

LANGUAGE, POLITICAL DISCOURSE AND IDEOLOGICAL EXPRESSION IN NIGERIAN POLITICS

Olaoluwa Adetunji Ewekeye

Department of English, Ajayi Crowther University, Oyo.

oeuwekeye@gmail.com

ARTICLE INFO

Article No.: 0405

Accepted Date: 07/06/2026

Published Date: 30/06/2026

Type: Research

ABSTRACT

Language occupies a central position in political life, functioning not only as a medium of communication but also as a mechanism through which power relations, ideological positions, and social realities are constructed and negotiated. This study examines the relationship between language, political discourse, and ideological expression in Nigerian politics, with particular attention to how political actors deploy linguistic resources to influence public perception, legitimise authority, mobilise support, and shape political consciousness. Situated within the tradition of Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA), the study investigates the ideological functions of language in political communication and interrogates the implications of linguistic choices within Nigeria's multilingual sociopolitical environment. The study adopts a qualitative research design and employs documentary research methods. Data were generated from selected political speeches, campaign messages, public political statements, and relevant scholarly literature on political communication in Nigeria. Data analysis was conducted qualitatively using Fairclough's three-dimensional model of Critical Discourse Analysis, focusing on textual features such as framing, metaphor, modality, evaluative language, rhetorical construction, lexical selection, and code-switching. Findings reveal that political discourse in Nigeria operates as a strategic instrument for producing and sustaining ideological meanings rather than merely transmitting information. Political actors selectively employ linguistic and discursive strategies to construct political realities, negotiate identities, legitimise political authority, and influence public attitudes and behaviour. The study further demonstrates that while English remains dominant in formal political communication, Nigerian Pidgin and indigenous languages are frequently mobilised to enhance political accessibility, symbolic inclusion, and grassroots engagement. However, unequal linguistic representation and selective language practices may simultaneously reproduce exclusion, reinforce ethnic and ideological divisions, and constrain broader democratic participation. The study concludes that language is a constitutive force in Nigerian politics and an important site for the production and contestation of power, identity, and ideology. It therefore advocates greater critical attention to political language practices as an essential step towards promoting inclusive political communication, democratic accountability, and more equitable participation within Nigeria's multilingual society.

Keywords: Language, Political Discourse, Ideological Expression, Critical Discourse Analysis, Political Communication, Nigerian Politics, Multilingualism.

Introduction

Language occupies a central position in political life because politics is fundamentally enacted through communication. Political actors depend on language not merely to convey information but to persuade audiences, legitimise authority, construct identities, and influence public understanding of social and political realities. Political speeches, campaign messages, policy documents, debates, and media engagements are all sites where meanings are produced and contested. Through language, political leaders define problems, justify policies, mobilise support, and shape citizens' perceptions of governance and national development.

The relationship between language and politics has attracted sustained scholarly attention across linguistics, political science, and communication studies. Ayodabo and Ayinuola (2025), drawing on Kamalu and Aganga (2011), argue that language performs an important role in expressing political intentions and directing political action. Political communication often relies on linguistic and discursive strategies such as framing, metaphor, rhetorical appeals, presupposition, lexical selection, evaluative language, and code-switching to influence interpretation and public response. Such linguistic choices are rarely neutral; they frequently reflect ideological positions and institutional interests while shaping what audiences perceive as legitimate political realities.

Critical approaches to political discourse further suggest that language does not simply describe political conditions but actively participates in creating and sustaining them. Political actors strategically use discourse to establish authority, construct social identities, negotiate legitimacy, and influence patterns of inclusion and exclusion. Consequently, language becomes a mechanism through which power relations are exercised and contested. This relationship becomes even more significant in multilingual societies where language choice extends beyond communication to issues of identity, participation, and representation. In such contexts, political language can either promote democratic inclusion or reinforce existing inequalities. Nigeria presents an important case for examining these dynamics because of its complex linguistic environment characterised by the coexistence of English, Nigerian Pidgin, and numerous indigenous languages. Although English continues to dominate formal political communication and governance, political actors frequently alternate between languages to appeal to different audiences, construct solidarity, and negotiate ethnic and ideological identities.

Statement of the Problem

Despite increasing scholarly interest in political discourse, much of the existing literature on Nigerian politics has concentrated on campaign rhetoric, electoral communication, or general persuasive strategies. Less attention has been paid to understanding how language simultaneously operates as a vehicle for ideological expression, identity construction, and political influence within Nigeria's multilingual context. As a result, there remains a limited understanding of how specific linguistic choices shape political realities, influence public perception, reinforce or challenge power relations, and affect democratic participation. This gap is significant because political discourse in Nigeria often intersects with issues of ethnicity, religion, governance, and national identity. When language choices privilege certain groups, ideologies, or forms of political participation over others, they may contribute to social exclusion and deepen political divisions. There is therefore a need to examine political language beyond its informational function and explore how discourse constructs and sustains political meaning and ideological positions in contemporary Nigerian politics. Against this background, this study investigates the relationship between language, political discourse, and ideological expression in Nigerian politics. Through

this discussion, the paper contributes to a deeper understanding of the relationship between language, power, and political processes in Nigeria.

Study Objectives

1. To analyse how language is strategically deployed in selected political discourses to establish authority, exercise ideological control, and persuade target audiences.
2. To examine the use of specific linguistic resources, including framing devices, metaphorical expressions, evaluative language, and rhetorical patterns, in selected political texts and assess their role in shaping public opinion and political meaning-making.
3. To evaluate the effects of language choice in multilingual political settings on audience inclusion, social representation, political participation, and national identity formation. The study draws primarily from the literature on selected political speeches, campaign messages, and media political texts, with illustrative references to the Nigerian sociopolitical environment.

Literature Review

The relationship between language and politics has attracted sustained scholarly attention because political processes are largely enacted through discourse. Language is increasingly recognised not merely as a medium for conveying political information but as a strategic resource through which political actors shape public understanding, legitimise authority, negotiate identities, and advance ideological interests. Consequently, political discourse has become an important area of inquiry within linguistics, political science, and communication studies. Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) provides one of the most influential approaches for examining this relationship. Fairclough (1992) argues that discourse should be viewed as a form of social practice through which power relations and ideological meanings are produced, maintained, and transformed. According to him, language is not independent of social structures; rather, linguistic choices contribute to shaping political realities and normalising particular worldviews. Extending this position, Fairclough (1995) contends that political texts often embed ideological assumptions that become accepted as common sense through repeated discursive practices.

Similarly, Wodak and Meyer (2016) maintain that discourse both shapes and is shaped by institutional and sociopolitical contexts. Their position highlights how political communication reflects broader struggles over authority, legitimacy, and social control. Van Dijk (1997) further explains that political discourse operates ideologically through selective representation, categorisation, and control of public knowledge. Political actors therefore influence audience perception not only through what is communicated but also through what is emphasised, omitted, or framed in particular ways.

Political discourse scholars have also identified specific linguistic mechanisms through which ideology is expressed. Chilton (2004) argues that political communication relies heavily on strategies such as metaphor, legitimisation, de-legitimisation, positive self-presentation, and negative representation of opponents. These strategies shape political realities by directing public interpretation and influencing political behaviour. Similarly, Charteris-Black (2011) demonstrates that metaphor functions as a powerful persuasive device in political speech because it simplifies complex realities and strengthens ideological appeal.

Within multilingual societies, language assumes additional political significance because language choice becomes connected to issues of identity, participation, and representation. Political language can either promote inclusion or reinforce existing inequalities. In the Nigerian context, scholars have shown that political communication reflects the country's linguistic diversity and broader sociopolitical complexities. Kamalu and Agangan (2011) observe that

Nigerian political speeches frequently employ persuasive and evaluative language to construct legitimacy and mobilise public support. Their analysis demonstrates that discourse functions not only to communicate policies but also to establish authority and shape political consciousness. Relatedly, Ayodabo and Ayinuola (2025) argue that language in political contexts serves strategic purposes beyond information dissemination, particularly in influencing public attitudes and directing political engagement. Their work suggests that linguistic choices in political communication often reflect underlying ideological positions and broader struggles over governance and representation.

Although existing scholarship provides valuable insights into political communication and discourse practices, many studies concentrate on rhetoric, persuasion, or electoral language without sufficiently integrating questions of ideology, multilingualism, and identity construction. There remains limited attention to how language simultaneously functions as political discourse and ideological expression within Nigeria's multilingual environment. This study addresses this gap by examining how linguistic choices in political texts and speeches construct political realities, negotiate identities, and shape power relations in Nigerian politics.

Theoretical Framework: Fairclough's Three-Dimensional Model

This study is anchored in Norman Fairclough's (1992, 1995) three-dimensional model of Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA), one of the most influential theoretical approaches for examining the relationship between language, power, and ideology in institutional and public discourse. Fairclough's framework is particularly relevant to the present study because it provides a systematic means of connecting the linguistic features of political texts and speeches with the broader sociopolitical structures within which they are produced and interpreted. By conceptualising discourse simultaneously as text, discursive practice, and social practice, the model enables an integrated examination of how political meanings are constructed, circulated, and legitimised in Nigerian politics.

The first dimension, text, focuses on the linguistic organisation of political discourse itself. Analysis at this level examines vocabulary, lexical selection, grammatical patterns, modality, transitivity, cohesion, metaphor, evaluative language, pronoun use, and rhetorical structures employed within political speeches, campaign messages, policy statements, debates, and media engagements. Political language is rarely neutral; rather, it is strategically designed to persuade, legitimise authority, mobilise support, and construct ideological positions. Through specific linguistic choices, political actors foreground certain realities while suppressing others, thereby shaping public interpretation of political events and social conditions. For example, choices relating to agency ("government achieved" versus "mistakes were made"), metaphor ("war against corruption"), and evaluative expressions may influence how political responsibility, national challenges, and collective identities are represented.

The second dimension, discursive practice, concerns the processes through which political texts are produced, distributed, and consumed. Fairclough emphasises that discourse does not emerge in isolation but is shaped by institutional contexts and existing communicative traditions. Central to this dimension are the concepts of intertextuality and interdiscursivity, which explain how political actors draw upon previous speeches, national narratives, ideological traditions, media representations, and competing political discourses to construct legitimacy and influence audiences. Within Nigerian politics, political speeches frequently incorporate references to nationalism, religion, ethnicity, development discourse, democratic ideals, and historical memory to strengthen persuasion and political positioning. Analysis at this level therefore examines who produces political texts, the institutional channels through which they circulate, and

how audiences interpret and negotiate their meanings across multilingual and multicultural settings.

The third dimension, social practice, situates political discourse within broader structures of power, ideology, governance, and sociocultural relations. Fairclough (1995) argues that discourse both reflects and reproduces social realities while also creating opportunities for resistance and transformation. At this level, political discourse is examined as a mechanism through which dominant ideologies become normalised and institutional authority is maintained or contested. In the Nigerian context, political language frequently intersects with issues of ethnicity, national identity, regional interests, religion, citizenship, and democratic participation. Discursive choices may therefore reinforce inclusion or exclusion, legitimise particular political interests, and shape public understandings of governance and national belonging.

Underlying Fairclough's model is the assumption that language constitutes a form of social practice and cannot be separated from relations of power and ideology. This position aligns with the broader CDA tradition advanced by Wodak and Meyer (2016), who argue that discourse both influences and is influenced by social and institutional contexts. Political discourse is especially suitable for CDA because it represents a domain in which language functions simultaneously as communication, persuasion, symbolic authority, and ideological struggle.

Accordingly, the application of Fairclough's framework to this study enables a multilayered analysis of Nigerian political texts and speeches. It allows the study to move beyond the surface meanings of political communication to interrogate how linguistic forms construct ideological positions, how political messages are institutionally circulated and interpreted, and how discourse contributes to the production, maintenance, and negotiation of power within Nigeria's political landscape. Through this analytical lens, language emerges not merely as a medium of politics but as one of the principal sites through which political authority and social realities are produced and contested.

Methodology

This study adopts a qualitative research design and employs qualitative discourse analysis to examine selected political texts and speeches within the Nigerian political context. Data were obtained through documentary methods and consist of purposively selected political speeches, campaign messages, public political statements, and political media texts relevant to political communication in Nigeria. Data analysis is guided by Fairclough's (1992, 1995) three-dimensional model of Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA), which examines discourse at the levels of text, discursive practice, and social practice. At the textual level, the study analyses linguistic features such as vocabulary, lexical choices, modality, transitivity, pronoun use, framing, metaphor, evaluative language, and rhetorical structures to determine how political meanings and ideological positions are constructed. At the level of discursive practice, attention is given to how political texts are produced, circulated, and interpreted, including patterns of intertextuality and audience engagement. At the level of social practice, the analysis explores how political discourse reflects and reproduces broader issues of power, identity, inclusion, and ideological influence within Nigeria's multilingual political environment. The analysis is interpretive rather than quantitative and focuses on understanding how language functions as a tool of political persuasion and ideological expression.

Analysis and Discussion

Using Fairclough's (1992; 1995) Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA), this section examines selected political speeches and campaign texts to demonstrate how language functions as a medium

of political persuasion, ideological expression, and power negotiation in Nigerian politics. The analysis focuses on recurring discourse patterns across textual, discursive, and social dimensions.

1. Political Legitimation through Allusion and Historical Positioning

One recurrent feature in Nigerian political discourse is the use of allusion to construct legitimacy and political entitlement. During the 2023 presidential primaries, President Bola Ahmed Tinubu’s campaign slogan, “Èmi ló kàn” (“It is my turn”), functioned as a politically loaded allusion rather than a literal claim. The expression drew upon historical narratives of party loyalty, political investment, and regional expectations. Textually, the utterance foregrounded personal sacrifice and entitlement. Discursively, it activated shared political memories among party delegates regarding coalition-building and electoral support. Socially, the statement reflected broader debates surrounding political rotation, elite bargaining, and representation within Nigeria’s democratic process. Similarly, campaign expressions such as “Renewed Hope” projected an ideological narrative of national recovery and transformation. Such lexical constructions positioned political leadership as capable of restoring collective aspirations while simultaneously framing existing conditions as requiring renewal.

2. Pronouns and the Construction of Collective Identity

Political speeches frequently deploy pronouns to construct solidarity and legitimise authority.

Political Text	Linguistic Feature	CDA Interpretation
“We must unite to rebuild our nation.”	Inclusive pronoun (“we”)	Constructs collective responsibility and reduces social distance between leader and citizens
“Together, we can build the Nigeria of our dreams.”	Inclusive modality	Presents political goals as shared national aspirations
“They failed the people.”	Negative other-presentation	Constructs opposition as responsible for national problems

The repeated use of first-person plural pronouns creates symbolic inclusion while preserving hierarchical political authority. Fairclough (1995) argues that such pronoun patterns often naturalise leadership positions by presenting political agendas as collective interests.

3. Metaphor and Ideological Framing

Metaphor remains central to ideological expression in Nigerian politics because it simplifies complex realities and emotionally mobilises audiences. For example:

Political Text	Metaphorical Pattern	Ideological Effect
“The PDP has become an illness and APC is the medicine.”	Politics as health/illness	Delegitimises opponents and legitimises political transition
“War against corruption.”	Governance as warfare	Justifies strong state intervention
“Nigeria must be rescued.”	Nation as endangered object	Constructs urgency and saviour leadership

Such metaphors are persuasive because they transform political disagreements into moral or existential struggles. Charteris-Black (2011) notes that metaphor in political communication frequently operates as ideological framing.

4. Humour, Proverbs, and Cultural Legitimation

Political discourse in Nigeria often combines humour and indigenous expressions to strengthen audience connection. During campaign interactions, Tinubu's statement: "Delegates, don't turn to delicacies" introduced humour through wordplay. Beyond entertainment, the expression indirectly criticised transactional politics while preserving audience rapport. Similarly, indigenous proverbial expressions such as "à pè m'òra-èni làá pe t'émídire" ("people naturally favour what benefits them") function rhetorically to normalise political self-interest and localise political messages within culturally familiar frameworks. From a CDA perspective, these choices reveal interdiscursivity—the blending of political, cultural, and conversational discourses to increase persuasion.

5. Code-Switching and Multilingual Political Inclusion

Nigeria's multilingual environment makes language choice itself an ideological resource. Statements such as:

"Una sabi say na together we fit succeed."

illustrate strategic movement from English into Nigerian Pidgin.

Textually, code-switching reduces formality. Discursively, it broadens accessibility and audience identification. Socially, it constructs politicians as culturally connected to ordinary citizens.

However, multilingual inclusion may also become symbolic rather than substantive when linguistic accessibility does not translate into broader participation in governance.

6. Positive Self-Presentation and Negative Other-Presentation

Consistent with Van Dijk's (1997) ideological square, Nigerian political discourse frequently presents in-groups positively and opponents negatively.

Examples include lexical oppositions such as:

"progressive" versus "failed leadership"

"transformation" versus "backwardness"

"renewal" versus "decline"

These lexical choices are not neutral descriptions but ideological constructions designed to shape public evaluation and electoral alignment.

Overall, the analysis demonstrates that Nigerian political discourse operates beyond information exchange. Through pronouns, metaphor, lexical selection, humour, allusion, and multilingual practices, political actors construct legitimacy, negotiate identity, and reproduce ideological positions. Political language, therefore, emerges as a central mechanism through which power is exercised, contested, and normalised within Nigeria's democratic space.

Findings

1. Political Discourse Functions as a Mechanism of Legitimation and Ideological Positioning

The findings reveal that political language in Nigeria performs functions that extend beyond information dissemination to the construction and legitimisation of political authority. Across the analysed texts and speeches, political actors strategically deploy lexical choices, pronouns, modality, metaphor, and rhetorical expressions to establish leadership credibility and influence public interpretation of political realities.

At the textual level, expressions such as Bola Ahmed Tinubu's campaign slogan "Èmi ló kàn" ("It is my turn") illustrate how political discourse uses allusion and historical positioning to legitimise political ambition. Rather than presenting candidature as personal aspiration alone, the expression invoked narratives of political contribution, loyalty, and entitlement within party structures. Similarly, lexical constructions such as "Renewed Hope" framed political leadership as a vehicle for recovery and transformation. The analysis also identified contrasting ideological

orientations across campaign discourses. While some speeches relied on assertive declaratives and action-oriented language to project decisiveness and authority, others foregrounded lexical items associated with unity, restructuring, inclusion, and reform. These patterns indicate that political texts operate as sites where leadership identities and competing visions of governance are discursively produced.

2. Linguistic and Rhetorical Strategies Shape Political Persuasion

A second major finding is that persuasion in Nigerian political discourse is achieved through systematic linguistic and rhetorical choices rather than through policy content alone. Political actors employ metaphor, humour, evaluative language, pronoun selection, and intertextual references to influence audience perception and emotional engagement. The analysis demonstrates that metaphors such as politics as healing, governance as rescue, and anti-corruption as warfare simplify complex political realities and present political alternatives as moral necessities. Humorous expressions and culturally familiar sayings further strengthen persuasive appeal by reducing social distance and constructing relatability. Pronoun patterns such as repeated use of “we”, “our people”, and “together” were found to construct collective identity and national solidarity, while oppositional references to “they” and competing political actors frequently reinforced ideological boundaries. These findings suggest that political persuasion in Nigeria is strongly dependent on discourse strategies that shape interpretation and emotional alignment.

3. Language Choice Serves as a Resource for Identity Construction and Political Inclusion

The findings further show that language choice is central to identity negotiation and political mobilisation in Nigeria’s multilingual environment. Although English remains dominant in formal political communication, politicians increasingly employ Nigerian Pidgin and indigenous languages to broaden accessibility and perform proximity to grassroots audiences. Instances of code-switching and multilingual messaging were found to function as inclusionary discourse practices that reduce institutional distance and enhance audience engagement. Expressions delivered in Pidgin and indigenous languages projected cultural familiarity and strengthened perceptions of shared identity. However, the findings also indicate that multilingual political communication may remain largely symbolic where linguistic accessibility is not accompanied by broader structures of participation and representation. Thus, language choice simultaneously operates as a communicative and ideological resource.

4. Political and Institutional Discourses Reproduce Broader Power Relations

The final finding demonstrates that political discourse in Nigeria is embedded within wider institutional and ideological structures. Beyond campaign speeches, political advertisements, official statements, and media representations participate in shaping public understanding of governance and citizenship. The analysis revealed recurring patterns of positive self-presentation and negative other-presentation through selective lexical choices and evaluative framing. Such discursive practices privilege particular political identities while marginalising competing narratives. At the level of social practice, these patterns contribute to the normalisation of existing power relations and influence who is recognised as legitimate within political participation. Overall, the findings support Fairclough’s proposition that discourse both reflects and reproduces social realities. In the Nigerian context, political language emerges as a significant site where authority is negotiated, ideologies are naturalised, identities are constructed, and democratic participation is shaped.

Conclusion

This study has demonstrated that language occupies a constitutive rather than merely expressive role in Nigerian politics. Political discourse in Nigeria is not simply a medium through

which political ideas are communicated; it is a strategic site where power is exercised, ideologies are legitimised, identities are negotiated, and public realities are constructed. Through the deliberate deployment of linguistic resources such as framing, metaphor, evaluative expressions, code-switching, and selective language choice, political actors shape public interpretation, mobilise support, and influence patterns of political participation. The findings further reveal that Nigeria's multilingual ecology presents both opportunities and tensions within political communication. While English continues to function as the dominant language of formal governance and institutional legitimacy, Nigerian Pidgin and indigenous languages remain critical instruments for political accessibility, symbolic inclusion, and grassroots mobilisation. Yet, the unequal distribution of linguistic power and persistent implementation gaps in language policy continue to reproduce patterns of exclusion that constrain equitable political engagement for some language communities.

Ultimately, the study underscores that political struggles in Nigeria are also linguistic struggles. The contest for authority, representation, and national identity is mediated through language choices that determine whose voices are amplified, whose interests are legitimised, and whose participation is recognised. Therefore, any meaningful attempt to deepen democratic practice, strengthen national cohesion, and expand inclusive governance in Nigeria must move beyond viewing language as a neutral vehicle of communication and recognise it as a decisive political resource that shapes both political processes and their outcomes.

Policy Recommendations

1. Government institutions and political actors should prioritise the translation and dissemination of selected high-impact political and governance materials—such as campaign messages, voter education content, public policy summaries, and civic engagement announcements—into major indigenous languages relevant to their target audiences. Rather than requiring full-scale multilingual communication across all platforms, implementation should begin with key political events and public communication channels, including radio broadcasts, community meetings, and digital media.
2. Electoral bodies, media organisations, and professional communication institutes should organise periodic short-term workshops and certification programmes focused on political language use, multilingual audience engagement, message framing, and ethical communication practices. These programmes should emphasise practical competencies such as adapting messages across linguistic groups and reducing exclusionary discourse.
3. Rather than pursuing broad policy reforms without operational structures, government agencies responsible for language planning should establish measurable implementation targets. Initial efforts should focus on producing multilingual civic education materials, supporting the development and standardisation of orthographies where necessary, and expanding indigenous language use within selected public institutions and government communication outlets.
4. Media regulatory and professional bodies should strengthen existing content review processes by incorporating periodic discourse assessments during election cycles and major political events. Monitoring should focus on identifying persistent patterns of exclusionary language, unequal representation, and biased framing while encouraging media houses to adopt internal editorial guidelines that support linguistic diversity and balanced political reporting.

5. Political actors and public institutions should employ controlled translanguaging and code-switching selectively in contexts where multilingual communication improves comprehension and audience participation. Such practices should complement rather than replace official communication standards, particularly during public engagement activities, debates, civic education campaigns, and community outreach programmes.

References

- Agho, J. O. (2025). *Influencing Voters' Behaviour: Language and ideology of selected Nigerian political campaign speeches*. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics and Translation*, 11(1), 26–34.
- Althusser, L. (2025). *Ideology and ideological state apparatuses*. Pavón Vasconcelos Ediciones.
- Ayodabo, Joel Olatunde and Ojo Akinleye Ayinuola. 2025. “Lexical Constructions of Èmi ló kàn. Strategies in Political Campaign Speeches of Bola Ahmed Tinubu.” *Arusha Working Papers in African Linguistics*, 7(1): 79-94.
- Ayokunle, O. P. (2024). Discourse of Intertextuality in the Language of Political Advertisements in Selected Nigerian Newspapers. *Elsya: Journal of English Language Studies*, 6(1), 1-19.
- Charteris-Black, J. (2011). *Politicians and Rhetoric: The persuasive power of metaphor* (2nd ed.). Palgrave Macmillan.
- Charteris-Black, J. (2011). *Politicians and rhetoric: The persuasive power of metaphor*. Springer.
- Chilton, P. (2004). *Analysing political discourse: Theory and practice*. (3rd ed) Taylor & Francis e-Library.
- Chukwuokoro, I., Egwu, R., & Anyanwu, E. (2025). *A critical discourse analysis of statutory silencing of indigenous languages in Nigeria's National Language Policy*. *Journal of The Linguistic Association of Nigeria*, 5(1), 79–93.
- Enemuo, O. (2019). *Critical discourse analysis of selected pidgin political campaign speeches in Nigeria*. *Interdisciplinary Journal of African & Asian Studies (IJAAS)*, 5(3).
- Fairclough, N. (1992). *Discourse and Social Change*. Polity Press.
- Fairclough, N. (1995). *Critical discourse analysis: The critical study of language*. Longman.
- Fairclough, N. (2003). *Analysing discourse: Textual analysis for social research*. Routledge.
- Fairclough, N. (2013). *Critical discourse analysis: The critical study of language*. Routledge.
- Halliday, M. A. K., & Matthiessen, C. M. (2013). *Halliday's introduction to functional grammar*. Routledge.
- Kamalu, I., & Agangan, R. (2011). A critical discourse analysis of Goodluck Jonathan's declaration of interest in the PDP presidential primaries. *Language, discourse and society*, 1(1), 32-54.
- Lakoff, G., & Johnson, M. (1980). *Metaphors We Live By* (University). *Chicago*, 4(15-21), 26.
- Makinde, P. O., & Adejumo, B. F. (2024). Linguistic appeals in political discourse: A multimodal discourse analysis of 2023 presidential election billboards and posters in Nigeria. *Journal of English Language Teaching and Linguistics*, 9(3), 287-299.
- Rasheed, E. 2018. “Kinds and Functions of Allusion in English and Arabic Languages: A Contrastive Study.” *Journal of the College of Basic Education*, 42(11): 1-22.
- Van Dijk, T. A. (1997). Discourse as interaction in society. *Discourse as social interaction*, 2(1), 1-37.
- Van Dijk, T. A. (1997). What is political discourse analysis? *Belgian journal of linguistics*, 11(1), 11-52.
- Wodak, R., & Meyer, M. (Eds.). (2015). *Methods of Critical Discourse Studies*. Sage.