The discursive structures selected in talks and texts in politics and other spheres of social life are determined by the situations in which they are used. Politics and rhetoric are interwoven, and the latter is highly esteemed as an instrument of persuasion or manipulation in the former. Personal pronouns provide an easy access to these activities in mind control because they readily provide multiple identities. This researcher argues that Muhammadu Buhari in both his maiden speech as a Military Head of State in 1984, and inaugural speech as a President with executive powers in 2015 tactfully deployed personal pronouns to present different identities and project different ideologies, and that the backgrounds from which he spoke impacted on his pronominal choices. This study, therefore, sets to provide an insight into the influences of the ideological stances from which he spoke on his choice of language. The theoretical framework guiding the study is critical discourse analysis. The analysis reveals that by strategically selecting personal pronouns, Buhari constructed the identities that reflected the military and civilian backgrounds from which he spoke, as well as created the in-groups and out-groups he desired to project the authoritarianism and persuasion of military and democratic regimes respectively.

Key words: personal pronouns, junta, discursive structures, ideologies, Muhammadu Buhari,
the speeches. He also discovers that Buhari’s use of language in both contexts reflected his dispositions as a military leader and a democratic president respectively. Shamdama (2015) studied Buhari’s inaugural speech of 25th May 2015 from the perspective of Critical Discourse Analysis using Fairclough’s (1989) Three Dimensional Analytical Model. The analysis reveals that the ideologies / plans of Buhari’s administration include to promote good governance, strengthen international relations, foreign policies, democracy, fight insecurity, and others. Ademilokun (2015) carried out a linguistic appraisal analysis of aspects of attitudinal change in the 2015 inaugural speech. He made the Appraisal Theory of Martin and White (2005) his analytical tool, and observes that Buhari used affective meaning, judgment, and appreciation to convey attitudinal meaning with which he established interpersonal relationships with the people, as well as seek their cooperation. Oke (2015) carried out a brief critique on the 2015 inaugural speech. He did not adopt any theoretical or analytical framework. No sampling technique was used in selecting the few sentences he analyzed, and his observations were more of personal opinions.

The present study focuses on unpacking Muhammadu Buhari’s pronominal choices in the two inaugural speeches he presented to Nigerians from a critical discourse perspective, with a view to making overt the meanings behind the personal pronouns deployed in them. Pronouns are powerful linguistics / rhetorical devices capable of creating referential ambiguity as well as projecting in-group and out-group identities, and as a result require some attention in political discourse. Tyrkkö enthuses thus:

Given that nearly all political speeches are ultimately intended to exploit in-group and out-group dynamics to the advantage of the speaker and detriment of their political opponents, the considered use of personal pronouns is a highly salient characteristic of political speaking (2).

Since personal pronouns are considered fundamental in political discourse, and Buhari’s inaugural speeches delivered from two opposing backgrounds at different stages in his life have not been studied from this perspective as far as the researcher knows, it becomes crucial to study the pronominal choices he made in them to establish that contexts are instrumental to the choice of pronouns. This researcher, therefore, compares his pronominal choices as he constructed and managed the different social roles and role relationship with his audience in the contexts of the speeches.

Political discourse is complex and multifaceted, and comprises parliamentary debates, speeches, propaganda, political talk shows, interviews, and a host of others. It aims at persuading or manipulating the audience to accept what the leaders sell to them. It is often seen as “typically verbose, hyperbolic, dishonest and immoral and is sometimes simply labelled ‘rhetoric’” (van Dijk 1997: 4). George Orwell exploited the use and abuse of the English language by political elites in his Nineteen Eighty Four and suggested that “Language has the power in politics to mask the truth and mislead the public” (Berkes 2000:1). In other words, politicians choose words that help them gain control over the people by selling to them ideologically loaded words which on further interpretations may end up in lies, deception or absolute nothingness.

Political speeches are delivered for different purposes, including the inauguration of new government. Inaugural speeches signal the end of a tenure of office and the inception of a new leadership. It is delivered by the head of the incoming executive to set the tone of the new administration. Such a speech therefore contains the mission statements of the new government. In the case of coup d’états, the new head of the junta justifies their seizure of state power, while in a democratically elected regime, the incoming leader appreciates the electorates for casting their votes for him/her, while promising them good governance. Inaugural speeches also weigh the the out gone leadership. Muhammadu Buhari delivered two inaugural speeches to Nigerians:

a. The maiden address he presented on January 1, 1984 as the Head of a junta.

b. The inaugural speech he delivered on May 29, 2015 after he won that year’s presidential election.

The constitutional role of the military is to defend the nation state from external aggression and internal threats, but most often they interfere in governance, especially in the developing countries of Africa, Asia and Latin America. In Nigeria, particularly, the military have constantly dabbled into governance for reasons ranging from corruption and financial recklessness to tribalism, breach of a constitutional provision, and a host of others. Chukwuma Kaduna Nzeogwu, for instance, in his maiden speech after their January 15, 1966 coup maintains that:

Our enemies are the political profiteers, the swindlers, the men in high and low places that seek bribes and demand 10 percent; those that seek to keep the country divided permanently so that they can remain in office as ministers or VIPS at least, the tribalists, the nepotists, those that make the country look big for nothing before international circles, those that have corrupted our society and put the Nigerian political calendar back by their words and deeds. (Para. 7)

Major General Muhammadu Buhari cites “mismanagement of political leadership and a general deterioration in the standard of living’ as some of the reasons for the December 31, 1983 coup. He called his
emergence as the Head of the Supreme Military Council a “challenge and call to national duty” (Para. 1). Meanwhile, Major General Ibrahim Babangida in his inaugural speech after ousting Buhari insists that “the principles of discussion, consultation and cooperation which should have guided decision-making process of the Supreme Military Council and the Federal Executive Council were disregarded soon after the government settled down in 1984” (Para. 5), and that “Major General Muhammadu Buhari was too rigid and uncompromising in his attitude to issues of national significance” (Para. 6).

Military governments usually have their flaws, one of which is that they are ill-equipped for politics and politicking. “Officers trained to perform professional and frequently technical tasks may find it difficult to adapt themselves to the very different kind of leadership required by government” (Jordan 1985: 98). Nigeria was under military regimes from 1966-1979 and 1983-1999. The current democratic dispensation started on 29th May, 1999.

Effective communication “is at the base of every military strategy” (Condurache 2007: 1). Ambiguity and misinterpretations could be ignored in casual communication within the military since meaning can always be worked out without causing damage. In formal military operations, the reverse is the case. The military operate under great stress most of the time in formal situations due to their “high workload, high emotional tension, G forces and other conditions commonly encountered in the battlefield”, so, inability to interpret signals in such situations could be catastrophic (Use of Speech and Language Technology in Military Environments: 10). Military speech “under stress” is the speech that has had its characteristics modified as a result of an environmental (situation and /or physical) force applied to the person speaking” (Use of Speech and Language Technology in Military Environments 2003: 10). The sources of stress in military speech are divided into four categories – physical, physiological, perceptual and/or psychological. Coup involves deep mental, psychological, emotional and physical engagement on the part of the executors, leaving them in some kind of trauma during and after its execution. To this end, the maiden speech of the head of a junta reflects his emotional, mental and psychological state, as he rolls out instructions to the people who must comply or face the music of non-compliance.

Consequently, military communications are direct, brief, highly intelligible, and authoritative in nature. No wonder, Kirtley (2011) notes that in the military “every communication must be clear and quick so that sensitive orders can be carried out without dangerous incidents” (14). Among the features of military language that have been identified through linguistic analysis are: “it tends to be a sanitized form of language; it emphasizes the expertise of those who use it, and it contains a specific notion of hierarchy” (Encyclopedia.com: Language, Military: Official, Terminology: 1). Within the military, acronyms, military jargon, specialized lexis and phrases, as well as specialized coding system and figures of speech that enable them to conceal meaning by downplaying details that could trigger high emotions are used in communication. Communication from the military to the public is direct, brief and authoritative, and contains euphemisms for the purposes of masking the truth if need be.

Pronouns are words that substitute for nouns and noun phrases in sentences. “Such nouns occur (or are understood) as their antecedents in the sentences or passages where they are used” (Egbe 2000: 88). Pronouns are a small group of words belonging to the closed system items. They are sub categorized into personal, demonstratives, possessive, reflexive, interrogative, indefinite, relative, but of all these, personal pronouns are hugely exploited in political discourse. “They are personal pronouns because they are used by the speaker (or writer) for referring to one or other of the three kinds of entities (persons and things all technically known as persons) normally involved in actual communicative uses of language” (Aremo 2004: 15). The English language maintains three grammatical persons:

i. First person: the speaker or writer or the speaker or writer and others. The pronouns are I and we (subjective case), me and us (objective case) and my and our (possessive case).

ii. Second person: the person the speaker or writer is addressing. The pronouns are you (subjective and objective case) and your (possessive case).

iii. Third person: the person or thing the speaker or writer talked about. The pronouns include he, she, it and they (subjective case); him, her, it and them (objective case), and her, his, its, and their (possessive case).

I, we, you and they (as well as their objective and possessive cases) are used extensively in political discourse because they present multiple identities. Political office holders deploy them in varying degrees, depending on which of their senses they want to construct. I, for instance, presents multiple selves. It makes reference to the person speaking and also points to his/her public (professional or institutional) and private discourse identities in politics (Bramley 2001). In addition, it is used to indicate commitment and establish authority (Bramley 2001, De fina 1995). I enables politicians to assert themselves as people with political clout to make decisions and assertions on behalf of the people. “Politicians jump between the various identities; whether they choose to be private or public depends on the context and the effect the politician is looking for’ (Nakagwee 2001: 7). Presenting private aspect of themselves paints a picture of sincerity.
and helps to build the credibility of the public identity (Fetzer 2002).

You presents a complicated picture because it performs multiple functions in sentences, "making it difficult to understand its referent by an unsuspecting audience" (Bramley 2001: 261). It addresses part of or the entire audience. This prompted Kitagawa and Lehrer (1990) to identify three uses of you:

i. Referential you – it identifies a specific person.
ii. Impersonal you – it is also called indefinite or generic you. Impersonal you can refer to anyone or everybody, making it have a general referent.
iii. Vague you - it refers to a specific but unidentified individual.

The impersonal you “can be used in two ways; to refer to the speaker, as a replacement for I, and for the speaker to include themselves as a typical member of a category, in which case it refers to us” (Allen 2007: 4). He goes on to note that "it can distance the speaker from the actions being discussed by expressing them as a part of social order over which they have no control" (4). It behooves the listener to make conscious effort to identify its referents. Political speakers deploy this feature of you to present their beliefs and opinions as commonsense or familiar knowledge, and the audience accepts them without questioning their meaning.

We conveys a sense of collective identity or group membership, making the speaker the mouthpiece of the audience. In other words, it enables speakers to identify with "us" (the in-group), while distancing themselves from "them" (the out-group). In addition to the inclusive or patriotic we, there is also the exclusive we which refers to the speaker and some people other than the general public. "The use of political plural we (or its possessive our) has many implications for the political position, alliances, solidarity, and other sociopolitical position of the speaker, depending on the relevant in-group being constructed in the present context". (van Dijk, 1997: 33-34). They serves to distance the speaker from the subject matter and creates the out-group. It also serves as a referent for third person plural.

Citing Ochs (1996), Hall states that "social identity encompasses participant roles, relationships, reputations, and other dimensions of social personae, which are conventionally linked to epistemic and affective stances" (2011: 32). Members of a social group access similar conventions linked to epistemic and affective stances. "Speaking the 'correct' variety makes the individual an 'insider', a member of the in-group'; not doing so identifies the individual as an outsider or a member of the 'out-group': s/he is not one of us, an X, because s/he does not speak our language" (Byram 2006: 7). So, speaking the language, dialect, jargon of your numerous social groups makes you a member of the groups.

Major General Muhammadu Buhari, in his January 1, 1984 maiden speech enacted the identity of not only the military, but also the Head of the Supreme Military Council and Federal Executive Council with all the powers and influence that go with the office. The role relationship involved in that speech introduced constriction, terseness, and remoteness, with a heavy dependence on the passive on his language. The language of May 29, 2015 speech was far more relaxed and contained nothing like the authoritative and dictatorial language of military broadcasts. It resembled the language of political maneuvering aimed at manipulating the audience and controlling their mind to his advantage.

CDA is an approach in language study which focuses on the inter-relatedness of language, power and ideology. “CDA specifically focuses on the strategies of manipulation, legitimization, the manufacture of consent and other discursive ways to influence the minds (and indirectly the actions) of people in the interest of the powerful” (van Dijk 1995: 18). The texts and talks we produce in various speech events are constructed to serve the interests of the dominant members of society. In other words, “our words are not neutral. Our words are politicized because they carry the power that reflects the interest of those who speak” (McGregor 2003: 2). The choices we make of words from a number of alternative words available are self-serving, but many language users subscribe to them unknowingly. We arrive at speech events with the assumptions that we must abide by some sociolinguistic conventions guiding texts, talks and conducts. These assumptions are naturalized commonsense ideologies institutionalized by power elites to fan the embers of power asymmetry. So, political elites consciously choose discourse structures that place them at the centre of power. CDA questions these naturalized assumptions that sustain power relationship with the aim of raising consciousness and creating awareness that will engender social equality and social justice.

METHOD

The speeches under analysis are Muhammadu Buhari’s January 1, 1984 speech published by Premium Times from the archives on May 25, 2015 and his May 29, 2015 speech published by the Vanguard on May 29, 2015. They comprise one thousand two hundred and twenty-seven (1227) and one thousand nine hundred and seventeen (1917) words respectively. Data for analysis were excerpted from the speeches by deliberate selection. The analysis was done in two parts - quantitative and
qualitative. The quantitative analysis is done using a table to determine the frequency of occurrence of personal pronouns in the two speeches, while the qualitative analysis deploys critical discourse analysis to interpret the pronouns so as to highlight the meanings behind their choice.

RESULTS

The tabulation of the personal pronouns deployed in the speeches is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>I</th>
<th>Me</th>
<th>We</th>
<th>Our</th>
<th>Us</th>
<th>You</th>
<th>Your</th>
<th>They</th>
<th>Their</th>
<th>Them</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 1 showing the distribution of personal pronouns in the speeches.

As noted above, the 1984 speech contains only forty (40) personal pronouns, whereas the 2015 speech contains one hundred and one (101). I is used only four (4) times in the 1984 speech and twenty two (22) times in the 2015 speech. My occurs only once in the 1984 speech and eight (8) times in the 2015 speech. We did not occur at all in the 1984 speech, but it is used once in the 2015 speech. The 1984 speech has thirteen (13) we, while the 2015 speech has almost twice the number (23). Our occurred eleven (11) times in the 1984 speech and as many as twenty eight (28) times in the 2015 speech. Us is used three (3) times in the speech of 1984 and nine (9) in the one of 2015. You is used three times in the 1984 speech, while your did not occur at all in it. In comparison, you is used twice, and you are used once and four times respectively, while them is used once. In the 2015 speech, they is used five times, their three times, and them once.

Buhari as a Head of a junta had little or no reason to persuade Nigerians to accept his government or cooperate with so he used personal pronouns minimally in the 1984 speech. On the contrary, the 2015 speech which typifies political speech was aimed at achieving mind control by creating in-groups and out-groups. Personal pronouns are therefore far more in number in the 2015 speech than in the 1984 speech because the onus of winning the mind of the public was more on him in the former than in the later.

DISCUSSION

Use of I

Excerpts from the 1984 speech to illustrate the use of I include:

1. In pursuance of the primary objective of saving our great nation from total collapse, I, Major- General Muhammadu Buhari of the Nigerian army have...been formally invested with the authority of the Head of the Federal Military Government and the Commander-in-Chief of the Armed Forces of the Federal Republic of Nigeria. It is with humility and deep sense of responsibility that I accept this challenge and call to national duty. (Para 1)

2. ... I am referring to the fire incidents that gutted P&T buildings in Lagos, the Anambra State Broadcasting Corporation, the Republic Building at Marina, the Federal Ministry of Education, the Federal Capital Development Authority Accounts at Abuja and the NET Building.... (Paragraph 9)

3. Fellow Nigerians, this indeed is the moment of truth. My colleague and I – the Supreme Military Council, must be frank enough to acknowledge the fact that at the moment, an accurate picture of the financial position is yet to be determined....(Paragraph 10)

The first occurrence of I in paragraph 1 line 1 referred cataphorically to Major General Muhammadu Buhari. The other uses of I in paragraph 1 line 5; 9 line 5, and 10 line 1 referred to Buhari’s public discourse identity as the Head of a Government. It reveals that the speaker was vested with the power and authority of office to speak bluntly on the crucial national issues raised in sections of the speech. There was no reason to present his private discourse identity to the people since his government was an imposition on them. He would readily stifle compliance from them if the need arises. Consequently, the use of I in the speech was restricted to his professional and institutional identities as a soldier and the head of a junta.

In paragraph 10 line 1, my colleagues and I, could have been simply replaced with we, if not that we would introduce ambiguity. To exclude the public from the we, he tactically mentioned the Supreme Military Council, and then used we in the succeeding sentence in paragraph 10 line 3 as an anaphoric referent.

In sharp contrast to the 1984 speech, President Buhari had ample opportunity and reasons to present his private identity to Nigerians in his 2015 Speech. Below are some excerpts:

4. I am immensely grateful to God who has preserved us to witness this day and this occasion… (Para. 1)

5. I would like to thank President Goodluck Jonathan for his display of statesmanship in setting a precedent for us that has now made our people proud to be Nigerians wherever they are… I hope this act of graciously accepting defeat by the outgoing president will become the standard of political conducts in the country. (Para. 2)

6. I would like to thank the millions of our supporters who believed in us even when the cause seemed hopeless. I salute their resolve in waiting long hours in the rain and hot sunshine to register and cast their votes… I thank those who tirelessly carried the campaign on social media. At the same time, I thank our countrymen and women who did not vote for us … (Para. 3)

7. I thank all of you. (Para. 4)

President Buhari uses I in the excerpts above and some other places in the speech to highlight some of his inert
personal qualities such as a believer in God and his powers to give life; a man who appreciates good gestures; a man who believes in the exercise of fundamental human rights. Here are excerpts on the deployment of I to project his institutional discourse identity:

8. I belong to everybody and I belong to nobody. (Para. 4) Buhari presents himself as a fine and responsible leader whose administration would not be discriminatory, and who would give Nigerians equal attention. The statement also means that he does not owe anybody, including godfathers, any obligations.

9. As far as the constitution allows me, I will try to ensure that there is responsible and accountable governance at all levels of government in the country. For I will not have kept my own trust with the Nigerian people if I allow others abuse theirs under my watch. (Para. 14)

It signals Buhari’s public identity as a leader who believes in the rule of law and accountability. His use of my shows possession – ownership of the government and so denotes power relationship. It is the awareness of the ownership that prompted the appeals he made to workers, the press, and the Niger-Deltans to work towards achieving productivity, patriotism, and unity respectively in the following excerpts:

10. … I appeal to employers and workers alike to unite in raising productivity so that everybody will have the opportunity to share in increased prosperity… My appeal to the media today … is to exercise its powers with responsibility and patriotism (Para. 15)

11. My appeal for unity is predicated on the seriousness of the legacy we are getting into… (Para. 16)

12. The amnesty programme in the Niger Delta is due to end in December… I call on the leadership and people in these areas to cooperate with the states and federal government … As ever, I am ready to listen to grievances of my fellow Nigerians. I extend my hand of fellowship to them…. (Para. 21)

The President presents himself as an amiable leader soliciting support for and cooperation with his government from different segments of the Nigerian society.

Use of You

You is sparsely used in the two speeches. Here are instances of its use in the 1984 speech:

13. As you must have heard in the previous announcement, the Constitution of the Federal Republic of Nigeria (1979) has been suspended… (Para. 2)

14. The last Federal Military Government drew up a programme with the aim of handing over political power to the civilians in 1979. The programme as you all know, was implemented to the letter…. (Para. 4)

15. We are confident and we assure you that even in the face of the global recession … given prudent management of Nigeria’s existing financial resources and our determination to substantially reduce and eventually nail down rises in budgetary deficits and weak balance of payments position…. (Para. 12)

These are instances of the generic you deployed by Buhari to evoke group membership in the hearers. The issues are presented as commonsense; giving the hearers no room to question what he meant. You in the excerpts above is generalized to address all Nigerians.

In the 2015 speech, you occurs only in “Thank you” in Paragraph 4 where he is appreciating Nigerians for voting or not voting for him, and at the end of the speech where it serves as a closing statement. The referents are the Nigerian populace. Buhari is very conscious of the divisiveness across religious, political, ethnicity, and regional lines at that point in Nigerian history as evidenced in the pattern of voting in the 2015 Presidential election, so he did not want to be misunderstood.

Use of We

In his 1984 speech, Muhammadu Buhari indicates his awareness of the team spirit in military government. To this end, he deploys the exclusive we extensively to establish group membership with his colleagues, while excluding the rest of Nigerians. Here are some instances:

16. …We have no doubt that the situation is bad enough…. (Para. 10)

17. …We are determined that with the help of God we shall do our best to settle genuine payments to which Government is committed, including backlog of workers’ salaries after scrutiny. (Para. 11)

18. We are confident and we assure you that even in the face of the global recession, and the seemingly gloomy financial failure, given prudent management of Nigeria’s existing financial resources and our determination to substantially reduce and eventually nail down rises in budgetary deficits and weak balance of payments position…. (Para. 12)

We refers to the General and members of his government in all the three excerpts above.

19. Fellow Nigerians, finally, we have dutifully intervened to save this nation from imminent collapse. We therefore expect all Nigerians, including those who participated directly or indirectly in bringing the nation to this present predicament, to cooperate with us…We shall remain here and salvage it (Nigeria). May God bless us all. Good morning. (Para. 18)

The first and second we in Paragraph 18 line 1 (as well as the objective case us in line 3) are exclusive since they create an in-group membership with the General and members of the Federal Military Government alone, while the last we in line 4 (and the last us) is inclusive because it refers to the General, members of the Federal Military Council, and Nigerians.

Other instances of inclusive we in the speech are:
The last general election was anything but free and fair… while corruption and indiscipline have been associated with our state of under-development, these two evils in our body politics have attained unprecedented height in the past few years. The corrupt, inept and insensitive leadership in the last four years has been the source of immorality and impropriety in our society. (Para. 8)

Buhari deploys our to establish group membership with Nigerians so as to make them feel he has their interest at heart and has spoken on their behalf.

In the 2015 speech, the exclusive we is also used extensively because the President has to convince Nigerians that his government would deliver on the lofty campaign promises he made to the people. Here are some examples:

21. Elsewhere, relations between Abuja and the states have to be clarified if we are to serve the country better. (Para. 14)
22. … For the longer term we have to improve the standards of our education. We have to look at the whole field of medicare. We have to upgrade our dilapidated physical infrastructure (para. 16).
23. … We shall rebuild and reform the public service to become more effective and more serviceable. We shall charge them to apply themselves with integrity to stabilize the system. (Para. 17)
24. … Together we cooperated to surprise the world that had come to expect only the worst from Nigeria…. (Para. 3)
25. At home we face enormous challenges…
26. We can fix our problems.

We in the paragraph has both President Muhammadu Buhari and Ex-President Goodluck Jonathan as its referents.

Some of the few instances of inclusive we in the speech are:

27. … the legislators were preoccupied with determining their salary scales, fringe benefit and unnecessary foreign travels, et al, which took no account of the state of the economy and the welfare of the people they represented. (Para. 6)
28. Corrupt officials and their agents will be brought to book. (Para. 12)

The legislators, corrupt officials and their agents are portrayed as the enemies of the people. Instead of doing the work they were sent to do, they turned around to pursue personal gains and divert the resources meant for the public to their pockets.

In the 2015 speech, Buhari uses they, not to create an out-group, but as a cohesive device.

Examples:
29. At home we face enormous challenges. Insecurity, pervasive corruption, the hitherto unending and seemingly impossible fuel and power shortages are our immediate concerns. We are to tackle them head on. Nigerians will not regret that they have entrusted national responsibility to us… (Para 9)
30. However, no matter how well organized the governments of the federation are they cannot succeed without the support, understanding and cooperation of labour unions, organized labour… (Para15)

They is an anaphoric referent to governments.

CONCLUSION

The study analyzed the two speeches delivered by Muhammadu Buhari on the occasions of his maiden speech on January 1, 1984 after he toppled the government of Alhaji Shehu Shagari and emerged the head of the junta that ruled Nigeria for the next 20 months, and on May 29, 2015, on the occasion of his inauguration as the President of Nigeria and the winner of the 2015 Presidential election. It establishes that Muhammadu Buhari’s choice of personal pronouns reflected his military background and conveyed his military ideology and disposition in the 1984 speech, and popped up the politician in him in the 2015 speech. The 2015 speech is an embodiment of political discourse where the speaker’s intention is to sway the audience to believe whatever s/he packages for them. Discourse structures therefore portray the identity of their users, and the context from which they speak or write determines their choice of language.
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