and orientation of a political party are brought to bear through language, one of the most important sign systems of humans. Language also possesses an inherent quality of reciprocity that distinguishes it from any other sign systems [2]. In recent times, political speeches (PSs) have attracted much scholarly attention because of their central place in the organization and management of society in local and national governance.

Since PSs play a crucial role in the lives of nations all over the world, a linguistic study of such a vital corpus is worthwhile. This is because communication is a very powerful mechanism for social control; the attitudes of citizens, whether to favour or to oppose some national policies, are greatly shaped by the kind of speech delivered to them. Since a speech act is the basic unit of linguistic communication, understanding the speech acts

in PSs is paramount in our quest to appreciating the social attitudes of the citizenry towards socio-economic activities. Obviously, citizens are best controlled by such speeches to rally support for government policies [3]. It is, therefore, imperative that scholars in developing economies like Ghana begin to pay much attention to PSs, especially concession speeches (CSs) of presidential candidates, to understand their communicative functions in the light of the social contexts in which they are produced.

Although political CSs may be a relatively new area of research for scholars, researchers, and students in Africa, they have long been very common in the United States of America (USA) because democracy in America, as far as we know, is more than two hundred years. In Ghana, in particular, and Africa, in general, conceding defeat is not as easy as in America, and losers of elections are sometimes persuaded to concede by eminent citizens in the country and the international community. Though political speech genres such as inaugural speeches have been widely studied by scholars and researchers in America, CSs have attracted less attention. In Africa, too, as far as I know, either very few studies or none exists on CSs. Besides, speech act (SA) analysis of post-election speeches of Ghana, in particular, and Africa in general, have received very scanty attention.

Even with these, many of the data sets have tended to be speeches of non-African presidents, for example, the speech of President Ronald Reagan of the United States of America and revealed how the President was calling for action against communism, to the people of West Berlin and the world [4]. Many of the studies done on PSs of diverse kinds have focused on the linguistic choices made to represent events in a way that fits the ideology of the politicians, and to exhibit power. Only few scholars and researchers have attempted to investigate the communicative force (i.e., the illocutionary speech acts) carried in such linguistic choices [5, 6-7]. Given that very little attention has been paid to CSs, either in one or two cultural settings, the present study aims to investigate linguistic resources of CSs presented by two Ghanaian presidential candidates (namely, Nana Addo Dankwa Akuffo-Addo and John Dramani Mahama) and two American presidential candidates (namely, Al Gore and Hillary Clinton). Hence, as a cross-cultural study, it seeks to fill the gap in the literature linguistic resources on CSs, particularly, of Ghanaian and American presidents. The study sought to answer the research question - How are interpersonal linguistic resources used by the selected political leaders in Ghana and the United States of America with regard to Concession Speeches?

2. Materials and Methods

Qualitatively descriptive research design was used for the study. The researchers explored the meaning of Concession Speeches (CSs) delivered by four political leaders in Ghana (Nana Akuffo-Addo and President Mahama) and America (AL Gore and Hillary Clinton). These four CSs from different political leaders reflect speeches from two different cultural backgrounds and different political history. The researchers seek to understand the content of the linguistic resources of these CSs. All the four speeches were purposively selected for the study. Secondary documents were main instruments for the study. Reliability and Validity of the linguistic resources of the study were examined. The four tutors of English from different colleges carefully identified the metadiscourse resources, using the text *Metadiscourse* [8]. The four speeches were closely read by the above teachers who took keen interest in the study. Three other raters apart from the researchers, were engaged in the identification of speech acts for authenticity. The table in Appendix A shows how the SAs identified by the researchers were rated by the three teachers of English. Though there were differences amongst the raters about the classification of the speech acts (SAs), those differences were ironed out after scrutiny of the various sentences. The qualitative data was analysed by the use of the interpretative method based on the themes arrived at during the document analysis. The themes were related to the research question.

3. Results and Discussions

3.1. Interactional Linguistic Resources in Concession Speeches

The second research question of the study deals with the interactional linguistic resources used by the speakers and the affectual meaning of the texts. The linguistic resources identified and analyzed include self-mention, hedging, boosters, attitudinal markers and engagement markers in the selected speeches. The discussion of the research question is based on Interactional Metadiscourse Theory which helps the researchers to deal with the interpersonal linguistic resources used in the selected data. Table 1 shows the frequency distribution of interactional resources in the CSs analyzed:

Table 1. Distribution and Frequency of Interactional Resources in CSs

Resources	Nana Addo	John Mahama	Hilary Clinton	Al Gore	TOTAL
Hedges	5	14	15	6	40
Boosters	5	2	13	13	33
Self-Mention	63	86	128	83	360
Attitude Markers	5	3	3	22	66
Engagement Markers	33	53	97	40	223
Total	111	158	256	164	689

Table 1 shows the distribution and frequency of Interactional Resources in the CSs for the study. From the table, NCS made use of 5 hedges, 5 boosters, 63 self-mention, 5 attitude markers and 33 engagement markers. MCS used the following metadiscourse markers; 14 hedges, 2 boosters, 86 self-mention, 3 attitude markers and 53 engagement markers. HCS had 15 hedges, 13 boosters, 128 self-mention, 3 attitude markers and 97 engagement markers. Elements of metadiscourse are rhetorical tools that make a text reader-friendly and enable the writer to get the attention of the audience. The resources that all the four speakers used most are the self-mention. The total number of interactional resources is 689 and out of this number, self-mention alone stood at 360, followed by Engagement Markers which were 223. Attitude markers were the next mostly used resources. Out of the total number of 689, attitude markers were 66 followed by hedges 66, and the least used sub-category of the interactional resources is boosters which the data identified as 33 slots.

Table 2. Frequency and Percentage Rating of Resources in CSs

Resources	Frequency	Percentage
Hedges	40	5.80 %
Boosters	33	4.78%
Self-Mention	360	52.24%
Attitude Markers	66	9.57 %
Engagement Markers	223	32.80 %
Total	689	100 %

Table 2 shows the percentage ratings of the resources in the data for the study. There are 40 hedges used across the CSs by the four political leaders. The 40 slots of hedges

constitute 5.80% of the total number that is 689. There are 33 boosters in the data constituting 4.78% and it is the least used resources in the texts. Attitude markers are 66 (9.57%). Engagement markers are the second highest used resources in the data. The engagement resources are 223 constituting 32.80 % and finally, the most used resources are self-mention (360) which constitutes 52.24%. The research question of the study deals with the interactional linguistic resources used by the speakers and the affectual meaning of the texts. The linguistic resources identified and analyzed include self-mention, hedges and boosters, attitude markers, engagement markers, in the selected speeches.

Metadiscourse refers to the concept that writers must learn to *organize texts*, *engage readers*, and *signal attitudes* to the material and the audience [8]). By using meta-discourse, it is expected that writers produce more reader-friendly texts so that readers can easily follow their writing. From the four CSs for the study, all the five categories under Interactional perspective of Metadiscourse were identified. The various categories are discussed with examples from the CSs delivered by the four political leaders under study:

3.2. Hedges

Hedges are used by writers when they do not want to show their full commitment to ideas [10]. Sometimes readers might have different opinions related to certain issues. Hence, writers use *hedges* for increasing the reliability and objectivity of their study [11]. By analyzing, there were 40 (5.80%) hedging devices found in the Concession Speeches. The frequency of occurrence of hedges was the fourth highest among the other interactional marker categories. The following were the examples of hedges used by the speakers:

Extract 1

We *might* not have been given the ruling we sought…… (NCS).

Extract 2

For those of us who choose to be contenders and go into electoral contests, we go *about* it as a win-lose proposition…… (MCS).

Extract 3

Our campaign was not *about* one person, it was *about* the country… (HCS)

Extract 4

I *wouldn't* call him back… (ACS)

Extract 5

I am *grateful* to all the well-wishers… (NCS)

Extract 6

I am *grateful* to the almighty God who has sustained us through the implementation of the agenda for transformation… (MCS).

Extract 7

I still *believe* in America… (HCS)

Extract 8

Some have expressed concern that the unusual nature of this election *might* hamper the next president in the conduct of his office… (ACS).

The speakers made use of hedges to facilitate other possible perceptions from their interlocutors and supporters. In Extract 1, the speaker used *might* in the sentence. It showed the speaker's uncertainty that his supporters and himself were not treated fairly

at all in the elections and in the verdict given the apex court of the land. Example 2 showed the speaker's ability to talk about the intention of an individual going into an election. The statement means that as one decides to go into the election contest, it is obvious that either a win or a loss awaits him or her so the speaker had that assertion in mind. In Extract 3, HCS makes her interlocutors aware that the whole country went into the elections but not one single person. Extracts 5 and 6 talk about the appreciation both speakers have shown to all those who supported the campaign in one way or the other. Both speakers used the word *grateful*, indicating how they cherish what the supporters did. In Extract 7, HCS used *believe* which shows that though she lost the elections, America remains the same likewise her belief in the country. *Might* is used in extract 8 by ACS that for all that happened in the elections was not the best and would not help the work of the next president.

The findings of the accord with previous studies on hedging in political discourse [12, 13]. In his study on hedging in political debates of Barack Obama and John McCain, the researcher discovered how linguistic resources, such as modal auxiliaries, adjectives, lexical verbs, and adverbs were predominantly used as hedges in the studied genre [14]. The deployment of hedges in pre-election and post-election political texts, also revealed interesting findings. In particular, it was found that post-election speeches, such as CSs, employed approximators, as well as adjectival, adverbial and nominal modal phrases [15].

3.3. Boosters

Boosters are used for avoiding different opinions or possible objections [16]. Writers utilize boosters to show their certainty instead of doubt so that there will be no conflicting arguments [17]. The use of boosters showed the writers' authorization to make claims in a firm way. This study identified 33 (4.78%) boosters used by the four speakers in the CSs. From the five interactional categories, boosters had the lowest frequency of occurrence in the CSs. The examples of boosters used by the speakers are provided as follows:

Extract 9

We *must* embark on a path that builds than the path that destroys… (NCS).

Extract 10

And while it is true that only one person can be elected president, in reality, and *certainly* in a democracy such as ours… (MCS).

Extract 11

But I still believe in America and I *always* will……….(HCS).

Extract 12

The strength of American democracy is *shown* most *clearly* through the difficulties it can overcome… (ACS).

As can be seen from the extracts 9-12, the speakers used four different kinds of boosters for expressing their certainty. The boosters used in the four extracts are *must*, *certainly*, *always* and *clearly*. The speaker in Extract 8 expresses the concern and the fact that it is obligatory that all citizens in the country unite behind the new leader because the elections are over. In Extracts 9 to 54, MCS, HCS ACS expressed their certainty about the reality in elections, belief in America and the strength of the American democracy. These findings agree with the findings of some previous studies [18, 19-20]. In a study by Jalilifar and Alavi-Nia, they found that politicians use boosters for various purposes. For instance, they found that in the 2008 presidential debates, Obama used boosters for self-protection and evincing a sense of urbanism [20].

3.4. Self-Mention

Self-mentions express writers' presence by using first-person pronouns as well as possessives [21]. The first-person pronouns, such as *I* and *we*, and possessives including *my, my, ours, us, me* and *our* are used. It is likely that writers also mention themselves as the writers, the authors, or the researcher. A writer uses self-mention to provide information related to his/her position and character [17]. In addition, when a speaker needs to provide new information, self-mentions can prove their originality. On the other hand, because the speaker is the principal part of a speech, self-mentions assist speakers to find accessible ways for the audience to comprehend the text. In this study, the researcher identified 360 self-mention markers in CSs for the study. The data revealed that the most frequently used resources are the self-mentions. In the data, 360 (52.24%) self-mentions were identified in the current study. Below are examples of self-mention markers used by the speakers:

Extract 13

I am saddened by the verdict and *I* know that many of *our* supporters are saddened too………..(NCS).

Extract 14

And *we* have been able to do all these things because *we* have always functioned as one nation, one people… (MCS).

Extract 15

We have seen that *our* nation is more deeply divided than *we* thought… (HCS).

Extract 16

I know that many of *my* supporters are disappointed… (ACS).

The data show that there were 7 kinds of self-mentions used by the speakers. The self-mentions consisted of *I, We, Me, Our, Ours, Us, My*. These 7 self-mentions had almost the same function as expressing the speakers' position related to the study as the leaders of the various political parties during the elections. In Extract 14, NCS used *I* and *our* to indicate the leadership role he rendered for his political party and inclusion of all those who supported him in the campaign. MCS in extract 15 used *we* twice to suggest that he and the supporters and other individual who in one way or the other wanted him become president the second term are part of him and he is also part of them. Extracts 16 and 17 used *our* and *my* respectively. Whilst HCS sees the nation as theirs (*our* nation), ACS says the supporters are his (*my* supporters). In both cases, I think the speakers show that they were not alone in the elections. The four speakers used *I* and *we* to show leadership and responsibility and inclusivity. These findings are comparable to the findings of previous studies that have investigated self-mentions in political discourse [18, 22].

3.5. Attitude Markers

Attitude markers are used by writers to express their opinion on the proposition [10]. In particular, writers use attitude markers to communicate their personal feelings towards the ideas. Generally, attitude can be expressed in the forms of adjectives (e.g., *appropriate*), verbs (e.g., *prefer*), and adverbs (e.g., *unfortunately*) [23]. In this study, there were 66 or 9.57% attitude markers identified in the data. The following presented examples of attitude markers used by the speakers.

Extract 17

As I said, whilst I *disagree* with the court's decision, I accept it… (NCS).

Extract 18

I would have cherished an opportunity to do *even* more, but I respect the will of the Ghanaian people….(MCS).

Extract 19

I know how *disappointed* you feel because I feel it too, and so do tens of millions of Americans who invested their hopes and dreams in this effort. …(HCS)

Extract 20

Some have expressed concern that the *unusual* nature of this election might hamper the next president in the conduct of his office….(ACS).

From the extracts, four different forms of attitude markers used by the speakers. Extract 17 showed that NCS did not agree with the Supreme Court but he accepted the verdict so that the nation could move on. It also indicates that it was needful that NCS accepted the verdict for the peace the country was enjoying to be intact. MCS in extract 18 was indirectly telling the people that he had done a lot for the nation and if he had been given the chance, he could have done more (to do *even* more). In extract 19, HCS expressed her disappointment as well as her supporters about the results of the elections. ACS in extract 20 is equally disappointed about the unusual nature that particular elections. The use of the word *unusual* indicates that American elections have not been like this very one. Extant literature has demonstrated the significance of attitude markers in political discourse [24, 25]. Ismail for instance, has noted that attitude markers are used to show the speaker's affective value towards the audience [25].

3.6. Engagement Markers

A study revealed that engagement markers help writers bring readers into discourse, inviting them into argumentations [16]. Commonly, engagement markers are in the forms of personal pronouns, directives, asides, and interrogative structures [16]. By using engagement markers, the speakers have included the audience and the supporters in the delivery of the CSs. This study identified 223 (32.80%) engagement markers in the speeches. From the data, engagement markers are the second most frequently used by the four speakers. The following are few engagement markers identified in the CSs: *should, must, you, your, we, us, show, our, let us, ensure* among others. The following were the examples of engagement markers in the data along with explanations.

Extract 21

We shall not be asking for a *review*….(NCS).

Extract 22

But I say to you that this day *should* not mark the defeat of your role in this nation's political process….(MCS).

Extract 23

You poured *your* hearts into this campaign….(HCS)

Extract 24

I heard *you* and may God bless *you*….(ACS).

From the examples provided, it could be seen that the speakers used different kinds of engagement markers. For example, in Extract 22, the speaker used *should*. This engagement marker aimed to invite readers to have the same opinion that all the supporters and MCS went into the elections so if there is any defeat it must be for all. *You* and *your* are used in extracts 22, 23 and 24 to show inclusivity of all people who invested in the various

campaigns. In other words, the speakers see the supporters as part of the whole election process, though they led the various political parties. By using those engagement markers, the speakers intended to make their supporters follow their opinions and ideologies related to their leadership [24, 26].

3.6.1. The Two Ghanaian CSs at a Glance

The two speeches from Ghana were from two different political parties (NDC and NPP) with different political ideologies and the two parties believe in social and property owning democracy respectively. In fact, between the NPP and NDC, there is the struggle of which one is better. Right after the 2012 general elections, the NDC was of the view that Nana Addo had no business wasting the resources of the nation by taking the election petition to the highest court of the land. The NPP, on the other hand, was of the view that it was legitimate to test the case in court as it (NPP) believed in the rule of law [27]. According to them (NPP), the only legal option left was the court; hence, this statement by NCS "Even in our disappointment, we can take pride that the NPP has again led the way in deepening Ghana's democracy." It is clearly seen that whilst the NPP sees the action of going to court as legitimate, the NDC sees it as exercise in futility.

The linguistic resources used by NCS, there are 5 hedges, 5 boosters, 63 self-mention, 5 attitude markers and 33 engagement markers. MCS used 14 hedges, 2 boosters 86 self-mention, 3 attitude markers and 53 engagement markers. One outstanding statement made by Nana Addo (NCS) is 'As I said earlier, whilst I disagree with the Court's decision, I accept it.' The above SA (Commissive) means that there might be certain things the speaker never liked and could have asked for a review, but he considered the interest of his country and let it passed. Supporters who might have wished their leader had taken different steps in addressing the court's verdict were carried along by the statement of their leader (Nana Addo). MCS had this to say 'That notwithstanding the irregularities associated with this election, I have decided at this stage to congratulate the President-elect.' Although MCS had one or two issues with the election results and could have also challenged the outcome, for the sake of the stability and continuity in Ghana's democratic journey, he forgot about it. A close look at the two speeches by the Ghanaian political leaders indicates that both of them consoled themselves through the use of certain linguistic features. Some of the words or expressions in the speeches were also used to create some bonding with the electorates or the people generally, especially, the use of the pronoun *we*. For example, MCS says "I wish to thank all of the people who worked on my campaign for their dedication and tireless efforts." and NCS says "Even in our disappointment we can take pride in the way we have conducted ourselves."

3.6.2. HCS against ACS

The two speeches being compared and contrasted here are from the same cultural background after the 2000 general elections between Al Gore and President W. Bush both of America and the 2016 general elections between Hillary Clinton and Donald Trump. One major difference between HCS and ACS is that before Al Gore gave his CS, he had challenged the election results in the Supreme Court and Hillary Clinton was the first female presidential candidate in the history of the United States of America. The two American speakers used a lot of personal pronouns (both singular and plural), showing that they carry their supporters along even as they use the singular pronoun '*I*' in their speeches. The length of their speeches as compared to their African counterparts is very significant because CSs are normally brief speeches but that of HCS and ACS are a bit longer, HCS had 1170 words and 61 sentences whereas ACS had 1050 words and 52 sentences and that alone tells listeners and readers how mature the American democracy has become. Based on the fact that the American democracy has come of age, ACS has this to say 'This is America.' No matter how painful the lost was, he (ACS) still believes in the constitution of America and the American democracy. Again, ACS said 'This is America

and we put country before party; we will stand together behind our new president.' while HCS said, 'Because, you know -- you know, I believe we are stronger together and we will go forward together.' From the data, HCS used 15 hedges, 13 boosters, 128 self-mention, 3 attitude markers and 97 engagement markers against 6 hedges, 13 boosters, 83 self-mention, 22 attitude markers and 40 engagement markers respectively.

From the two CSs from the American political leaders, one sees that the leaders are politically grown and mature. Though it is painful losing an election, they see elections and conceding a normal ritual and as part of every day's activity. The following are some statements made by political leaders of America through their CSs. Hillary Clinton (HCS) uses *we* rather than *I* consistently throughout her CS, encouraging audience participation and identification. Early on she states, "*We* can do what seems impossible if *we* have the vision, the passion and the will to do it together".

The two speeches, in their different ways, are means toward the same end (at least, in part), of creating the appearance of unity and thereby seducing harmony. By their insistence, explicit and implicit, on the Americanness of togetherness, on the assumption that all of us want to and can manage to come together as a people, they make the public expression of any other emotion, such as concern about the fairness or rationality of the election [28]. John Kerry, after the 2004 elections had this to say 'In an American election, there are no losers because the next morning we all wake up as Americans.' George Bush in 1992 said, 'There is important work to be done and America must always come first.' Richard Nixon in 1960, also had this to say, 'One of the great features of America is that we have political contests and once the decision is made, we unite behind the man who was elected.' Nothing of the sort is heard from the Ghanaian political leader because he thinks his opponent has incumbent advantage to rig the elections and that sometimes, a whole Parliament is boycotted for a four-years tenure mandate. Oquaye (2010) posits that elections in Ghana will only be fair when one Presidential Candidate is persuaded by a powerful chief to accept defeat so that should he appear on the political scene, Ghanaians and for that matter, the electorates will reconsider him or her in the next general elections [29]. It is an open-secret that His Royal Majesty, Otumfoo Osei Tutu II had to speak to Ex-President Mahama before conceding to Nana Addo Dankwa Akuffo-Addo during the 2016 elections.

3.6.3. Key Interpersonal Linguistic Expressions

There are certain key features about CSs also known as post-election speeches. These common pragmatic resources include congratulations, thanking, blaming the Electoral Commission for one offence or the other, reporting, challenging electoral processes and motivating themselves alongside the teaming supporters. There are some expressions that are used by all the speakers to express their dissatisfaction of the electoral processes. Below are some examples:

Extract 25

'I know how disappointed you feel because I feel it too, and so do tens of millions of Americans who invested their hopes and dreams in this effort'….(HCS),

Extract 26

'while I strongly disagree with the court's decision, I accept it'….(ACS),

Extract 27

'As I said earlier, whilst I disagree with the Court's decision, I accept it'….(NCS),

Extract 28

'I know that this is not the outcome that we wanted and hoped for, but I say to you that this day should not mark the defeat of your role in this nation's political process'….(MCS).

The data presented above shows one key element of post-election speeches (CSs) and that is the fact that each loser has one complaint or the other to make when the election results are not declared in their favour. All the four speakers had similar things to say, looking at the data presented. From the data, each of the four speakers had one or two issues to complain about using various stylistic language. Beforehand that Al Gore (ACS) had a difficult task ahead of him, and afterwards some called his concession the speech of his life, contrasting it with his less-successful efforts during the campaign [30]. Hillary Clinton (HCS) on the other hand a writer said is saturated with cultural assumptions of gender, power, and politics. In many ways, Clinton is emblematic of the infamous "double bind" that all women who seek to challenge normative gendered roles must inevitably face [30].

3.6.4. Differences between CSs of Ghana and America

Since the study is a comparative one, there is the need to consider the differences between the two political and democratic countries. It is also clear that from 1960 to date all the CSs delivered by American political leaders are available for further studies but Ghana can boast of just two CSs that are available, though there have been seven successful elections in Ghana. This study has shown that the American leader speaks passionately about America in the course of delivering the CS, though they complained about the electoral processes and irregularities. No wonder Al Gore said 'This is America and we put country before personal interest.' even though Al Gore of America in the 2000 general elections, retracted his concession twice. The story is slightly different in the Ghanaian context because in Africa at large, when one wins an election, the Electoral Commission has done its work well but the same individual loses an election and the same Electoral Commission has rigged the elections in favour of another individual. A study on correspondence between Nigeria's ex-President Obasanjo and Goodluck Jonathan, reveals a similar circumstance where the former accused the Electoral Commission of Nigeria to have rigged the elections in favour of the latter [31].

4. Conclusion

The study concluded that speakers of CSs in the two different cultural contexts use similar statements, as has already been discussed earlier in this study. For instance, the four losing candidates used almost the same interpersonal linguistic resources (*hedges, boosters, self-mention, attitude markers,* and *engagement markers*) to establish a bond between them and their interlocutors and supporters, as postulated by the Interactionist Theory by Hyland (2005). Even though the speakers led their political parties to the elections as individuals, they represent the masses and that there was the need to carry the supporters along by the use of those linguistic resources. The study comparative analysed CSs of four political leaders from Ghana and America that revealed various illocutionary acts expressed and performed in the selected speeches.

5. Recommendation

It is recommended that Speech Act Theory and the Metadiscourse Interactionist theory used to analysed CSs, of these four leaders can be studied from other theoretical perspectives. For instance, Swales's (1990) genre theory can be used to investigate the rhetorical moves and linguistic resources that characterize the genre. That will allow for a detailed analysis of a wider range of linguistic resources such as noun phrases, verb phrases, and the use of adjuncts, beyond the SAs in CSs in order not to treat them as mere rhetoric in politics.

References

[1] Charteris-Black, J. (2005). *Politicians and rhetorics: The persuasive power of metaphors*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

[2] Barth-Weingarten, D. (2003). Concession on spoken English, on the realization on a discourse pragmatic relation. Tubingen: Tubingen University Press.

[3] Searle, J. R. (1976). *A classification of illocutionary acts*. Cambridge: University Press.

[4] Skoniecki, S. F. & College, E. (2004). Tear apart this speech: A Burkean analysis of Ronald Reagan's "Tear this Wall" speech. *Young Scholars in Writing: Undergraduate Research Writing and Rhetoric, 2*, 18-28.

[5] Al-Faki, I. M. (2014). Political speeches of some African leaders from linguistic perspective. *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science*, 4(3), 1981-2013.

[6] Alo, M. A. (2012). *A rhetorical analysis of selected political speeches of prominent African leaders*. Retrieved on 13/09/2014 from http://www.bjournal.co.uk/BJASS.aspx.

[7] Chilton, P. (2004). *Analyzing political discourse: Theory and practice*. London: Routledge.

[8] Hyland, K. (2005). *Metadiscourse: Exploring interaction in writing*. London: Continuum.

[9] Moheddin, K. R. & Sherwani, K. A. (2019). Hedges used in Kurdish political discourse. *International Journal of Psychosocial Rehabilitation*, *23*(03), 648-657.

[10] Akbarpour, M. & Sadeghoghli, H. (2015). The study on Ken Hyland's interactional model in OUP publications. *International Journal of Language and Linguistics, 3*(4), 266-270.

[11] Wang, L. & Zhang, Y. (2016). An analysis of meta-discourse in the abstracts of English academic papers. *Global Journal of Human-Social Science, 16*(9), 9-16.

[12] Mohammed-Hashim, S. S (2015). *Speech acts in political speeches*. Iraq: Star Publishing Company.

[13] Rumman, R. A. (2015). Hedging in political discourse: Evidence from the speeches of King Abdullah II of Jordan. *Prague Journal of English Studies, 4*(1), 157-185.

[14] Al-Rashady, F. (2012). Determining the role of hedging devices in the political discourse of two American presidentiables in 2008. *TESOL Journal, 7*, 30-42.

[15] Laurinaitytė, R. (2011). *Hedges in political discourse*. Unpublished master's thesis, Vilnius Pedagogical University, Vilnius.

[16] Khedri, M. & Kritsis, K. (2018). Meta-discourse in applied linguistics and chemistry research article introductions. *Journal of Research in Applied Linguistics*, 9(2), 47-73.

[17] Gholami, M., Tajalli, G., & Shokrpour, N. (2014). An investigation of metadiscourse markers in English medical texts and their Persian translation based on Hyland's model. *European Journal of English Language and Literature Studies*, 2(2), 1-41.

[18] Ali, A., Rashid, A., & Abbas, S. (2020). Metadiscourse markers in political discourse: A corpus-assisted study. *Global Social Science Review, 5*(3), 56-63.

[19] Elhambakhsh, S. E. & Jalalian, M. (2015). Critical discourse analysis of hedges and boosters in iranian TV election debates of presidential candidates. *Journal of Applied Linguistics and Applied Literature: Dynamics and Advances*, *3*(1), 31-40.

[20] Jalilifar, A. & Alavi-Nia, M. (2012). We are surprised; wasn't Iran disgraced there? A functional analysis of hedges and boosters in televised Iranian and American presidential debates. *Discourse & Communication*, 6(2), 135-161.

[21] Alyousef, H. S. (2015). An investigation of meta-discourse features in international postgraduate business students' texts: The use of interactive and interactional markers in tertiary multimodal finance texts. *SAGE Open, 5*(4), 1-10.

[22] Albalat-Mascarell, A., & Carrió-Pastor, M. L. (2019). Self-representation in political campaign talk: A functional metadiscourse approach to self-mentions in televised presidential debates. *Journal of Pragmatics*, *147*, 86-99.

[23] Hudri, M. (2017). An analysis of illocutionary acts of Donald Trump's victory speech in the United States Election 2016. Unpublished master's thesis, English Education Department, Faculty of Tarbiyah and Teachers Training.

[24] Chiluwa, I. (2015). Radicalist discourse: a study of the stances of Nigeria's Boko Haram and Somalia's Al Shabaab on Twitter. *Journal of Multicultural Discourses*, *10*(2), 214-235.

[25] Ismail, A. I. H. M. (2012). Discourse markers in political speeches: Forms and functions. *Journal of the College of Education for Women*, *23*(4), 1260-1278.

[26] Farghal, M. & Kalakh, B. (2019). Engagement in translation: Interactional metadiscourse markers in American presidential debates. *Jordan Journal of Modern Languages and Literatures*, *12*(1), 103-122.

[27] Ninsin, K. A. (Ed.). (1998). *Transition to democracy*. Ghana: The Council for the Development of Social Science Research in Africa.

[28] Fairclough, N. (1995). *Critical discourse analysis*. London: Longman.

[29] Oquaye, M. (2001). *Government and politics in contemporary Ghana (1992 – 1999) – A study*. Accra: Africa Governance Institute.

[30] Nader, L. (1995). Civilization and its negotiators. In P. Kaplan (Ed.), *Understanding disputes: The politics of law* (pp. 39-63). Oxford: Berg.

[31] Oghogho, A. J. (2016). A speech act analysis of correspondence between Nigeria's Ex-President Olusegun Obasanjo and Goodluck Jonathan. *International Journal of English Language*, Literature *and Humanities*, 4(11), 576-592.