

**A RHETORICAL ANALYSIS OF CRISIS FRAMES CAPTURED IN THE 2023 NAIRA REDESIGN  
SPEECH OF PRESIDENT MUHAMMADU BUHARI**

**By**

**Eyamba Mensah, Ph.D**

Department of Mass Communication  
University of Calabar, Calabar

**Abstract**

This study analysed the crisis rhetoric of President Muhammadu Buhari during his 8-year tenure (2015-2023). Anchored on the rhetorical theory of Aristotle and Robert Entman's framing theory, this study determined the crisis frames captured in the Naira redesign speech delivered by President Buhari during his time in office as President. The study employed critical discourse and rhetorical analysis. The findings of this study showed that the President strategically captured crisis frames, employed rhetorical appeals and other rhetorical devices to communicate policy responses, build trust and project leadership in addressing the concerns of the public in the face of the many challenges that bedevilled the Country. The enquiry reveals the appropriateness of the rhetorical strategies employed vis-à-vis the crisis situations by the President as well as his rhetorical competence. The research contributes to knowledge in the field of strategic and political communication as it will stimulate further dialogue in the area.

**Introduction**

In contemporary political discourse, the rhetoric employed by leaders during times of crisis plays a pivotal role in shaping public perception, garnering support, and maintaining national stability (Borchers, 2016). The strategic use of language and persuasive techniques becomes particularly significant for political leaders aiming to communicate effectively and manage public sentiment during critical moments. Presidential crisis rhetoric stands as a captivating and pivotal field within the realm of political communication, delving into the intricate ways leaders employ persuasive language during periods of substantial national and international turmoil. These crises necessitate strategic communication tactics that not only address public concerns but also convey leadership, navigate complex issues, and influence public perception and policy outcomes (Borchers, 2016). This research embarks on an exploration of presidential crisis rhetoric, focusing on the interplay of rhetorical analysis, crisis frames and rhetoric. ). The study of presidential crisis rhetoric is not confined to the analysis of successful communication strategies but also encompasses instances of rhetorical missteps and the resulting consequences. Throughout history, presidential crisis rhetoric, though not a statutory responsibility of the Commander-in-chief has served multiple purposes, including information dissemination, unity-building, crisis management, and policy communication. The content and tone of speeches have evolved to suit the prevailing media landscape and societal expectations, while the core goals of addressing citizens' concerns and guiding the nation through challenging times have remained constant. In Nigeria, President Muhammadu Buhari who is known for his distinct communication style characterized by directness and authority, has delivered a series of speeches addressing national crises in Nigeria. In the context of Nigeria's socio-political landscape, where public opinion and societal responses are highly sensitive to crisis situations, it becomes crucial to analyse the rhetorical strategies utilized by President Buhari in his crisis speeches. Such an analysis can provide insights into the ways in which he as a leader of the nation navigates the intricate balance between conveying information, instilling confidence, and evoking empathy.

There is a gap in knowledge in the field of presidential rhetoric in Nigeria. While a lot of work has been done on Presidential crisis rhetoric of foreign presidents, especially of American and European leaders, there is a dearth of such, concerning Nigerian presidents. This study is therefore scholarly significant in that it seeks to unravel the usage by a Nigerian President of crisis rhetoric. This study therefore attempts a ground breaking exercise into the area of presidential crisis rhetoric in Nigeria. Literature is only replete with linguistic investigations of political rhetoric from the pragmatic stand point. Awonuga (2005) studied the linguistic features of the former President Olusegun Obasanjo's broadcast to the nation on August 25, 2002. Olaniyi (2009) conducted a pragmatic analysis of President Umar Yar'Adua's inaugural speech of 29th May 2007. Kamalu and Agangan (2011) conducted a Critical Discourse Analysis of President Goodluck Jonathan's Declaration of interest in the PDP Presidential Primaries while Sarafa (2011) conducted a pragmatic analysis of President Goodluck Jonathan's inaugural speech. None known to the researcher had delved into the rhetoric of their crisis communication while in office. For President Buhari whose tenure was characterized by landmark crisis, it becomes very necessary to do a rhetorical analysis on the speeches he had made especially during his last three years in office (2020-2023) which happened to be the most turbulent period of his presidency. It is worthy to note that for most of the time he maintained a measure of silence.

In the face of significant crises spanning the years 2020 to 2023, including the COVID-19 pandemic, economic challenges, social unrest, and political controversies, there existed a need to undertake an analysis of the crisis speeches delivered by President Muhammadu Buhari. These speeches served as a window into his leadership and communication style during critical moments, providing insight into how he framed the crises, communicated policy responses, and appealed to the nation's unity. However, a gap exists in understanding the rhetorical strategies employed by President Buhari in his crisis speeches and how these strategies influenced public perception, policy adoption, and national cohesion. Therefore, this study aims to address this gap by conducting a systematic rhetorical analysis of select crisis speeches delivered by President Muhammadu Buhari during the specified period. In this analysis, we examine the crisis frames as we seek to unravel the persuasive techniques, and strategic communication choices that shaped his crisis narratives and their impact on the Nigerian populace. By delving into these speeches, we aim to shed light on the ways in which presidential crisis rhetoric contributes to the larger discourse of leadership, crisis management, and national resilience in Nigeria.

### **Review of Relevant Literature**

In this section, a review of selected concepts and relevant literature within the scope of the research is made coupled with the Theories being used to drive the work.

### **Political Communication**

Political communication can trace its roots to the earliest classical studies of Aristotle and Plato. A review of literature on political communication reveals an important point about its definition. It is “notoriously difficult to define with any precision, simply because both components of the phrase are themselves open to a variety of definitions, more or less broad” (McNair, 2011, p.3). In fact, modern political communication is very much an interdisciplinary field of study, drawing on concepts from communication, political science, journalism, sociology, psychology, history, rhetoric, and other fields (Kaid, 2004).

This difficulty notwithstanding, quite a few definitions of this phrase litter the literature landscape of the subject with none gaining universal acceptance. Political communication has been defined as an “interactive process concerning the transmission of information among politicians, the news media and the public” (Havard, 2004, p.1). So also has it been defined according to Denton and Woodward (1990, p.14) as “pure discussion about the allocation of public resources (revenues), official authority (who is given the power to make legal, legislative and executive decision), and official sanctions (what the state rewards or punishes)”. However, this definition has a snag. McNair (2011) opines this definition incorporates only verbal and written political rhetoric, but not symbolic communication acts which are of growing significance for an understanding of the political process as a whole. Graber (1981) advanced a more all-encompassing definition with the adoption of the term ‘political language’, suggesting that it comprises not only rhetoric but paralinguistic signs such as body language, and political acts such as boycotts and protests. But by this researcher’s reckoning, Chaffee’s (1975) definition of political communication appears to be the simplest and arguably the best. Political communication is the “role of communication in the political process” (Chaffee, 1975, p.15). Worthy of discussion under the topic political communication are its integral elements by which political action is conceived and realized. These elements include political organisations, the media and the citizens.

### **Rhetorics**

Rhetoric is the art of effective or persuasive speaking or writing; broadly defined in modern times as the art of effective communication (Burton, 2016). Rhetoric can be traced to the ancient Greece and Rome where it was studied from the fifth century B.C. to the early Middle Ages. Nordquist (2016) says the meaning of the word rhetoric can also be traced back ultimately to the simple Greek assertion ‘eiro’ which means “I say”. According to Young, Becker and Pike (1970), almost anything related to the act of saying something to someone--in speech or in writing--can conceivably fall within the domain of rhetoric as a field of study.

The English word rhetoric is derived from Greek ‘rhetorike’, which came into use in the circle of Socrates in the fifth century and first appeared in Plato's dialogue Gorgias, probably written about 385 B.C. Rhetorike in Greek specifically denotes the civic art of public speaking as it developed in deliberative assemblies, law courts, and other formal occasions under constitutional government in the Greek cities, especially the Athenian democracy. As such, it is a cultural subset of a more general concept of the power of words and their potential to affect a situation in which they are used or received (Kennedy, 1994).

Rhetoric is both an art of communication and a method of critical inquiry on artifacts of communication. As an art, it concerns the deliberate strategies of effective communication. As a method, it examines these strategies and their effectiveness in a communicative context. More formally, it is “an effort to understand how people within specific

social situations attempt to influence others through languages” (Selzer 2004, p. 280-1). There are three general models of study in terms of dealing with the textual and contextual dimensions of the artifact. The first mainly examines the textual features. The textual category makes use of “one or other kind of rhetorical terminology as a means of careful analysis of a single symbolic act considered on its own discrete terms” (*ibid*). This considers the text complete and autonomous in its form and content. My analysis of Madhav K. Nepal’s speech at the beginning follows this approach. The second examines the contextual (rather extra-textual) features focusing more on understanding “individual pieces as parts of larger communicative chains, or conversations,” and attempts to “create a thick description of the (sometimes complex) cultural environments that existed when the rhetorical event took place ...” (*ibid*). This approach works in congruence with the notion that “rhetoric exists both inside and outside the text,” and then accepts the role of social, cultural, political and historical factors in shaping the construction of an artifact.

The third approach takes that rhetoric naturally combines text and context. This respects the view (of Mailloux, for example) of overcoming the artificial distinction between textual and extra-textual interpretive approaches. It also goes with Selzer’s suggestion that text and context “should not be understood as mutually exclusive” (2004, p. 302). This approach derives largely from the classical rhetoric, especially the modes of appeal, genres, and canons.

According to Aristotle in his book *Rhetoric* (4th century BC), rhetoric has three genres. They are judicial (forensic), epideictic (ceremonial) and deliberative (legislative) rhetoric.

### **Rhetorics and Crisis Management**

Crises not well handled attract consequences (Augustine, 1995). Therefore, crises and consequences are not mutually exclusive. A poorly handled crisis for an organization can lead to its extinction as was seen in the case of Enron Energy Company (Ulmer, Sellnow and Seegar, 2011). A crisis not well managed can also contribute to a loss of election for leaders as was seen in the case of President Jimmy Carter in the poor handling of American hostages held in Iran (Griffin, 1994). Without mincing words, the manner in which organizations or leaders of nations address or rhetorically manage crises serves as a turning point: Respond well and survive the crisis; respond poorly and suffer public wrath and a dent on reputation (Heath & Millar, 2004).

The drift expressed in the preceding paragraph indicates that there is rhetorical dimension to crisis management. Crisis constitutes a rhetorical problem that requires the deployment of skillfully developed messages to respond to the concerns of stakeholders in an ethical manner (Heath, Toth & Waymer, 2009). A rhetorical problem is thus a perceived or actual gap between what stakeholders believe or how they behave and what stakeholders should believe or how they should behave. It is a “gap in agreement, alignment of interests, cocreated meaning, shared understanding, shared facts and their interpretation, motivation, interests, evaluations, behaviour, or conclusions” (Heath and Coombs 2006, p.118).

Since scholars (Heath et al, 2009; Heath & Coombs, 2006) have established that every crisis triggers a rhetorical problem, it will not be out of place to assume a rhetorical problem requires a rhetorical approach for its solution. Heath and Millar (2004, p.5) note that:

A rhetorical approach to crisis explicitly acknowledges that the responsibility for the crisis, its magnitude, and its duration are contestable. It stresses the message development and presentation part of the crisis response. It underscores the role that information, framing, and interpretation play in the preparation for a crisis, response to it, and post crisis comments and actions ... (it) features the communication processes and efforts to co-define meanings that assist persons who are affected—or think they are affected—to prepare for, accommodate to, and recover from the disruptive events. What the event means—how it is to be interpreted—becomes a central rhetorical theme... A rhetorical approach to crisis recognizes that each crisis has an actual dimension and a perceived dimension. Some crises are “perceived” to be bigger or smaller than they actually are. One explanation for this difference in perception is the ability of key spokespersons to communicate effectively before, during, and after the crisis.

In presidential crisis communication for example, a rhetorical presidency does a president a lot of good in crisis management as it affords the presidency unlimited access to the populace. This “new way” according to Tulis (1987) affords a president or his spokespersons the opportunity to go public to promote the president’s policies while in office and to appeal to the public for support even before the advent of any crisis. This is the time to develop a crisis

plan; a time to prepare the staffs of the communication directorate in the presidency to know how to prevent or mitigate the negative effect of a crisis and to know how to react in the event of a crisis.

In Nigeria, instances abound of how past presidents or their spokespersons have inadvertently employed inappropriate rhetoric while defending government actions and policies or when reacting to angry citizens thereby breeding more enemies than friends for the president. Spokespersons are included in this discourse because it is assumed, they speak for the President. Reuben Abati, the Senior Special Adviser Media and Publicity to the erstwhile Nigerian President – Goodluck Jonathan – referred to critics of his principal as “cynics, the pestle-wielding critics, the unrelenting, self-appointed activists, the idle and idling, twittering, collective children of anger, the distracted crowd of Facebook addicts, the BBM-pinging soap opera gossips of Nigeria” (Abati, 2012). The spokesperson to President Muhammadu Buhari - Femi Adesina apparently has not learnt from the mistake of his predecessor. He too; in reaction to critics of his principal has labeled them ‘wailing wailers’. This display of disdain and usage of uncharitable language towards stakeholders is an indication of either a lack of a well thought through crisis response plan or a non-adherence to such plan at the heat of the moment.

When a crisis breaks, employing the appropriate rhetoric and doing so at the right time are essential in effective crisis management. In a nation, for example, Kacewicz and Meany (2016) posit a crisis situation demands a decisive action and urgent response from the president. The options of possible response to diverse kinds of crisis are quite numerous. Heath and Millar (2004) believe response can include blame placing, whether that blame is fairly and accurately assigned. It can also entail blame accepting. The situational crisis communication theory, as propounded by Coombs (2007), prescribes a framework for understanding the numerous response types available to a crisis rhetor and a mechanism for anticipating how stakeholders will react to a crisis. This shall be described in detail under the theoretical framework section of this study.

In a nutshell, the rhetorical intervention required during a crisis is a quest for control; a control for the dominant narrative. A political leader in response to a crisis need to responsibly define the crisis, the actions that need to be taken, the actions that will be taken, are being taken, or have been taken. He must demonstrate persuasively that he understands the crisis and has the resources—intellectual, managerial, financial, rhetorical, and ethical—to restore to an acceptable, as opposed to an unacceptable, narrative. If a president abdicates this control to journalists or opponents of the government, the consequences can be grave. If he does not handle the situation properly, he may lose some of his credibility and legitimacy and would probably be discarded for this by opposition parties and by the citizens during the next elections (Kleinnijenhuis, Van Hoof, Oegama & De Ridder, 2007; Shah et al., 1999).

### **Rhetorical Appeals**

A common framework of rhetorical study observes the three interconnected modes of appeal from classical rhetoric (especially from Aristotle): *ethos*, *pathos*, and *logos*. These are the principal means of persuasion. In current scholarship, these are taken to be the crucial means of identification and motivation in addition to persuasion. *Ethos* refers to the proofs the communicator uses to establish her character/credibility. It includes the appeal to her personality, ethicality of reasoning, and originality of the contents. *Pathos* means emotional reasoning or the ways of involving the audience through the means of facilitating their understanding. It is also about evoking audience’s sense of self-respect, common human values and individual responsibilities. *Logos* refers to the steps or means of intellectual reasoning. It involves the studied-out facts and information presented to maintain originality in the text being communicated. *Logos* augments both *ethos* and *pathos* by providing the communicator resources for establishing trustworthiness and for addressing the audience’s expectations.

### **Theoretical Framework**

Theories are important in research because they help define the boundaries of a research field and keep research focused in the essential elements of what is demanded in the research instead of wandering afar of and getting lost in the forest of bodies of knowledge. The researcher acknowledges there is a myriad of theories relevant to this proposed study. However, only two of those theories are deemed very germane to this study. They are the Rhetorical Theory, and Framing Theory.

### **Rhetorical Theory**

Rhetorical theory is the body of thought about human symbol use. According to Rhetorical Theory, communicating and presenting information is not just sending a static message; the process is considerably more dynamic. This study utilized Aristotle’s definition of Rhetorical Theory. Aristotle defined rhetoric as *the art of discovering all the available means of persuasion* (Littlejohn & Foss, 2009). Aristotle was convinced that, for a persuasive speech to be effective, speakers must follow certain guidelines or principles, which he called canons. These are recommendations for making

a speech more compelling. Aristotle points to five prescriptions for effective oratory, the canons of rhetoric, namely: *invention* (finding ways to persuade), *arrangement* (putting together the structure of a coherent argument), *style* (presenting the argument to stir the emotions), *delivery* (making effective use of voice, gesture, etc.), and *memory* (speaking without having to prepare or memorize a speech) [(Littlejohn & Foss, 2009)]. Aristotle saw the function of rhetoric as the discovery in each case of “the available means of persuasion”. According to him, the available means of persuasion are based on three kinds of proof: logical (logos), ethical (ethos) and emotional (pathos). Logical proof comes from the line of argument in the speech, ethical proof is the way the speaker’s character is revealed in the message, and emotional proof is the feeling the speech draws out of the hearers. Some form of logos, ethos and pathos is present in every public presentation.

### ***Framing Theory***

Framing theory is a mass communication research tool that is predicated on the assumption that the media gives spotlight view of specific aspects of reality that direct audience attention to those aspects by promoting specific definitions, descriptions and, or analysis which capture the imagination and form the mental films by which media consumers cognitively respond to issues and events distilled from the world by the media. The implication is that the media creates the frames by which raw information is filtered and presented to the public with the purpose of focusing their attention on considered angles of the issue or event.

Framing is therefore a system of information processing and presentation whose structure enables the magnification of particular facets of an event or story by elucidating on the import and cause of event, issue or story while identifying the relevant actors including their roles and whom or what should be held accountable.

Framing theory seeks to identify and explain frames; how they are developed, their sources and their effect. Generally, however, frames function as highlighters or moderators of key points about specific information subset. As moderators, they play down certain features of an issue which may be equally relevant but for one reason or the other are considered dispensable. But as highlighters they magnify dimensions that are, also for one reason are the other considered indispensable. Baresch, Hsu and Reese (2012) notes that frames do this “often with the effect of supporting a certain way of looking at the world...lay foundation on which we citizens build our collective understanding of our world. They further cited Goffman (1974) as defining frame to be a “schema of interpretation” that allows people to locate, perceive, identify and label a seemingly infinite number of concrete occurrences defined in its limits (p. 637 & p.638).

The essence of framing research as an endeavour to comprehend audience reliance on preconceived notions in interpretation of reality dovetails with Lippmann’s (1921) proposition of “pictures in our head.” It squares with comprehending how those expectations are formed and how they are used by people to interpret happening in their daily interactions in their social milieu. Hence, in summary, framing research considers how frames are constructed, how they are disseminated and how they are consumed by the audience. It also considers the dynamics that influence audience interpretation of received frames

### **Research Design**

The present research is an analytical study of select speeches of former President Muhammadu Buhari. It seeks to find out the crisis frames captured in the crisis component of his speeches. Since the purpose of this research is to enhance our understanding of the persuasive techniques employed in the corpora at hand, it became more appropriate to conduct our analytical investigation on the basis of a qualitative approach. This research follows rhetorical discourse analysis methodology, it systematically falls under a descriptive design. This analytic procedure was informed by the fact that the study deals with written political speeches which were searched to unravel the rhetorical components embedded in them. The justification for the choice of the rhetorical analysis is that the present study discusses crisis frames that are used in political speeches to persuade an audience. This type of analysis has been used in similar works by Abderahmane (1995), Alo (2012), Temidayo and Sotayo (2016), Akinwotu and Ezeja (2020), Wiredu (2021) and Katamba (2022), and so the researcher considered it appropriate for the present study. Consequently, we humbly aimed to conduct an intriguing investigation and introduce valuable findings that would contribute to the field of rhetorical discourse analysis, as well as create a solid foundation for any future research.

### **Synopsis of the Naira Redesign/Currency Swap Speech**

In this address, the President of Nigeria, addressed the citizens regarding the state of the nation and the government's efforts to strengthen the economy, fight corruption, and enhance security. The speech focused on the implementation of new monetary policies, including the redesign of certain banknotes and measures to address money laundering and illicit financial flows. The President emphasized on the importance of these policies for economic growth, financial inclusion, and security. The challenges faced during the implementation of the policies were acknowledged, and the President expressed sympathy for the citizens affected by the transitions. The address highlighted the positive outcomes of the policy initiative, including the retrieval of a significant portion of funds previously held outside the banking system as he acknowledged the concerns raised by citizens and institutions, as well as consultations with State Governors and the Council of State. The President addressed the legal dimension of the issue and assured that existing legal processes were being respected. The President further announced measures to ease the transition, including allowing the old N200 banknotes to circulate alongside the new banknotes for a specified period. The redemption of old N1000 and N500 notes at designated points was also emphasized. The President also encouraged citizens to continue using banking platforms to make their deposits.

The speech also related the policy to the upcoming presidential and National Assembly elections, mentioning the positive impact on minimizing the influence of money in politics as he assured the citizens of security during the elections and urged for a peaceful participation. The speech ended with a call for citizens to vote without fear and to avoid violence, while expressing well-wishes for a successful elections season. Throughout the address, the President emphasized his commitment to the well-being of Nigerians, transparency, and the rule of law. The importance of economic stability, security, and the democratic process were central themes in the speech.

### **Analysis of Crisis frames in the Speech:**

In the speech, the following crisis frames were captured:

1. **Economic Challenges:** The speech discussed the implementation of new monetary policies aimed at boosting the economy and addressing issues related to money laundering. The President emphasized the need to strengthen the economy, enhance security, and curb illicit financial flows.
2. **Currency Redesign:** The speech highlighted the redesign of Nigerian banknotes, the circulation of both old and new banknotes, and the challenges faced during the implementation of the policy. The President explained the rationale behind the currency redesign and the impact it had on economic growth.
3. **Financial Inclusion:** The President mentioned the importance of expanding financial inclusion and reducing the number of unbanked citizens as the policy aimed to encourage citizens to deposit money in the banking system.
4. **Corruption and Money Laundering:** The speech acknowledged the obstacles faced by citizens due to unscrupulous officials in the banking industry. The President directed the Central Bank of Nigeria (CBN) to collaborate with anti-corruption agencies to ensure that those impeding or sabotaging the policy were held accountable.
5. **Legislative and Legal Processes:** The speech acknowledged the ongoing legal proceedings related to the currency redesign and the pronouncements made by the courts. The President assured the citizens that the administration respects the rule of law.
6. **Election and Political Influence:** The speech mentioned the upcoming General Elections and emphasized that the new monetary policy will minimize the influence of money in politics. This policy was presented as a step towards ensuring free and fair elections.
7. **Appeal for Understanding and Non-Violence:** The President appealed to citizens to understand the temporary challenges posed by the currency redesign and to refrain from violence during the electoral processes.

These frames addressed economic challenges, financial policies, corruption, legal matters, political influence, and the upcoming elections, all of which contributed to the crisis context in the speech.

### **Discussion of Findings:**

Data from the Naira Redesign and Currency Swap Crisis Speech showed that President Buhari framed the crisis within an economic policy context, explaining the rationale behind the currency changes. He also emphasized the government's efforts to ensure economic stability and attract foreign investment through the currency swap, showcasing a positive angle of the crisis which could be seen as a stability and investment frame as he also captured

a Long-Term Vision Frame by using the speech to present the redesign as part of a larger vision for economic growth and development.

These findings indicate that President Buhari strategically employed crisis frames that aligned with the specific nature of each crisis. These frames allowed him to address the concerns of the public, project leadership, and communicate policy responses effectively which aligns with the key ideas of the framing theory. The application of these theoretical framework deepened our understanding of the communicative strategies used by leaders during crises, highlighting the interplay between language, perception, and policy actions.

### **Summary and Conclusion**

This study was carried out to rhetorically analyse the crisis communication of President Muhammadu Buhari vis-à-vis his speech during the Naira currency swap crisis of 2023. Delving into the realm of rhetoric has always been fascinating and intriguing to many communication researchers and the present research work can be considered as an attempt to broaden the scope of rhetorical studies as it goes beyond political discourses to consider and address the crises frames deployed by a Nigerian President.

In conclusion, this research work has successfully addressed the key objectives outlined at the onset. The findings provide valuable insights into the crisis frames captured in the crisis communication of President. The present study has contributed to the existing body of knowledge in the field of political and crisis communication by rhetorically analysing the President's crisis rhetoric. As we move forward, these findings can serve as a foundation for further exploration and innovation in mass communication. The implications of this research extend to politics and governance, and it is hoped that this work will stimulate continued dialogue and investigation in the years to come.

### **Recommendations**

Based on the findings of this research, the following recommendations are proposed:

1. The President of any Nation happens to be a focal point of the entire citizens and as one whose rhetoric carries a lot of weight, there is need for such persons to be rhetorically competent especially in the face of crisis hence it is recommended for political office holders and leaders to always get the necessary grooming in readiness of any unexpected circumstance.
2. It is recommended that future research should delve deeper into the aspect of political rhetoric to gain a more comprehensive understanding of the topic. This could involve exploring potential areas of expansion or refinement.
3. Although the current research interfaced with elements from other disciplines, more collaboration with experts from related fields, such as Linguistics and Literary studies, can offer fresh perspectives and enhance the robustness of the findings. This interdisciplinary approach can enrich the research and lead to a broader impact on Mass Communication.
4. A similar study can be conducted using other prominent office holders to validate the results of the findings here and these findings can be disseminated through various channels, including academic conferences, publications, and public presentations, to foster knowledge sharing and stimulate discussions within the academic and broader communities.

### **References**

- Abati, R. (2012, August 26). The Jonathan they don't know. Retrieved from <https://www.vanguardngr.com/2012/08/the-jonathan-they-dont-know/>
- Abderahmane, M. I. R. A. (1995). A rhetorical analysis of Hillary Clinton's speeches: "Keynote speech" (2013) and "Women's rights are human rights speech" (1995) (Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Bejaia, Algeria).
- Akinwotu, S. A., & Ezeja, O. I. (2020). "I belong to everybody and I belong to nobody": A critical discourse analysis of selected speeches of President Muhammadu Buhari. *Lokoja Journal of English and Literature (LOJEL)*, 1(2), 1-15.
- Augustine, N. R. (1995, November 30). Managing the crisis you tried to prevent. Retrieved from <https://hbr.org/1995/11/managing-the-crisis-you-tried-to-prevent>

- Awonuga, C. O. (2005). A stylistic study of sustenance of democracy by Nigeria's President Olusegun Obasanjo. *Journal of Social Science, 11*(2), 111-119.
- Baresch, B., Hsu, S., & Reese, S. D. (2012). The power of framing: New challenges for researching the structure of meaning in news. In S. Allan (Ed.), *Routledge companion to news and journalism studies* (pp. 637-647). London: Routledge.
- Borchers, T. A. (2016). Presidential crisis rhetoric in the 21st century: Theoretical and methodological challenges. In R. Friedenberga (Ed.), *Rhetorical studies of national political debates* (pp. 207-224). London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Burton, G. O. (2016, February 26). What is rhetoric? Retrieved from <http://rhetoric.byu.edu/>
- Chaffee, S. H. (1975). *Political communication*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.
- Coombs, W. T. (2007a). Attribution theory as a guide for post-crisis communication research. *Public Relations Review, 33*(6), 135-139.
- Denton, R. E., & Woodward, G. C. (1990). *Political communication in America*. New York: Praeger.
- Goffman, E. (1974). *Frame analysis: An essay on the organization of experience*. Harvard University Press.
- Graber, D. A. (1981). Political language. In N. Nimmo & K. Sanders (Eds.), *Handbook of political communication* (pp. 195-223). Beverly Hills: Sage Publications.
- Griffin, E. A. (1994). *A first look at communication theory* (4th ed.). Boston, MA: McGraw-Hill.
- Heath, R. L., & Coombs, W. T. (2006). *Today's public relations: An introduction*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Heath, R. L., & Millar, D. P. (2004). *Responding to crisis: A rhetorical approach to crisis communication*. Chicago: Sage Publications.
- Heath, R. L., Toth, E. L., & Waymer, D. (2009). *Rhetorical and critical approaches to public relations*. New York: Routledge.
- Kacewicz, L., & Meany, M. (2016, October 21). Crisis rhetoric: An exercise in persuasion (PowerPoint slides). Retrieved from <http://docslide.us/download/link/crisis-rhetoric-an-exercise-in-persuasion-laura-kacewicz-and-matthew-meany>
- Kaid, L. L. (2004). *Handbook of political communication research*. California: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- 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*(4), 32-54.
- Katamba, M. (2022). The rhetorical analysis of President Ellen Johnson Sirleaf's inaugural speech as Africa's first elected female president. *Akdeniz Havzası ve Afrika Medeniyetleri Dergisi, 4*(2), 71-82.
- Kennedy, G. A. (1994). *A new history of classic rhetoric*. Princeton: University Press
- Kleinnijenhuis, J., Van Hoof, A. M. J., Oegema, D., & De Ridder, J. A. (2007). A test of rivaling approaches to explain news effects: News on issue positions of parties, real world developments, support and criticism, and success and failure. *Journal of Communication, 57*(2), 366-384.
- Lippmann, W. (1921). *Public opinion*. New York: Harcourt, Brace & Co.
- Littlejohn, S. W., & Foss, K. A. (2009). *Encyclopedia of communication theory* (Vol. 1). London: Sage.
- Olaniyi, O. K. (2009). A pragmatic analysis of President Umar Yar'Adua's inaugural speech of 29th May, 2007. *Journal of the Nigeria English Studies Association, 13*(2), 10-22.
- McNair, B. (2011). *An introduction to political communication*. New York: Routledge.

- Sarafa, A. A. (2011). A pragmatic analysis of President Goodluck Jonathan's inaugural speech, Nigeria: Our nation in mourning. (Unpublished master's thesis, University of Ilorin, Ilorin).
- Selzer, J. (2004). *Argument in America: Essential issues, essential texts*. Longman Publishing Group.
- Shah, D. V., Watts, M. D., Domke, D., & Fan, D. P. (1999). News framing and cueing of issue regimes: Explaining Clinton's public approval in spite of scandal. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 66(3), 339-370.
- Tulis, J. K. (1987). *The rhetorical presidency*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Temidayo, A., & Sotayo, S. (2016, May 16). Rhetorical analysis of the inaugural speech of President Muhammadu Buhari. Retrieved from [jhss-khazar.org/./buhari-text-2.docx](http://jhss-khazar.org/./buhari-text-2.docx)
- Wiredu, S. A. (2021). Rhetorical analysis of the use of metaphor in Ghana's first and former president, Dr. Kwame Nkrumah's political speeches. *Journal of English Language Teaching and Applied Linguistics*, 3(10), 9-15.