



GOMBE SAVANNAH

JOURNAL OF
LANGUAGE, LITERATURE
& COMMUNICATION STUDIES
(GOSAJOLLCOS)



DEPARTMENT OF LANGUAGES
AND LINGUISTICS
GOMBE STATE UNIVERSITY



Volume 7 | Number 1 | JUNE, 2026



Savannah Journal of Language, Literature and Communication Studies (SAJOLLCOS)

Vol. 7 No. 1: June, 2026 — ISSN: 2787-0286 & 2811-2261 (Online & Print)

**SAVANNAH JOURNAL OF LANGUAGE, LITERATURE AND COMMUNICATION
STUDIES (SAJOLLCOS)**

**DEPARTMENT OF LANGUAGES AND LINGUISTICS,
GOMBE STATE UNIVERSITY**



VOLUME 7 NO. 1, JUNE 2026

ISSN: ONLINE: 2811-2261, PRINT: 2787-0286

**A Publication of Department of Languages and Linguistics
Gombe State University, Gombe State.**

**Copyright © 2026 SAVANNAH JOURNAL OF LANGUAGE, LITERATURE AND
COMMUNICATION STUDIES**
(SAJOLLCOS) Gombe State University, Gombe State. Volume 7, No. 1 June, 2026.



© Department of Languages and Linguistics, 2026
Gombe State University,
Tudun-wada Jauro Abare, Gombe -
Nigeria.

All rights reserved.

No part or whole of this Journal is allowed to be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system or transmitted in any form or by any means, without prior permission of the Copyright owner.

ISSN: 2787-0286 Print & 2811-2261 Online

Printed in Nigeria @Six-Sweet Printers and Publishers

GSU, Gombe, Gombe State.

Phone No: +2348039511789

E-mail: alameenalaira@gmail.com

The Journal

Gombe Savannah Journal of Language, Literature and Communication Studies (GOSAJOLLCOS) is a peer-reviewed journal of the Department of English, Gombe State University. The journal is committed to the development of communication arts through researches in Language, Linguistics, Literature, Theatre Arts, Cultural Studies, Creative Arts, Media and Communication Studies. It has both print and online versions. The Editorial board hereby calls for thoroughly researched papers and articles on the subject areas already mentioned. Submissions of papers are accepted all year round but publication is expected to be done in May/June annually. All manuscripts should be accompanied with the sum of ten thousand (~~N~~**10,000**) naira only. On acceptance of any manuscript, contributors will pay the sum of twenty five thousand (25,000) naira only as publication fee.



Editorial Committee

Dr. Abubakar Mohammed Gombe
Dr. Leah I. Jalo
Dr. Fatima Shuaibu Gara
Fatima M. Gurama
Mohammad Abubakar Musa

Editor-in-chief
Editor
Member
Member
Editorial Secretary

Advisory Board

Professor Saleh Abdu	Department of English, Federal University Kashere
Professor Emmanuel S. Dandaura University	Department of Theatre and Cultural Studies, Nasarawa State
Professor Muhammad Dahiru State University	Department of Languages, Yobe
Professor A. S. Abdulsalam Languages,	Department of Linguistics and Nigerian University of Ilorin
Professor E. U. Ahidjo	Department of English, University of Jos
Professor Nahum Upah Butari	Department of English and Drama, Kaduna State University
Professor Nesta Alu	Department of English, University of Jos

Editorial Policy

Savannah Journal of Languages, Literature and Communication Studies is Produced by the department of English and Literary Studies, Gombe State University, Gombe Nigeria. It invites scholarly and well researched articles on any topic related to language, literary and communication studies. Authors of article(s) should adhere to the following requirements:

- Manuscript(s) should be double spaced on A4 paper with 12 points, Times New Roman.
- Manuscript(s) length should not exceed 5000 words, including titles, references and/or notes.



- Abstract(s) should not be more than 250 words, followed by four to five keywords.
- Manuscript(s) sent to SAJOLLCOS must be original and previously unpublished.
- Manuscript(s) should adopt either the APA 7th edition or MLA 8th edition format
- Title(s) and subtitles should conform to the adopted referencing style.
- Manuscript(s) would be subjected to editing and peer reviews prior to acceptance and publication.
- Author(s) should provide a bio-data of not more than three sentences at the end of their paper stating their rank, affiliation, research interest and email address.
- All Manuscript(s) for consideration should be accompanied with non-refundable sum of ₦10,000.00 assessment fee.
- On acceptance of any manuscript, author(s) will pay the publication fee of ₦25,000.00
- Creative work publication fee of ₦5,000.00
- All editorial correspondences should be directed to:

The editor,

Savannah Journal of Language, Literary and Communication Studies, Department of Languages and Linguistics,
Gombe State University, Gombe.

Email: sajollicos@gmail.com

Website: <https://www.gombesavannahjournal.com>

For further enquiries, please contact: Editor-in-Chief

SAJOLLCOS, HOD's Office,

Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences Gombe State University, Gombe sajollicos@gsu.edu.ng,

C/o: amgombe2@gsu.edu.ng



LIST OF CONTRIBUTORS

Mustapha Ibrahim Garba, PhD

Department of English and Linguistics
Federal University Dutse, Jigawa
igmustaphasays@gmail.com
08065951233

Sakina Wada

Department of English and Linguistics
Federal University Dutse, Jigawa

Suku Hyellamada Kenan, PhD

Department of Languages and Linguistics,
Gombe State University,
hyellawilbe@gmail.com
08139668910

Aishatu Bello Umar

School of Secondary Education Languages,
Department of English Language, Federal
College of Education (Technical) Gombe
aishatubu@gmail.com
08036585813.

Hannatu Joseph Bega

Department of Modern Languages,
College of Education Billiri.
hannatujosephbega@gmail.com

Ibrahim Garba Nayaya (Baba)

National Teachers' Institute, Kaduna.
ibrahimba182@gmail.com
+2347066366586/ +2348125351694

Danlami Bala Gwammaja, PhD

Aminu Kano College of Islamic and Legal
Studies, Kano
danlamigwammaja@gmail.com
08020605148

Musa Ahmad Sani

Department of Arts Education, Faculty of
Education, Kaduna State University
musa.ahmad@kasu.edu.ng
08035562885

Abdullahi Dahiru Umar, PhD

Department of English and Literature,
Federal University Gusau
dumar@fugusau.edu.ng
08065726292

AbdulAzeez Lawal, PhD

Department of English and French, Umaru
Musa Yar'adua University, P. M. B. 2218,
Katsina
abdulazeez.lawal@umyu.edu.ng

Abdulrahman Idris Abdulwaheed, PhD

Department of English and Literary
Studies, Faculty of Arts, Yobe State
University, Damaturu
Email: iabdulrahman2255@gmail.com
08037041081

Hamidou Bappa, PhD

Department of English Language and
Literatures of English Expression, Higher
Teachers' Training College Maroua,
University of Maroua, P.O. BOX 55 Maroua,
Cameroon
Email: hamidoubappa@gmail.com
Tel: 696551858

Theodore Bebey, PhD

Department of English Language and
Literatures of English Expression, Higher
Teachers' Training College Maroua,
University of Maroua, P.O. BOX 55 Maroua,
Cameroon
Bebeylawane@yahoo.fr
/bebeytheodore20@gmail.com

Abdurrazak Abubakar

Department of English Language, Federal
College of Education (Technical) Bichi,
P.M.B. 3473 Kano State, Nigeria
abubakarabdulrazak296@gmail.com
07036051705



Sani Isma'il Abubakar

Department of English Language, Federal
College of Education (Technical) Bichi,
P.M.B. 3473 Kano State, Nigeria
ismailsania@gmail.com
07064891033

Malata Andrew Zakayo, PhD

Department of Languages and Linguistics,
Gombe State University,
zakayomalataandrew@gmail.com
08027326216

Ismail Bala
.....

Abubakar Mohammed Gombe, PhD

Department of Languages and
Linguistics, Gombe State University
08060839578
amgombe2@gsu.edu.ng

John O, Udeigwe Ph.D

Department Of English
Language/Literature
Abia State University – Uturu
jo.udeigwe@abiastateuniversity.edu.ng
08146142122

Shamsuddeen Ismaila

Department of Hausa, Shehu Shagari
College of Education, Sakkwato
Shamsuddeenismail83@gmail.com

Mshelbwala Comfort Usman

Department of English and Literary
Studies, Federal University of Kashere,
Gombe State, Nigeria
08067131647
comfortbwala01@gmail.com,

Shehu Yahuza Abbas

Department of General Studies, Isa
Mustapha Agwai 1 Polytechnic,
Lafia, Nasarawa State, Nigeria
abbassshehuyahuza@gmail.com /
Phone: 07030573795 / 08125163443,

Shema'u Abubakar Umar

shemauari@gmail.com / Phone:
08035965496
Department of General Studies, Isa
Mustapha Agwai 1 Polytechnic,
Lafia, Nasarawa State, Nigeria

Ibrahim Muhammed Ogah

ogahibrahim075@gmail.com / Phone:
07067169460
Department of General Studies, Isa
Mustapha Agwai 1 Polytechnic, Lafia,
Nasarawa State, Nigeria

Sani Saidu

Department of English and Literary
Studies, Yobe State University
sani002saidu@gmail.com
08061353634

Umar Amos Hadiya

Department of Languages and
Communication, Federal Polytechnic
Mubi
umardamos@gmail.com
08034846180

Abdullahi Usman Garko

Department of Languages and
Linguistics, Gombe State University
augarko@gsu.edu.ng



Angela Butack

Department of Languages and
Linguistics, Gombe State University

Fatima Ibrahim Usman

Dept of Languages and Linguistics
Gombe State University
+234 7041726084
phartimaribrahim@gmail.com

Tarr, Mathias

Department of Languages, Nigerian
Defiance Academy, Kaduna
08034641925
tarrmathias@yahoo.com

Fatima, Inuwa S. Gara, PhD

Department of Languages and
Linguistics, Gombe State University
08039199933
fatigara2@gmail.com

Apasi Marizukot Ahuoyiza

Department of English and Literary
Studies, Bayero University, Kano

Adamu Idris, PhD

Department of English and Literary
Studies, Bayero University, Kano
aidris@buk.eng.edu.ng

Ibrahim Sofiyat Temitope

Department of English and Literary
Studies, Bayero University, Kano



TABLE OF CONTENTS

SECTION A: Language & Literature

A Conceptual Metaphor Analysis of Selected Proverbs in Aliyu Kamal's Silence and a Smile

Mustapha Ibrahim Garba, PhD & Sakina Wada **1-15**

Repositioning Reading through Multimodality in English Language Teaching

Suku Hyellamada Kenan, PhD, Aishatu Bello Umar & Hannatu Joseph Bega **16-30**

Dislocation and Renegotiation: Postcolonial Belonging in Cry, the Beloved Country, Paradise, Bird Summons, and Wahala

Musa Ahmad Sani & Abdullahi Dahiru Umar, PhD **31-41**

Reconfiguring Belief: Religion, Culture, and Displacement in Postcolonial and Diasporic Fiction

Abdullahi Dahiru Umar, PhD & AbdulAzeez Lawal, PhD **42-54**

An Exploration Of Stylistic and Literary Devices In Tess Onwueme's The Broken Calabash

Abdulrahman Idris Abdulwaheed, PhD & Sani Saidu **55-74**

Borrowing and Code-Switching among Hausa-English Speakers in the North Eastern Nigeria: A phonological analysis

Hamidou Bappa, PhD & Theodore Bebey, PhD **75-89**

Disillusionment and Commitment: a Reader – Reception Study of Elma Shaw's Redemption Road

Abdurrazak Abubakar & Sani Isma'il Abubakar **90-103**

Contextual Use of English in Nigerian Motivational Discourse: A Critical Discourse Analysis of Selected Speeches

Aishatu Bello Umar & Malata Andrew Zakayo, PhD **104-113**

English Language In Nigeria, Past, Present And The Future: a Concerned Issue

John O, Udeigwe Ph.D **114-124**

The Interface between Morphosyntax, Language Development and Its Sustainability: A Case Study of Bura Verbal Group

Mshelbwala Comfort Usman **125-143**



Digital Folklore And Nation-Building: Repurposing Indigenous Verbal Arts For
Cultivating Civic Realignment And Social Stability Among Nigerian Youths

Shehu Yahuza Abbas & Shema'u Abubakar Umar

144-159

Algorithmic Reclamation: Digital Resources As Structural Instruments For
Countering Linguistic Imperialism Among Indigenous Language Teachers

Shehu Yahuza Abbas & Ibrahim Muhammed Ogah

160-173

Bi-Implication and Negative Markers in Atiku Abubakar's 2023 Presidential
Declaration Speech

Sani Saidu & Umar Amos Hadiya

174-196

Comparative Analysis of English and Tangle Fricative Phonemes for Pedagogical
Implications to the Tangle English Speakers

Malata Andrew Zakayo, PhD & Angela Butack

197-224

Writing the Posthuman: Artificial Intelligence, Literature, and the Metaphysics of
Relation in the Digital Age

Tarr, Mathias & Fatima, Inuwa S. Gara, PhD

225-233

A Sociolinguistic Analysis of Code-Switching and Code-Mixing in Selected
Episodes of *Jenifa's Diary*

Apasi Marizukot Ahuoyiza & Adamu Idris, PhD

234-248

A Linguistic Analysis of Language Evolution in Digital Communication

Ibrahim Sofiyat Temitope & Adamu Idris, PhD

249-269

SECTION B:

Gudunmawar Turawa Da Manazarta 'Yan Kasa Ga Ayyukan Al'Adun Hausawa Daga
1965 Zuwa Yau

Ibrahim Garba Nayaya (Baba) & Danlami Bala Gwammaja, PhD

270-287

Ashe Kunya Ba a Ido Kadai Take Ba: Sake Bitar Fulaku Ga Fulanin Zamani Da Suka
Yi Kaka Gida a Kasar Hausa

**Abdullahi Usman Garko, Abubakar Mohammed Gombe, PhD &
Shamsuddeen Ismaila**

288-295



SECTION C: Creative Writing

Poems for *Gombe Savannah: Journal of Language, Literature and Communication Studies*

Ismail Bala

296-300

Under the Mango Tree

Fatima Ibrahim Usman

301-303



Bi-Implication and Negative Markers in Atiku Abubakar's 2023 Presidential Declaration Speech

Sani Saidu

Department of English and Literary Studies, Yobe State University

sani002saidu@gmail.com

08061353634

Umar Amos Hadiya

Department of Languages and Communication, Federal Polytechnic Mubi

umardamos@gmail.com

08034846180

Abstract

This study examines negative markers in Atiku Abubakar's 2023 presidential declaration speech. In the speech, negative markers function as structured linguistic resources through which governance evaluation, responsibility, and political legitimacy were mediated via bi-implication. Rather than appearing as isolated grammatical features, negative constructions accumulated into stable discursive patterns that frame social crisis while indirectly withdrawing legitimacy from political authority. Using Fairclough's three-dimensional model of Critical Discourse Analysis, the study examines how negation, modal operators, absolutist quantifiers, and negatively evaluative expressions organise interpretation and circulate within shared campaign narratives. Analysis of extracts from the Katsina speech show that each negative construction simultaneously presents a descriptive proposition and an implicit evaluative judgement, positioning audiences as co-recognisers of governance failure. The patterned use of negative markers demonstrates how discourse systematically structures evaluation, responsibility, and legitimacy in a bi-implicative manner. The study contributes to Nigerian political discourse scholarship by highlighting bi-implication as an analytical tools for understanding how indirect critique stabilises legitimacy loss while sustaining rhetorical restraint in electoral contexts.

Keywords: bi-implication; campaign speech; critical discourse analysis; negative markers; political discourse;

1. Introduction

Political campaign discourse represents a significant site through which political actors negotiate power, construct legitimacy and shape public perceptions during electoral contests. Beyond presenting policy preferences,

campaign speeches evaluate existing political conditions, construct collective identities and persuade audiences to support particular ideological positions. Consequently, political discourse has received sustained scholarly attention within



Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) and political linguistics because it demonstrates how linguistic choices participate in the construction and reproduction of power relations, ideological meanings and social realities (Fairclough, 1995, 2015; van Dijk, 1998, 2006; Chilton, 2004; Wodak, 2009). Empirical studies across different political contexts further demonstrate that campaign discourse relies on various linguistic resources, including lexical choices, metaphor, modality, evaluation, framing and rhetorical strategies, to influence audience interpretation and establish political legitimacy (Ademilokun & Taiwo, 2013; Oamen, 2020; Ogunlana & Oamen, 2025).

Within electoral communication, political actors frequently employ indirect evaluative strategies through which criticism and political judgement are communicated without explicit accusation. Through negative framing, contrastive constructions, modality and evaluative expressions, speakers foreground crisis, failure and unmet expectations while encouraging audiences to infer responsibility and accountability from the conditions being described (Chilton, 2004; van Dijk, 2006; Ross & Caldwell, 2020). Such strategies allow political criticism to be presented not merely as partisan opposition but as an interpretation of shared social realities.

In Nigeria, political campaign discourse has attracted increasing scholarly attention because of the

country's competitive electoral environment and complex political landscape. Previous studies have demonstrated that presidential candidates employ metaphor, pronoun selection, identity construction, intertextuality, evaluation and rhetorical strategies to negotiate legitimacy and mobilise electoral support (Opeibi, 2009; Adegaju, 2015; Ademilokun & Taiwo, 2013; Oamen, 2020; Ogunlana & Oamen, 2025). However, while these studies have contributed significantly to understanding ideological representation in Nigerian political discourse, limited attention has been given to negative markers as systematic linguistic resources through which political actors construct evaluation, assign responsibility and influence audience interpretation. The relationship between explicit negative expressions and the implicit political meanings derived from them therefore remains insufficiently examined.

This relationship is particularly relevant because political speakers often use negative constructions to communicate more than their immediate grammatical meanings. A statement describing insecurity, economic hardship or institutional failure may simultaneously invite audiences to evaluate leadership performance, political responsibility and the legitimacy of existing arrangements. This study refers to this relationship between expressed meaning and inferred evaluation as bi-



implication, whereby linguistic expressions communicate an explicit proposition while generating additional implicit meanings within a particular social and political context. Atiku Abubakar's 2023 presidential declaration speech provides an appropriate context for examining this phenomenon. The speech contains recurring negative constructions relating to insecurity, economic hardship, institutional decline and governance challenges. These constructions do not merely describe undesirable conditions; they also encourage audiences to interpret such conditions in relation to political responsibility and leadership legitimacy without relying on direct accusation.

Against this background, this study examines how negative markers function as bi-implicative resources in Atiku Abubakar's 2023 presidential declaration speech. Drawing on Fairclough's (2015) three-dimensional model of Critical Discourse Analysis, the study investigates how negative constructions operate at the textual level, how they acquire meaning through discourse practices and how they contribute to wider ideological processes involving governance evaluation, political responsibility and legitimacy. In doing so, the study addresses an underexplored aspect of Nigerian political discourse by demonstrating how patterned negative constructions operate as

strategic resources for indirect political evaluation and persuasion.

2. 1 Literature Review

Political campaign discourse represents one of the most extensively examined areas within Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) because electoral communication provides a significant site where political actors construct identities, negotiate legitimacy, articulate ideological positions and persuade citizens. Unlike ordinary political communication, campaign discourse is produced within competitive environments where candidates seek not only to present policy proposals but also to evaluate existing political conditions, establish differences between competing actors and influence public interpretation of social realities. Consequently, campaign speeches function as strategic communicative practices through which politicians construct representations of themselves, their opponents and the societies they seek to govern.

Within CDA, political discourse is understood not merely as a collection of linguistic expressions but as a social practice through which power relations, ideological assumptions and political interests are reproduced and contested. Research in political discourse has therefore demonstrated that political meaning is created not only through explicit statements but also through subtle linguistic choices that guide audiences towards



particular interpretations, evaluations and conclusions. Lexical selection, grammatical structures, metaphor, modality, pronoun use and other discursive resources enable politicians to frame events, assign responsibility and legitimise particular political positions. Recent empirical studies have increasingly focused on these linguistic mechanisms, showing that political actors often rely on indirect forms of evaluation and implication to shape public perception while avoiding direct confrontation or explicit accusation.

One influential empirical investigation is that of Ademilokun and Taiwo (2013), who examined sixty newspaper campaign advertisements produced during Nigeria's 2011 presidential election using Fairclough's model of Critical Discourse Analysis. Their study demonstrated that electoral discourse relies heavily on strategic linguistic choices, including lexical selection, metaphor, intertextuality and persuasive framing, to construct favourable representations of political actors while simultaneously portraying opponents as unsuitable for effective leadership. The researchers argued that campaign discourse does not simply communicate political information; rather, it organises ideological meanings by directing audience attention towards particular evaluations of candidates, policies and social conditions. Their findings therefore illustrate how political

communication operates through carefully selected linguistic resources that influence public interpretation and electoral judgement.

Although Ademilokun and Taiwo's study provides significant understanding into the persuasive nature of Nigerian political discourse, its focus on newspaper campaign advertisements limits its engagement with spoken electoral discourse. Furthermore, while the study demonstrates how linguistic choices contribute to ideological positioning, it does not specifically examine how negative expressions function as discursive resources through which politicians construct criticism, assign responsibility and generate implicit evaluations. This limitation is particularly relevant to the present study, which focuses on how negative markers operate within presidential campaign speech to communicate both explicit descriptions and implied political meanings.

Another important contribution to the study of Nigerian political discourse is Oamen's (2020) investigation of resilience discourse in presidential campaign speeches during the 2019 general elections. Analysing twenty-three campaign speeches through the framework of Critical Discourse Analysis, the study revealed that political actors employed various discursive strategies, including categorisation, argumentation, criminalisation and victimhood narratives, to construct images of leadership competence and portray



opposing political actors as obstacles to national progress. The findings showed that campaign speeches are characterised by evaluative choices through which politicians establish moral distinctions between themselves and their opponents, thereby influencing how audiences perceive political actors and national challenges.

Despite its contribution to understanding rhetorical strategies in Nigerian electoral discourse, Oamen's study focuses mainly on broader patterns of political representation and leadership construction. It gives limited attention to the specific linguistic mechanisms through which negative meanings are produced and interpreted within campaign speeches. In particular, the study does not examine how negative lexical choices and grammatical constructions may simultaneously describe undesirable conditions and encourage audiences to infer criticism, failure or responsibility. This aspect remains significant because political speakers often rely on indirect evaluative strategies to communicate ideological positions without presenting them as direct accusations.

Recent research has extended Critical Discourse Analysis to the 2023 Nigerian presidential election by examining how candidates employed linguistic strategies to construct political identities and ideological positions. Ogunlana and Oamen (2025) analysed eighteen campaign speeches delivered by the major presidential

candidates using Fairclough's three-dimensional model of CDA. Their findings revealed that candidates strategically utilised metaphor, naming practices, pronoun choices, code-switching and other linguistic resources to establish relations of power, construct collective identities and distinguish between political in-groups and out-groups. The study demonstrated that campaign speeches are not neutral forms of communication but ideological practices through which candidates legitimise their political aspirations and challenge the credibility of their opponents.

However, while the study provides valuable evidence on the discursive construction of political identity during the 2023 election, its analysis treats negative expressions as part of wider persuasive strategies rather than examining them as independent linguistic resources. Consequently, it does not sufficiently explain how negative markers function within campaign discourse to create evaluative meanings, attribute political responsibility and encourage audiences to draw conclusions beyond the literal content of the speech. This limitation provides an important basis for further investigation of negative constructions within Nigerian presidential campaign discourse.

Similarly, Jibrin and Oguiche (2025) investigated the campaign speeches of the three major presidential candidates in Nigeria's 2023 general election by combining Fairclough's



CDA model with van Dijk's ideological framework and Chilton's approach to political representation. Their study revealed that political actors relied on intertextual references, ideological framing and rhetorical appeals to construct political realities and persuade the electorate. The researchers demonstrated that campaign speeches serve as ideological instruments through which candidates promote particular visions of society, legitimise their political programmes and present competing actors in favourable or unfavourable ways.

Although the study contributes significantly to the understanding of ideological representation in contemporary Nigerian electoral discourse, its analytical focus remains largely on broad ideological strategies rather than the detailed linguistic processes through which such meanings are realised. In particular, it gives limited attention to the role of grammatical negation and negative lexical expressions in producing implicit evaluations of governance, leadership and political responsibility. Therefore, further research is required to examine how specific negative constructions contribute to ideological persuasion within presidential campaign speeches.

One of the most recent empirical investigations into the ideological functions of negation is Yang's (2025) corpus-assisted study of thirty-five political speeches obtained from the White House archive. Combining

corpus linguistics with Critical Discourse Analysis, the study examined how negative constructions operate beyond their grammatical function to perform broader communicative and ideological roles. The findings revealed that negation contributes to discourse organisation by introducing topics, highlighting significant information, challenging previous assumptions and restructuring political arguments. More importantly, Yang demonstrated that negative expressions enable political actors to construct distinctions between preferred and opposing positions, reinforce ideological boundaries and justify political claims through indirect forms of evaluation.

The study provides important evidence that negation constitutes a meaningful discursive resource in political communication rather than merely a grammatical feature. However, its focus remains primarily on the general ideological functions of negation across political speeches and does not examine the specific interpretive relationship between negative expressions and the additional meanings they generate within particular campaign contexts. In particular, the study does not explore how a negative construction may simultaneously present an explicit description of a political condition while encouraging audiences to infer broader evaluations of leadership, governance or responsibility. This limitation creates



a space for examining negation through the perspective of bi-implication, where expressed meanings and implied meanings operate together in political discourse. Earlier corpus-based research by Durán (2018) also demonstrated the strategic significance of negation in political communication. Examining the inaugural speeches of forty-five United States presidents through the perspective of Systemic Functional Linguistics, the study found that negative constructions occur frequently in political discourse and perform functions beyond simple grammatical opposition. The analysis identified recurring relationships between negation, concession and other discourse patterns that contribute to argument development, emphasis and persuasive effect. These findings suggest that negation represents a consistent feature of political language through which speakers organise information, establish contrasts and shape audience interpretation. However, while Durán's study provides valuable quantitative evidence regarding the frequency and grammatical distribution of negation in political speeches, its primary focus remains linguistic patterning rather than the ideological processes through which negative expressions acquire political significance. The study does not sufficiently address how negative markers may function within specific political contexts to evaluate actors, construct responsibility and

encourage audiences to derive meanings that extend beyond the immediate proposition expressed. Related evidence regarding negative political communication is provided by Ross and Caldwell (2020), who analysed Donald Trump's Twitter discourse using the Appraisal framework. Their study demonstrated that political actors employ evaluative language to construct negative representations of opponents while simultaneously strengthening their own political identities. The analysis revealed that judgement, appreciation and emotional evaluation work together to portray opposing actors as incompetent, unreliable or threatening. The study therefore highlights that political negativity is not produced through isolated expressions but through interconnected linguistic resources that shape audience attitudes and political interpretations. Nevertheless, Ross and Caldwell's study focuses mainly on evaluative strategies within social media discourse rather than the specific role of negative markers in formal political speeches. Although it demonstrates how negative evaluation contributes to political persuasion, it does not examine how grammatical and lexical negation may generate additional implied meanings within campaign discourse. Consequently, the relationship between negative linguistic forms and the indirect ideological meanings derived from them remains insufficiently explored.



Comparative political communication research has further established that negativity constitutes a significant feature of contemporary electoral campaigns. Analysing ninety-seven election campaigns across forty-three countries, Nai and Gerstlé (2019) demonstrated that negative campaigning frequently attracts public attention and influences voter perceptions by emphasising crisis, failure, conflict and threat. Their findings indicate that negative political messages serve important persuasive purposes because they create contrasts between competing actors and encourage audiences to evaluate political alternatives.

However, the study conceptualises negativity primarily as a campaign communication strategy rather than as a linguistic phenomenon. While it explains why political actors rely on negative messages, it does not examine the specific linguistic mechanisms through which negative meanings are constructed, interpreted and connected to broader ideological evaluations. Therefore, further linguistic analysis is required to explain how negative expressions operate within political texts themselves.

Research on political legitimisation further demonstrates the importance of indirect evaluation in political discourse. A corpus-based investigation of Donald Trump's speech preceding the Capitol attack, drawing on van Leeuwen's model of legitimisation, showed that political

actors frequently rely on strategies such as evaluation, rationalisation, authorisation and mythopoesis to justify political actions and challenge alternative viewpoints. The study revealed that political claims are often presented not merely as personal opinions but as socially necessary positions supported by moral, institutional or ideological arguments. Although the study focuses primarily on legitimisation strategies rather than negation, it provides relevant insight into the broader process through which indirect meanings operate in political communication. By presenting evaluations through apparently descriptive claims, political speakers can encourage audiences to accept particular interpretations of events and actors. This principle is relevant to the present study because negative markers may similarly function as indirect resources for evaluating governance, assigning responsibility and constructing political legitimacy.

Recent studies on negation have also demonstrated that negative constructions perform important communicative and ideological functions beyond their grammatical role. They contribute to discourse organisation, create contrasts, challenge alternative positions and influence audience evaluation. However, much of the existing research has examined negation either from grammatical, cognitive or general ideological perspectives, with limited attention to how negative



markers function within campaign speeches as resources for producing both explicit descriptions and implicit evaluations.

More specifically, previous studies have not sufficiently examined how negative linguistic constructions generate additional meanings through the interaction between what is directly expressed and what audiences are encouraged to infer. This relationship is particularly relevant to political campaign discourse, where speakers frequently describe social problems, failures or undesirable conditions while simultaneously suggesting evaluations of political actors, governance practices and leadership competence. Although existing CDA research has provided valuable explanations of political persuasion and ideological representation, the role of negative markers as bi-implicative resources remains insufficiently explored.

Furthermore, within the Nigerian political context, existing studies have largely focused on broad rhetorical strategies, ideological framing and representational practices, while limited attention has been given to the micro-linguistic processes through which negative meanings are constructed and interpreted. The present study addresses this gap by examining how negative markers function as bi-implicative resources in Atiku Abubakar's 2023 presidential declaration speech. Using Fairclough's three-dimensional model of Critical Discourse Analysis, the study

investigates how negative constructions operate at the textual level, how they derive meaning within political discourse practices and how they contribute to wider ideological processes involving governance evaluation, political responsibility and legitimacy.

2.2 Theoretical Framework

This study is anchored in Fairclough's (2015) three-dimensional model of Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA), which conceptualises discourse as simultaneously a linguistic text, a process of discourse production and interpretation, and a form of social practice. The model provides a systematic framework for explaining how linguistic choices both reflect and shape wider social relations, ideological positions and power structures. At the textual level, the framework examines the linguistic resources through which meanings are constructed, including lexical choices, grammatical structures, modality and rhetorical patterns. The dimension of discursive practice focuses on how texts are produced, circulated and interpreted within specific social and communicative contexts, while the dimension of social practice explains how discourse relates to wider political, institutional and ideological processes.

Fairclough's framework is particularly appropriate for the present study because political campaign speeches represent forms of discourse where linguistic choices are closely



connected with the construction of political realities. Negative markers within political speeches cannot therefore be understood only as grammatical structures expressing denial or absence; rather, they must be examined in relation to the social contexts, political struggles and ideological purposes within which they operate. Through the interaction of the three dimensions, Fairclough's model enables the study to move from identifying negative linguistic forms to explaining how such forms contribute to political evaluation, responsibility attribution and legitimacy construction.

Although Fairclough's model provides the principal analytical framework, the study is further informed by the concept of bi-implication as an interpretive mechanism for explaining the relationship between explicit expression and implicit meaning. Bi-implication refers to the process through which a linguistic expression communicates a direct meaning while simultaneously encouraging the audience to derive additional meanings from the context in which it occurs. In political discourse, negative constructions frequently operate in this manner: a speaker may explicitly describe undesirable conditions while implicitly inviting audiences to evaluate political actors, institutions or policies associated with those conditions. This perspective is particularly relevant to the present study because it explains how negative markers move beyond

grammatical negation to function as resources for ideological evaluation. The interpretation of bi-implicative meanings is also supported by complementary perspectives on ideology, evaluation and political communication. Van Dijk's (1998, 2006) socio-cognitive approach explains how political meanings are interpreted through shared knowledge and ideological frameworks, while van Leeuwen's (2008) model of legitimation provides insight into how discourse establishes or challenges political authority. Similarly, Martin and White's (2005) appraisal framework contributes to understanding how evaluative meanings position audiences towards particular judgements and attitudes. These perspectives serve a supporting role by enriching the interpretation of ideological effects without replacing Fairclough's three-dimensional model as the primary analytical framework. Accordingly, Fairclough's (2015) model provides the overall structure for analysing how negative markers function as bi-implicative resources in Atiku Abubakar's 2023 presidential declaration speech. The textual dimension guides the identification of negative markers and their linguistic realisations; the dimension of discursive practice explains how these constructions acquire meaning through campaign narratives, audience expectations and shared political experiences; while the dimension of social practice examines their wider ideological implications



for governance evaluation, political responsibility and legitimacy. Through this integrated approach, the study explains how explicit negative constructions generate implicit political evaluations and contribute to persuasion within electoral discourse.

3. Methodology

This study adopts a qualitative research design within the framework of Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA). The data comprise Atiku Abubakar's 2023 presidential declaration speech delivered in Katsina, Nigeria, purposively selected because it constitutes one of the earliest major campaign speeches preceding the 2023 presidential election and contains recurrent negative constructions relating to governance, insecurity, economic hardship and institutional performance. The unit of analysis consists of clauses and sentence-level constructions containing grammatical negators, negative quantifiers, modal negatives and negatively evaluative lexical items. The analysis is guided by Fairclough's (2015) three-dimensional model of Critical Discourse Analysis. At the textual level, the study identifies and examines the lexical and grammatical

realisations of negative markers. At the level of discursive practice, it investigates how these constructions derive meaning through shared campaign narratives and audience knowledge. At the level of social practice, it explains how recurring negative representations contribute to governance evaluation, political responsibility, legitimacy and electoral persuasion.

The interpretation is further informed by the analytical concept of bi-implication, through which each negative marker is examined for both its explicit meaning and its implicit ideological implications. The analysis focuses on recurring discursive patterns rather than isolated examples, ensuring that interpretations remain grounded in textual evidence and the broader socio-political context of the speech, consistent with the interpretive orientation of Critical Discourse Analysis (Fairclough, 2015; Wodak & Meyer, 2016).

The analytical procedure adopted in this study is summarised in Table 1, which presents the categories of negative markers analysed, their bi-implicative functions and their relationship to Fairclough's (2015) analytical dimensions



Table 1. Analytical Framework for the Interpretation of Negative Markers

Analytical Category	Linguistic Realisation	Immediate Semantic Function	Bi-implicative Interpretation	Fairclough's Analytical Dimension
Grammatical Negation	<i>not, no, never, neither, nor</i>	Denial, absence or contradiction	Suggests governance deficiency, institutional failure or unmet public expectations	Text
Negative Quantifiers	<i>nothing, nobody, nowhere, none</i>	Total absence or exclusion	Constructs systemic neglect and social exclusion	Text
Negative Modality	<i>cannot, should not, must not, will not</i>	Impossibility, inability, prohibition or obligation	Represents governmental incapacity, responsibility or policy inadequacy	Text
Negative Lexical Evaluation	<i>failure, insecurity, poverty, corruption, hardship, unemployment, decay, collapse</i>	Negative assessment of social conditions	Delegitimises existing governance while legitimising political alternatives	Text
Discursive Interpretation	Shared campaign narratives, intertextual references, public knowledge, audience assumptions	Provides contextual interpretation	Enables audiences to infer responsibility without explicit accusation	Discursive Practice



Ideological Interpretation	Governance evaluation, legitimacy, political responsibility, electoral persuasion	Explains broader social meaning	Demonstrates how negative markers sustain ideological positioning and political persuasion	Social Practice
-----------------------------------	---	---------------------------------	--	-----------------

Source: Developed by the researcher based on Fairclough (2015), model and the analytical concept of bi-implication.

4. Data Analysis and Discussion

Negative markers in Atiku Abubakar's 2023 presidential declaration speech function as patterned discursive resources through which evaluation, responsibility, and political legitimacy are reorganised via bi-implication. Rather than treating negation as an isolated grammatical feature, the analysis shows that repeated negative constructions accumulate into a stable critique of governance that appears experiential, collective, and resistant to dismissal as partisan rhetoric. Across the extracts, negation simultaneously describes social conditions and withdraws legitimacy from political authority without overt attribution of blame.

The clause "We do not have a country that works for the ordinary person" establishes the dominant evaluative frame. The negator *do not have* constructs dysfunction as structural absence rather than episodic failure, thereby normalising governance inadequacy as a lived condition. By presupposing a shared benchmark of "a country that works" and anchoring evaluation to "the ordinary person,"

the construction redistributes responsibility away from named actors and positions governance failure as a systemic breach of inclusivity. Discursively, the audience are positioned as co-witnesses of exclusion, foreclosing counter-argument by framing evaluation as recognition rather than claim.

This framing is reinforced through historical contrast in "This is not the Nigeria our founding fathers dreamed of." Negation here stabilises crisis as a moral deviation from an accepted national ideal. By invoking collective memory, the construction shifted accountability from contemporary political rivalry to ethical continuity, allowing critique to circulate as restoration rather than opposition. The present was evaluated against an uncontested past, reorganising legitimacy loss as historical betrayal rather than policy disagreement.

Temporal accumulation structures evaluation in "Too many promises have not translated into real progress." The negative perfect *have not translated* combines with the quantifier *too many* to frame



stagnation as persistent and patterned. Governance credibility is eroded not through isolated failure but through repeated non-fulfilment over time. This construction pre-empts defence by presenting disappointment as cumulative experience already sedimented in public consciousness.

A similar redistribution of responsibility occurs in “Our young people are not being given the opportunities they deserve.” The passive form suppresses agency while foregrounding deprivation, allowing injustice to be recognised without explicit accusation. The moral predicate *deserve* intensifies evaluation while preserving restraint, positioning youth exclusion as systemic neglect rather than administrative oversight. The audience are aligned as moral evaluators rather than partisan judges. Normative boundaries are redrawn in “Leadership should not be about excuses but about solutions.” This contrastive negation excludes justification from the category of legitimate leadership, thereby reframing explanation itself as evidence of failure. Rather than accusing leaders directly, the construction delegitimises prevailing political discourse practices, closing off apology and rationalisation as acceptable responses to crisis.

The evaluative trajectory reaches a threshold in “We cannot continue to accept a system that delivers less and demands more.” The modal negator *cannot* signals moral exhaustion

rather than incapacity, while the comparative pair *less* and *more* construct governance as extractive and asymmetrical. Endurance is framed as irrational, positioning political change as a logical outcome rather than an explicit demand. Resistance is normalised without being commanded.

Across these extracts, a stable discursive pattern has emerged in which negation functions as a strategic mechanism for bi-implication. At the level of discursive practice, these constructions draw force from shared campaign conventions and media circulation in which decline, insecurity, and economic strain are already accepted as background knowledge. This circulation reduces the need for evidential argument and renders negation immediately intelligible and persuasive. At the level of social practice, indirect critique functions as a structural response to electoral scepticism and legitimacy fatigue, enabling authority to be withdrawn without polarising confrontation.

The analysis shows how bi-implication operates as the mediating mechanism, linking textual negation to legitimacy erosion. Governance failure is not asserted but made recognisable through patterned absence, moral evaluation, and cumulative disappointment. This organisation of critique confirms that indirectness in the speech functions discursively rather than stylistically, allowing political accountability to be



reconfigured while maintaining rhetorical restraint within the Nigerian pre-election context.

5. Conclusion

The patterned use of negative markers demonstrates how discourse structures evaluation, responsibility, and legitimacy in a systematic, bi-implicative manner. This study examines how negative markers function as bi-implicative resources in Atiku Abubakar's 2023 presidential declaration speech. The analysis shows that negation is systematically deployed to construct social crisis while indirectly withdrawing political legitimacy, allowing critique to circulate without explicit attribution of blame. Rather than operating as isolated grammatical choices, negative constructions form a stable discursive pattern through which governance failure is normalised as shared experience and moral recognition.

Using Fairclough's Critical Discourse Analysis, the study demonstrates how bi-implication mediates between textual form and ideological effect. At the textual level, negation frames absence, stagnation, and deprivation; at the level of discursive practice, these framings rely on shared assumptions within campaign communication and media circulation; and at the level of social practice, indirect critique functions as a structural response to electoral scepticism and legitimacy fatigue. In this way, political accountability is reorganised without overt confrontation.

The findings proves that negative markers play a central role in shaping persuasive force in the speech by positioning audiences as co-recognisers of failure rather than targets of argument. This strategy enhances rhetorical restraint while sustaining oppositional meaning. The study therefore contributes to Nigerian political discourse scholarship by showing that bi-implication is not merely a descriptive label but an analytical lens for explaining how indirect evaluation stabilises legitimacy loss in campaign rhetoric. Further research could extend this approach comparatively across candidates or electoral cycles to test the durability of this discursive pattern.

References

- Adedeji, A. O. (2015). *A critical discourse analysis of selected political campaign speeches of gubernatorial candidates in South-Western Nigeria, 2007–2014* (Doctoral dissertation).
- Ademilokun, M., & Taiwo, R. (2013). Discursive strategies in newspaper campaign advertisements for Nigeria's 2011 elections. *Discourse & Communication*, 7(4), 435–455.
- Chilton, P. (2004). *Analysing political discourse: Theory and practice*. Routledge.



- Durán, P. (2018). Negation in U.S. presidential inaugural addresses: A systemic functional perspective. *Functions of Language*, 25(3), 362–390.
- Fairclough, N. (1995). *Critical discourse analysis: The critical study of language*. Longman.
- Fairclough, N. (2015). *Language and power* (3rd ed.). Routledge.
- Jibrin, M. B. S., & Oguche, A. (2025). A discourse analysis of the campaign speeches of selected 2023 Nigerian presidential candidates. *Awka Journal of English Language and Literary Studies*, 12(2), 152–173.
- Martin, J. R., & White, P. R. R. (2005). *The language of evaluation: Appraisal in English*. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Nai, A., & Gerstlé, J. (Eds.). (2019). *The personalization of electoral campaigns in democratic societies: Causes and consequences*. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Oamen, F. I. (2020). Resilience discourse in Nigeria's 2019 presidential campaign speeches: A critical discourse analysis.
- Ogunlana, O., & Oamen, F. (2025). Power dynamics in Nigeria's political rhetoric: A critical analysis of presidential election campaign discourse. *Journal of the Linguistic Association of Nigeria*, 28(1), 133–151. <https://doi.org/10.60787/jolan.vol28no1.435>
- Opeibi, T. (2009). *Discourse, politics and the 1993 presidential election campaigns in Nigeria*. Nouveaux Horizons.
- Ross, A. S., & Caldwell, D. (2020). Going negative: An appraisal analysis of the rhetoric of Donald Trump on Twitter. *Language & Communication*, 70, 13–27.
- van Dijk, T. A. (1998). *Ideology: A multidisciplinary approach*. Sage.
- van Dijk, T. A. (2006). Politics, ideology, and discourse. In K. Brown (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of language and linguistics* (2nd ed., Vol. 9, pp. 728–740). Elsevier.
- van Leeuwen, T. (2008). *Discourse and practice: New tools for critical discourse analysis*. Oxford University Press.
- Wodak, R. (2009). *The discourse of politics in action: Politics as usual*. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Wodak, R., & Meyer, M. (Eds.). (2016). *Methods of critical discourse studies* (3rd ed.). Sage.
- Yang, Y. (2025). The ideological meaning of negation in political



speech. *Journal of the University of Ruhuna*, 13(1), 52–61.
<https://doi.org/10.4038/jur.v13i1.8061>. (Jolan)

APPENDIX A

Full Text of Atiku Abubakar Speech Declaring for 2023 Presidency in Katsina State

One People with One Future We will be One Country

**20th December 2022 at
Muhammadu Dikko Stadium**

1. Introduction.

First, I want to thank you all for being here today and for all your enduring support. I know there are over twelve million Nigerians out there, who may not be here with us today, but they have been with us since the 2019 election. I know these numbers are growing every day. I want to thank you all for believing in our vision.

I want to thank you all for your bravery. Despite the disappointment in the last election, you still believe that this time around, it is possible. For me, I could say there was never a break. Since our last fight in the court, challenging the 2019 election results, I have received several calls and encouragements from you to contest again.

I have listened to your brave voices. Beyond the words coming out of your mouths, I could imagine your frustrations, yet you are hopeful. I

admire you greatly for choosing hope over despair.

I know why you are doing this. You are doing this because deeply you believe something good is possible and is coming to Nigeria.

In the face of the worst division, you believe this country can still unite. In the face of economic hardship, you believe prosperity is coming. In the face of the worst insecurity, you believe peace is possible. I also share in your optimism; that is why I am here today to give you an answer.

2. The 2023 Election.

The 2023 election is not just like the usual elections; it is a referendum to decide whether we want greatness or continuous destruction. It is a choice between two paths: the path of unity and progress or the path of division and backwardness.

We need a new kind of leadership that will steer us to a positive path. In 2023, we want a President who has ideas on how to fix Nigeria. We want a president who understands, who inspires and is empathetic.

As the election is fast approaching, we should not be distracted from the devastating conditions we are in now. The ruling party wants to divide us; they want to divide us along the political, ethnic, and religious lines so that we forget to blame them for the rising inflation.

They want to distract us from holding them responsible for the insecurity and rising poverty. They want us to be



facing each other and hating one another. We should focus on the issues, not our differences. Let us unite and fight our common enemies: the lack of unity, insecurity, poverty, inflation, and unemployment.

That is what this election is about. I have no doubt in my mind that we as Nigerians can do it. We have done it in 1993. We can do it in 2023. We must stand firm, get our PVCs, come out en-masse, cast our votes, and protect it against any manipulation.

I have contested for the office of the President of the Federal Republic of Nigeria a couple of times in the past. My enduring persistence is borne out of my passion to rekindle the Nigerian dream that I was privileged to live.

Nigeria is a land of possibility. There is no challenging background that will make any Nigerian give up. I am a living witness to what is possible in Nigeria.

3. My Story

Who could have ever imagined, an eleven-year-old village orphan, who had to rear other people's cattle to raise money to feed his family, would have the opportunity to go to school for free, rise through the cadre of a decent profession, establish successful businesses, and become the Vice President of this country?

That is the Nigerian dream and that is my story. That is the possibility I want to pass to you and your children. No matter your current circumstances, that should not limit your success in life. There should not be any limit to

what you want to achieve if you are willing to work for it.

That is my dream for Nigeria. However, that is not possible without credible and visionary leadership, and that is what I want to offer to Nigerians.

4. The Declaration

You and I know that Nigeria is in dire need of visionary leadership. Our fundamental principles and purpose as a nation have never been challenged as it is today. Presently, Nigeria is a sinking ship; it must be rescued urgently. That is why I am happy to announce my candidacy for the President of the Federal Republic of Nigeria, under the platform of the PDP.

I offer myself to rescue the sinking ship. Under my captainship, this ship will sail to a brighter course by the grace of God. However, this journey is not mine alone. It is a journey I am taking for all Nigerians. It is also a journey to a destination I planned with my late great mentor, Major General Shehu Musa Yar'adua, and with my beloved compatriot, the late, and great, Chief Moshood Kashimawo Olawale Abiola. May their souls rest in peace.

These two gentlemen helped me find my path in politics, and as a group we had a vision to run Nigeria in a businesslike manner, where, as one nation, we would bid farewell to poverty, by understanding our differences, and harnessing them to do



together what we would not be able to do separately.

5. My Plan

Under my presidency, I want to focus on five key areas: Unity of Nigeria, Security, Economy, Education and devolving more resources and powers to the federating units.

Since the civil war, the unity of Nigeria has never been threatened as it is today. Nigerians are losing hope in the oneness of this country. My fellow Nigerians, I am the unifier that is coming to bond the broken union.

We will open doors for dialogue to hear the grieving voices of all Nigerians. Under my presidency, there will be a new Nigeria, where everybody has an equal voice and is heard.

Throughout my life, I have never looked at Nigerians as divided people. In my eyes, all Nigerians are the same. When I see you, I don't see Yoruba or Hausa or Igbo or Fulani or a northerner or southerner; when I see you, I only see a Nigerian, and I expect the best from you.

All Nigerians are equal and should be seen and treated equally. There is no unity without justice and fairness. That is why I will deliver leadership of justice and fairness.

Why is unity a priority? Well, we must work to strengthen our unity as my

dear friend and brother, Chief Alex Ifeanyichukwu Ekwueme, once said. National integration, he continued, will not come as a gift. It is the role of government to work very hard and promote it.

The APC administration has failed in its fundamental responsibility of protecting the lives and properties of Nigerians. The most significant human right is the right to life, which has not been protected under the APC administration.

Our military forces are fighting on the front lines without equipment and morale. That is not fair. If we get into power, we will increase the welfare of all security forces. We will use modern technology and intelligence to combat insecurity. We will also increase the number of personnel for our security agencies.

Why security? Because national security is the first sign of a functional government, and where it does not exist, we must not blame those who threaten it. We can only blame a government that allows it to be threatened. And if I am elected as your President, insecurity is one thing I will not tolerate.

All the macro-economic indicators are not favorable under the APC administration. APC inherited single-digit inflation; they now increased it to about 16%. When the APC came into power, unemployment was around



9%; now, unemployment is more than 33%.

The Exchange Rate was N197 to a Dollar in 2015, but in the hand of APC, Naira suffered the worst devaluation ever. As we speak, the exchange rate is more than N400 to a dollar, the official rate.

That was not the change we wanted. If we get elected, we will create alternative sources of foreign exchange supply to Nigeria and reduce importation to increase the value of the Naira.

They said we should go back to the farmlands. How can you ask people to go to the farms while you have not secured the farms? People cannot go back to the farm because they are afraid, they could be kidnapped or killed.

Under my leadership, we will ensure absolute security because that is the number one condition for economic prosperity. We will provide access to mechanized farming systems and develop the agricultural value chain. We must diversify our foreign exchange sources through exports of processed agricultural products.

When the APC came into power, Nigeria's debt was N12 trillion, and now they increased it to N32 trillion. They still want to borrow more. Under my leadership, we will reduce government borrowing. Too much

borrowing comes at the detriment of future growth.

We will operate a liberal economy that allows small businesses to grow through lower taxes and charges for small businesses and low-income earners. We will encourage the expansion of the private sector to spur economic growth.

For our population to have a positive impact, we must equip our people with modern competitive skills and provide the right environment for them to thrive. As Chief Abiola once said, "we in Nigeria must not allow ourselves to be left behind." If you look at our present state, you will agree with me that the world, and sadly, even the rest of Africa have left us behind.

More than 100 million Nigerians are either unemployed, underemployed, or unemployable. How could our ever-increasing population be of added value if we do not create opportunities for our people?

I know how to create jobs. I built several successful businesses and companies within Nigeria, and as a result of which thousands of people are gainfully employed. If I can manage my businesses well, I can manage the Nigerian economy well.

Education should be given free to every Nigerian, at least up to the secondary school level. I know the value of education; if not because of



education, what kind of value would someone like me, a poor child from a small village would have added to Nigeria?

That is why I established an educational community in my hometown, where I built schools from Kindergarten to University all in one place to provide education to the promising younger generation.

The success of any educational policy is not measured based on the number of bodies in classrooms or schools alone but also the quality and relevance of the education. That is why we will invest in improving access and quality of education.

Nelson Mandela once said, "No country can really develop unless its citizens are educated."

Every Nigerian must have access to affordable and decent healthcare. No Nigerian should be afraid of falling sick just because they cannot pay for the hospital bill. We will strengthen our health care programs so that every Nigerian can have access to the required minimum healthcare quality.

Nigerians cannot afford to pay high petrol prices. That is why we must ensure sufficient refining capacities within Nigeria. If we do that, petrol will be cheaper because it is locally produced. In the meantime, we will protect Nigerians from higher petrol prices through a new comprehensive Energy Policy.

To provide an adequate and affordable electricity supply for every Nigerian, we will ensure sufficient investment in the sector. We will leverage renewable energies to power homes and commercial centers.

And that is why we must provide opportunity for our people. When the citizens of any nation have the opportunity to progress at their own pace, they themselves will help make insecurity a thing of the past. We must remember that terror only thrives where there is local support and crime flourishes where it is profitable.

If we introduce opportunities for Nigerians to express and progress themselves, we would have depressed the insecurity.

6. My Policy Document

As you are aware, I am a man of policy. I will never be that kind of a president operating based on impulse. My administration will be guided by a consolidated and timely policy document.

You and I will be working together to update and review my existing policy document. We should consolidate our ideas into a unified people's policy that will reflect the realities and possibilities of the current time. The consolidated and reviewed people's policy document will be announced in due course. It will also serve as an input into the PDP manifesto.



7. Style of Governance

I am confident in my ability to deliver inclusive governance. I invite every well-meaning Nigerian to join me in rescuing Nigeria. I don't have to be the most qualified Nigerian, but I should be wise enough to bring together the most qualified Nigerians to work with them even if I don't know them previously. I will summon the best brains and work with them.

I would like to work more with young people. Young people are more agile, creative, and conversant with contemporary opportunities and challenges. I too, I feel like I am a 25-year-old. So, you can call me a youth too.

Our administration is going to be a transition of power from the senior generation to a younger generation.

We will cut down the cost of governance because leaders must sacrifice first for the benefit of the people. We will set our fiscal budget within a realizable and realistic level so that we can reduce government debts. We will support and actively engage the private sector in building infrastructure and creating more job opportunities.

8. Conclusion

In the end, this campaign is not about me; it is about you; it is about the future of this country. Let our stories be told for generations to come that

we are the ones that rescued Nigeria when it was on the verge of fatal destruction. This is our last opportunity to write our names with the golden ink of history. It must be now or never.

This time around is different; our journey will not end at the poll; we will get to work and rescue Nigeria. I invite every Nigerian to join me in this mission to save our dear country. I believe together we can do it. This is what we owe to Nigeria and the future generation. I have never been this optimistic, and with your support and God's grace, we will get to the Promised Land.

The late sage, Chief Obafemi Awolowo, did say that "after rain comes sunshine. After darkness comes the glorious dawn." We have experienced rain, and darkness has enveloped us for too long. Now is the time for sunshine. The hour of our glorious dawn is finally here.

Let me take this opportunity to specially thank the executives and members of the North-East Business Community for not only encouraging me to contest once again, but also for going ahead to purchase the Expression of Interest and the Nomination Forms for me.

My appreciation also goes to all the members of TEECOM chaired by the High Chief Dr. Raymond Dokpesi, for their hard work, dedication, and commitment to this project. I pray that



God will crown our efforts with God bless you
success.

AS ONE WE CAN GET IT DONE.

And may God bless the Federal
Republic of Nigeria.

Thank you

Bio-data

Sani Saidu is a researcher in English linguistics, specialising in political discourse and Critical Discourse Analysis, with research interests in Nigerian campaign rhetoric and applied linguistics.