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ABSTRACT

The paper explores President Muhammadu Buhari of Nigeria use of language in political setting. As a President, his choice of words and the language use speak a lot. Being a formal Military leader, his broadcast was more ‘khakitocratic’ (military) than democratic. His speech lasted five minutes but assessed using critical discourse analysis (CDA). The paper discusses context and culture in discursive interactions. Political language democratically, is important to national unity as it can illicit positive or otherwise reactions from electorates. Analysis for the study was based on Fairclough’s three dimensional conceptualisation of discourse with the aid of tabular illustrations. Findings reveal assumptions that unsaid words have implicit meanings than the said, being that words are neutral and, of course, the unsaid ideological politics of meanings could establish ‘khakitocratic’ language through discourse. The study concludes that people need ontological and epistemological inferences to develop societal consciousness about socio-political engagements to enhance understanding of undefined expressions.
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INTRODUCTION

Linguistically, discourse is a context-bound act of communication verbalised in a text, and waiting to be inferred from it. It also refers to formal treatment of a subject in speech or writing, such as a sermon, homily, speech, dissertation, campaign or even lecture. This study has a pragmatic-semantic implication of linguistic devices that are used in order to fulfill both the informative and inferential functions, and even contrasts them with generally proposed ideas of spontaneous conversational language. Discourse, according to Olaoye (2008) and Verdouk (2010), is verbal communication, talk or conversation. The term Discourse analysis (DA) therefore, is the systematic breaking into the constituent parts, that is, the contents and the language used in a text with a view to assessing, examining the text or making comments on it. DA as a linguistic phenomenon involves an assessment of the contents, the context, language used, domain, the interlocutors (speaker-hearer), as well as the analysis of the speech sound, psycho and sociolinguistic aspects, the morphological, syntactic and semantic aspects of the text. Olaoye (2007) sees DA as speaker-hearer analysis of speech sound. Spoken DA examines the paralinguistic cues, such as the use of eye contact, gazing, winking, head movement like nodding, finger pointing, waving, dismissing, beckoning, brandishing, among several others.
Based on the above, scholars such as Allen (2021) argue that research on communicative language event in context indicates that the surface text is the set of expressions which makes some knowledge explicit, while other knowledge or information remains implicit, though it still applies during processing which is by way of influence. It surmises to state that the prevalence of DA in research previously has been traced to the “linguistic twist” of the twentieth century which evolves round the development in philosophy with the recognition that language is not so much to be understood as reflecting reality but as creating reality, the type that does not pre-exist to be discovered by language but that language brings reality to life in the sense of being understood and interacted with people in a society. In his own contribution, Locke (2004) asserts that having realised that DA is a formalistic and critical about socio-cultural paradigms, it therefore, creates a new focus on critical discourse analysis (CDA).

CDA may be viewed as a dissenting view against the dominant formal paradigms that primarily study the way social power, dominance and inequality are enacted, reproduced and resisted by text and talk in social and political contests. In another development, van Dijk (2003) and Willig (2008) also espouse that traditionally, psychologists were deeply immersed in a regimental methodological approach in the production of knowledge in which one variable was experimentally manipulated and the effects on the other variable closely observed and recorded. However, the trend has greatly shifted lately with researchers examining the performative and productive functions of language in contexts. Psychologists’ turn to language gained prominence in the 1980s as a challenge to the traditional psychology’s reliance on cognitivism. Gergen (1989) posits that discursive psychologists are of the opinion that people’s account and the explanations they provide largely depend on the discursive contexts within which their views are produced. This study discusses knowledge as situated and contingent, thus an explanation or interpretation of people’s perception or attitude about a psychological phenomenon which should be taken into account the context or culture and circumstances of social interaction. This paper therefore seeks to examine the [unsaid] from the [said] of the first speech made by President Buhari of Nigeria after 105 health vacation days in London in order to show how best CDA and its analytical tools such as conversation analysis, deixis, cohesion and coherence can be used to decode the explicit and the implicit meanings in the president’s broadcast to the nation. This study is not only to infer but to also explain a critical basis for conducting this research with the relevant influence of Critical Theory on the categories of meaning of language use and power relations as well as the approach of post-structuralist Discourse Theory. The paper applies Critical Theory in developing interventions of CDA within the meaning categories of saying the [unsaid] from the [said] in discourse.

Critical theory is a reflective theory which gives agents a kind of knowledge inherently productive of enlightenment and emancipation. Based on the above, Geuss (1981) and Geuss & Luke’s (1997) opinions are almost similar that the post-structuralist discourse theory examines meaningful categories as the centrality of language and discourse in which the reader/listener replaces the author as the primary object of inquiry because the meanings of a text shift in relation to the identity of the reader/listener. Discourse is situated sequentially in the sense that the primary context within which social interaction occurs comes first and largely shapes accounts and constructions of participants involved in discourse. It is contingent because of the variability of language use in different cultures, contents and contexts. Similarly, Potter (2003) kindles that social interaction is of very importance to CDA, as discourse analysts do analyse
data gathered through open-ended interviews from the society, group discussions, and field observation protocols.

**Principle of Positioning in Discourse Analysis**

In discourse and conversational analyses, the concept of positioning has been an influential frame of thought for conceptualising context and culture in social interactions. Positioning theory has been viewed as an interactionist concept which can be conceptualised as a discursive construction of personal narration. Moreover, it is believed that people discursively construct their versions of social reality from their personality taken positions informed by discursive practices embedded in their socio-cultural environment. Davies & Harre (1990) and Tirado & Galvez (2007) contend that people do generally construct their discourses based on subject positions so that when participants in a social interaction take up particular positions, they see and interpret word from, and through that chosen strategic position in terms of images, symbols, values, metaphors, story lines and socio-cultural concepts available to them within a given discursive environment in which they are positioned. In other words, there are a cluster of rights and duties available to, and accessible by participants involved in social interactions in a given context which inevitably shape their public discourses in every day conversation. Davies & Harre (1990) and Harre & Moghaddam, (2003) in different studies argue that public discourse in every day conversation is as important as discourse itself. People’s discourse and positioning in social interactions reflect, to a large extent, the available interpretative repertoires or discursive practices embedded in their given contexts, and can be understood by aggregating their belief systems, values and socio-cultural experiences over a period of time. Slocum-Bradley (1991) also opines that people’s discourse and positioning in social interactions reflect the available interpretative repertoires. This therefore implies that any position taken by a person/participant/illocutor in a social discourse and interpersonal interaction may be informed by the rights and duties available to him or her thus, the assumed position limits the repertoire of possible social acts available to the individual. In this view, it is seen that positioning creates a space in which members participating in a conversation are assigned a series of specific position. The sense of positioning in discourse is not firm or static, but it influences, and can easily be altered to suit the discourse environment, time, space and circumstances. Tirado and Galvez (2007) also submit that the sense of positioning in discourse is dynamic, capable of infusing into time, space and circumstances of the discourse milieu. This implies that positioning is negotiable, and thus providing people the opportunity and the possibility to question individuals of their positions, cause for such a position, among other things to confirm or deny an adopted position. To this effect, however, a line needs be drawn between subject position and roles in social interactions in that subject positions “offer discursive locations from which to speak and act rather than prescribing a particular part to be acted out”. In corroborating the above, Willig (2005) espouses that “roles can be played without subjective identification whereas taken up subject position has direct implication for subjectivity”. In essence, subject position allows participants in a social interaction to subjectively express their perceptions and attitudes about a phenomenon which may reflect their individuality and socio-cultural experiences of the discursive milieu.
The Concepts of Intertextuality and Discourse Analysis

Another fundamental principle in discourse analysis is the concept of intertextuality which holds that meaning and intelligibility in discourse and textual analysis are dependent upon a network of prior and concurrent discourses and texts. Bakhtin (1991) and Metapedia (2010) posit that language is “heteroglossia”, meaning that the interrelatedness and existence of language and discourses involve multiple voices speaking through texts. A written or spoken language may depend on other background information within a given social context in which it is discursively deployed for its meaning. Discourses or texts are dialogical in the sense that meanings and interpretations of texts or utterances are rational. Metapedia (2010) is of the view that the words and the meanings conveyed in a language in social interactions are shaped by the socio-cultural experiences of the interlocutors in their given contexts. There is no construction of meaning or language in discourse that is not influenced by certain social groups, discourses, conditions, classes or relationships as far as discourse analysis.

Position of language and discourse is the phase that language deployed in social discourse which may lend itself to multiple interpretations and conceptualisations on the basis of socio-cultural contexts and intentions. Metapedia (2010) expresses that multiple interpretations and conceptualisations are fundamental to CDA. Undoubtedly, the principle of intertextuality is premised on the fact of meaning beyond texts in the strict sense of written or spoken discourse, thus, the concept of intertextuality is the foundational activity behind interpreting cultural meaning in any significant social discourse and by which meaning discovery in a text is made possible. Examining language intertextuality (in context) means searching for traces; the bits are pieces of texts borrowed and sewn together by writers and speakers to generate new discourse. James (1986) also submits that far, it is obvious that discourse in every day interaction depends largely on the background for its meaning and interpretation. It is imperative therefore, that analysis of discourse of people should be grounded in the shared meaning provided by the discursive milieu because a text is not an autonomous or unified object, but a set of relations with other texts. It is therefore important to summarise the concept of intertextuality as the fundamental concept, which no text, much as it might like to appear, is original and unique in itself, rather, it is a tissue of inevitable, and to an extent, unwitting, references to and quotations from other texts. It is inevitably pertinent to state that it is instructive that any analysis of spoken or written language produced in discourse interactions should take into consideration the broader view of texts in terms of meaning making and how text may be attributed to other meanings held in the society or context within which discourse occurs.

Examining Language Use in Discourse

The major task of discourse analysts is to probe into how a person, through the variability of language, represents versions of reality within discourse context and its implications for knowledge production. Discourse analysts contend that beliefs, attitudes, attributions and perceptions of people are not stable and enduring across contexts, rather, they are constructed in accordance with historical and socio-cultural contexts of discourse and interpersonal interaction. In order to understand the perceptions of people about a given psychological phenomenon, it is very important to understand how, within a given milieu, people strategically draw on available
discourse devices to negotiate and represent their reality of the phenomenon. Discourse participants and how they position a given psychological phenomenon may speak volumes of their socio-cultural background. The beliefs and attitudes of people about a psychological phenomenon may not be enduring but may be as a result of their background information such as values, cultures or religion. This implies that in the contextual analysis of language and the process of meaning making, the analysts ought to look for patterns within the discursive milieu. This is in line with intertextuality which conceptualises textual analysis as a function of a particular context or background.

In lending credence to the above, Taylor (2001) kindles that the possible and useful approach to discourse analysis is to search for patterns within much larger contexts, such as those referred to as “society” or “culture.” This approach is very vital for discourse analysis because it sees and treats language as an important part of wider process and activities in a given society, for example, a homophobic that describes or categorises homosexuality as “immoral” and “sacreligious”. This person may not be taken up in this position on homosexuality completely freely without the constraints of his or her historical and cultural context. The positioning of homosexuality in this context as “immoral” and “sacreligious,” may be shaped by the experiences of religion, culture, traditions and social identities embedded in the larger society of the speaker which serve as the building blocks for the construction of version of reality. The positioning of the phenomenon of homosexuality within a given social context may be relational; it may be shaped by the conventional notions of right or wrong available to individual speakers in their milieu.

Perceptions of people about social phenomenon, such as homosexuality may be differently positioned or categorised across diverse society depending on the socio-cultural orientations of those involved in the discourse, and thus, they can be better understood in terms of discursive practices available to people in a particular context. This is the essence of the concept of positioning and intertextuality, that is, the immediacy of discourse, though specific to individual speakers cannot be the sole context and consideration for the production and interpretation of language in social discourse.

**Purpose of the Study**

The purpose of the study is to assess through critical discuss analysis (CDA) the body language of President Muhammadu Buhari’s first broadcast after his 105 days medical vacation in London mainly focusing on the need for Nigeria to remain united despite its challenges.

**RESEARCH METHODOLOGY**

Meyer (2001) asserts that the procedure of critical discourse analysis (CDA) is defined as interpretive process, even though a number of criticisms have been raised about its methods of data collection and description. This is because there is a little discussion about statistical and theoretical representativeness of the material analysed. This study therefore adopts text reducing method of analysis in order to concentrate on clear formal properties of a small number of texts, which contradicts their hermeneutic endeavour. The researchers did the principled collection of
President Buhari’s first broadcast after his 105 days medical vacation in London in the form of corpus not merely as a tool but a concept in CDA that illustrates a historical insight of “warming as discourse in socio-historically specific systems of knowledge and thought”. This study makes use of the ten (10) points raised in the President’s speech on 21st August, 2017 because they are capable of portraying implicit meaning [the unsaid] that can be derived from the explicit meaning [the said] in discourse of ‘khakitocracy’ i.e. from military point of view. The aim in using CDA is not to discover this perception but rather to explain and discuss the unsaid from the said. The methodology used here is of course in accordance with Norman Fairclough’s three dimensional conceptualisation of discourse which is text, discursive practice and social practice:

**Figure 1: Fairclough’s three dimensional framework of discourse**

Data Collection

The collection of textual data for fictional analysis of a critical discourse can be quite insightful to the practical and discovery process of CDA. Irvine (1994) is of the opinion that texts never shows that really happened, only the narrative of what happened with the point of view and cultural/ideological interests, thus, a text’s analysis is achieved productively especially in a narrative genre by working with conversational materials and content, analysing transcripts of dialogue of the major issues [the said]. The President’s broadcast was subjected to Critical discourse analysis to identify the categories of meanings as well as their ideological orientations, and how they reflect power relationship between the speaker (President Buhari) and his listeners (Nigerians).
Data Presentation

The data presentation is the excerpt of discourse strands in the President’s broadcast as used in the list of coding categories. The coded corpora are presented as President Buhari’s first broadcast after his 105 days medical vacation in London of 21st August, 2017.

The Corpora

i. I have been kept in daily touch with events at home. I was distressed to notice that some of the comments, especially in the social media have crossed our national red lines by daring to question our collective existence as a nation. This is a step too far.

ii. In 2003 after I joined partisan politics, the late Chief Emeka Ojukwu came and stayed as my guest in my home town Daura. Over two days we discussed in great depth till late into the night and analysed the problems of Nigeria. We both came to the conclusion that the country must remain one and united.

iii. Nigeria’s unity is settled and not negotiable. We shall not allow irresponsible elements to start trouble.

iv. Every Nigerian has the right to live and pursue his business anywhere in Nigeria.

v. The beauty and attraction of a federation is that it allows different groups to air their grievances and work out a mode of co-existence.

vi. The National Assembly and the National Council of State are the legitimate and appropriate bodies for national discourse.

vii. The national consensus is that it is better to live together than to live apart.

viii. Terrorists and criminals must be fought and destroyed relentlessly so that the majority of us can live in peace and safety.

ix. We are going to reinforce and invigorate the fight against elements of Boko Haram, kidnappings, farmers versus herdsmen clashes in addition to ethnic violence fuelled by political mischief makers. We shall tackle them all.

x. Our collective interest now is to eschew petty differences and come together to face common challenges.

Linguistic Tools and Analytic Concepts

Appropriate linguistic tools and analytic concepts that practitioners find most useful in doing close textual analysis are employed in the CDA of this study. Therefore, the details of making explicit the implicit information embedded in daily interactions either spoken or written which are appropriately applied to this study are discussed, and these include broadcast analysis, deixis, cohesion and coherence, then intertextuality and heteroglossia.

Data Analysis

The text in this study contains both intrinsic and extrinsic features of linguistic tools and analytic concepts which are inherent in the data. But, the listeners (Nigerians) can be included in this
critical concepts enterprise for the purpose of saying the [unsaid] from the [said] categories of meaning. The President’s use of certain linguistic and rhetorical devices presupposes listeners’ presence in the context of the President’s broadcast. The listeners (Nigerians can make a post-structuralist sense of the President’s broadcast by relating the speech to their knowledge, emotions, and experience). They can also assume the position by constructing their identity on the indirect evidence of what the speech says.

Much of this evidence is lexical and ideological, thus, within a relatively brief space, the President uses evaluative words, phrases and sentences tacitly to enable the listeners to grasp meanings through analysis, deixis, modality, cohesion and coherence. These (words-phrases-sentences) broadcast are clearly attitudinal, because they emerge from the President’s ideological perspectives as they convey his ‘khakitocratic’ perceptions and observations.

**Deictic Analysis of President Buhari’s Broadcast**

Since deictic is the psycholinguistic phenomenon to all spoken or written discourse, it is appropriate to apply the technical term for these broadcast cues known as deictics. The deictic elements are in the boundary line between semantics and pragmatics since they encode some aspects the context. Deictics in this data pointed or rather directed the listeners (Nigerians) attention to the President’s communicative events of the discourse. The deictics in this study are shown in table 1 below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S/N</th>
<th>Corpus</th>
<th>Person Deictics</th>
<th>Place Deictics</th>
<th>Time Deictics</th>
<th>Discourse Deictics</th>
<th>Social Deictics</th>
<th>Gesture Deictics</th>
<th>Symbol Deictics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>I,</td>
<td>home, our</td>
<td>our nation, the</td>
<td>Daily</td>
<td>daily touch</td>
<td>some of the</td>
<td>especially in</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>country</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>with events at</td>
<td>comments, our</td>
<td>the social</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>home.</td>
<td>collective</td>
<td>media.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>…was distressed</td>
<td>existence as a</td>
<td>Our national</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>to notice that</td>
<td>nation.</td>
<td>redlines.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>some of the</td>
<td>…daring to</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>comments especially</td>
<td>question our</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>in the social</td>
<td>collective</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>media have</td>
<td>existence as a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>crossed our</td>
<td>nation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>national</td>
<td>…a step too</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>redlines.</td>
<td>far.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>I, my, we,</td>
<td>home</td>
<td>2003, two</td>
<td>After I joined</td>
<td>joined</td>
<td>especially in</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>town,</td>
<td>days late</td>
<td>partisan</td>
<td>partisan</td>
<td>the social</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>…stayed as</td>
<td>media.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>my</td>
<td>Our national</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>we both came</td>
<td>redlines.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>to conclusion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>we,</td>
<td>Daura, Nigeria, the country</td>
<td>into the night politics. …the late Emeka Ojukwu came and stayed as my guest. …discussed in… great depth… and analysed the problems of Nigeria. …the country must remain one and united.</td>
<td>politics. guest.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>His</td>
<td>anywhere in Nigeria</td>
<td>Every Nigerian has the right to live and pursue his business</td>
<td>…irresponsible elements. …shall not allow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Their</td>
<td>Federation</td>
<td>The beauty and attraction of a federation is that allow different groups to air their grievances</td>
<td>beauty and attraction, grievances co-existence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>National Assembly and National Council of State</td>
<td>The National Assembly and National Council of State is the legitimate appropriate bodies for national discourse.</td>
<td>The National Assembly and the National Council of State bodies.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>It</td>
<td>The national consensus</td>
<td>better to live together than to live apart</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Us</td>
<td>Relentless Terrorists and</td>
<td>…majority of</td>
<td>…can live</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Cohesion and Coherence of President Buhari’s Broadcast

Cohesion and coherence are obviously present in the data (the President Buhari’s broadcast). Cohesion deals with sentence unity, determined by lexically and grammatically overt inter-sentential relationships, while coherence concerns itself with text unity based on the logical connections that listeners or readers perceive in a written or oral text. In this study therefore, the cohesion in the President Buhari’s broadcast is the explicit markings of its coherence by means cohesive devices. In this study, coherence in the President’s broadcast was implicit and psychological because it has mental process of discourse production and comprehension. Since cohesion has illustrative constraints in the President’s broadcast, coherence is rather represented in table 2:

Table 2: Coherence of President Buhari’s Broadcast

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S/N Corpus</th>
<th>Logical Connection</th>
<th>Implicit of the Explicit Discourse</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>…daily touch with events at home, distressed.</td>
<td>This is a step too far</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>The late Emeka Ojukwu, two days we discussed in great depth till late in the night</td>
<td>The country must remain one and united.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Not allow irresponsible elements to start trouble</td>
<td>Nigeria’s unity is settled and not negotiable.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Discursive Practice

Discursive practices are the spoken and unspoken rules and conventions that govern how individuals learn to think, act, and speak in all the social positions they occupy in life (Alvermann, 1997). In any case, CDA is concerned with studying and analysing written texts and spoken words to reveal the discursive sources of power, dominance, inequality, and bias and how these sources are initiated, maintained, reproduced and transformed within specific social, economic, political and historical contexts (van Dijk, 2001). Discursive practices try to illuminate ways in which the dominant forces in the society construct versions of reality that favour their interest. This version enables the listeners (Nigerians) to think, infer and make conclusions based on the national reality vis-à-vis the President’s broadcast. Thus, the discursive practice is illustrated as part of the extended study in table 3:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date of broadcast</th>
<th>Broadcaster</th>
<th>Hours of broadcast</th>
<th>Listeners</th>
<th>Translation to other languages</th>
<th>Theme</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21st August, 2017</td>
<td>President Muhammadu Buhari</td>
<td>5 minutes</td>
<td>Nigerians</td>
<td>Very possible</td>
<td>The need for Nigeria to remain united despite its challenges</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Social Practices Based on President Buhari’s Broadcast

The social practice theory is a description of how individuals in their different opinions and societies around the world shape and are shaped by the cultural atmosphere in which they live (Fairclough, 1970). He argues that discourse is not solely bound to the text but must also involve analysing the relationship between texts, processes and social conditions, both the immediate conditions of the situational context and the more conditions of institution and social structures.
before coming up with the three integrated levels of discourse. The [unsaid] from the [said] contexts of the broadcast are thus [said] below:

The five (5) minutes broadcast of President Muhammadu Buhari after his 105 medical days in London was so brief but full of meanings, and thus sent Nigeria’s social media into frenzy.

i. I have been kept in daily touch with events at home. I was distressed to notice that some of the comments, especially in the social media have crossed our national red lines by daring to question our collective existence as a nation. This is a step too far: the statement was “khakitocratic” (military) rather than democratic, and as such, it is “riot act” in nature, thus ready to apprehend “hate speakers”.

ii. In 2003 after I joined partisan politics, the late Chief Emeka Ojukwu came and stayed as my guest in my home town Daura. Over two days we discussed in great depth till late into the night and analysed the problems of Nigeria. We both came to the conclusion that the country must remain one and united: the Nigeria’s warlord, was pacesetter, a no nonsense man Chief Emeka Ojukwu who one time believed in the existence of Biafra nation, and who actually started the first civil war dialogued with President Buhari in 2003 that Nigeria must remain one and united. So it is needless for IPOB (Indigenous People of Biafra) leaders to start to agitate for secession, so IPOBS dream is child’s play.

iii. Nigeria’s unity is settled and not negotiable. We shall not allow irresponsible elements to start trouble: the togetherness discursions between President Buhari and late Chief Emeka Ojukwu (even though Buhari was not the President then) agreed that Nigeria unity is sacrosanct, and a closed case that must not be ventured into, so the indigenous people of Biafra (IPOB) must not be allowed to strive. No wonder, the group was consequently afterwards proscribed.

iv. Every Nigerian has the right to live and pursue his business anywhere in Nigeria: Hausa, Igbo and Yoruba can live anywhere in Nigeria as Nigerians’ ‘nigerianity’ is not negotiable, and as such, the Arewa groups from the Northern part of Nigeria mandating Igbos from the Eastern part of Nigeria, and Yorubas from the Western part of Nigeria to leave the Northern part of Nigeria for their respective States of origin is like testing the will of the government.

v. The beauty and attraction of a federation is that it allows different groups to air their grievances and work out a mode of co-existence: since democracy is the government of the people by the people and for the people, Nigerians are free to air their grievances and pains, but must do this within the armpits of the law (a negation of khakitocracy).

vi. The National Assembly and the National Council of State are the legitimate and appropriate bodies for national discourse: though Nigerians are allowed to air their pains, grievances or aspirations, it has to be carried out via the National Assembly and National Council of State as the only legitimate and appropriate bodies that can listen to national cries, (even though bills of this nature channeled through National Assembly and National Council of State never see light of the day).
vii. The national consensus is that it is better to live together than to live apart: willy-nilly, either in joy or pain, in poverty or affluence, etc., our togetherness as indivisible nation is a closed case.

viii. Terrorists and criminals must be fought and destroyed relentlessly so that the majority of us can live in peace and safety: since the miscreants are very minute, considering Nigeria’s population, though powerful, they must be crushed permanently if Nigerians must live in peace in Nigeria.

ix. We are going to reinforce and invigorate the fight against elements of Boko Haram, kidnapping, farmers versus herdsmen clashes in addition to ethnic violence fuelled by political mischief makers. We shall tackle them all: President Buhari’s persistent silence it seemed, on the actions and inactions of the Fulani herdsmen in the country because he, the president is a Fulani man, now vows to deal with not only Boko Haram, kidnapping, ethnic violence fuelled by hate speeches but also farmers and herdsmen clashes (not minding whose ox is gored).

x. Our collective interest now is to eschew petty differences and come together to face common challenges: The President then sought general and common interest to overcome whatever that might be seen as a hindrance to our living together as an indivisible nation, Nigeria.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

The discussion of the findings from this study is associated with critical discourse analysis (CDA) because the data for this study is correlation. The study shows how linguistic forms can be systematically related to social and ideological functions. The presence of person deictics, place deictics, time deictics, discourse deictics, gesture and symbolic deictics as well as reference coherence in the study tend to offer much pragmatic force to the discourse because what is left unsaid is more importance than what is said, thus, there is a shift of focus from the [said] linguistic denotation to [unsaid] socio-cultural and historically determined issues of language use where the attention is redirected to the [said] and pragmatics about the late Chief Emeka Ojukwu. The constructive success of the President’s broadcast processing and interpretation under discursive practices, and the revelation of intertextuality with heteroglossic features in the social practices do suggest the sort of discursive resources that the broadcaster/speaker and the listeners may share.

CONCLUSION

Discursive psychologists contend that our knowledge of the social work should not be treated as objective truth and that our knowledge and representation of the world are not reflection of a reality “out there”, rather they are products of our ways of constructing versions of the world through language. Language use is not a neutral phenomenon, therefore, CDA has unveiled the hidden ‘khakitocratic’ explicitness of the President’s broadcast because the broadcast has impact on the people’s live in all ramifications and its sensibility has enables Nigerians to know and understand that in the discourse, we can say more of the unsaid than the said. However, the post-
structuralist approach to the discourse implied a social constructivist’s view of discourses since reality is not fixed, but constructed through interactions, and it is mediated by language and other semiotic systems (body language. i.e. of ‘khakitocratic’ style). This is possible because if language is constructed, it can be deconstructed and reconstructed as this offers a discourse of possibility. Any situation in which some individuals prevent others from engaging in the process of enquiry is one of violence, it is necessary to apply a highly context – sensitive, democratic approach which takes an ethical stance on social issues with the aim of transforming society – an approach with the attitude rather than step by step method, thus CDA in this study has developed the listeners’ consciousness of the societal issues of power, a precondition for developing new practices and conventions based on the various forms of ideological assumptions that are hidden in the President Buhari’s broadcast.
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