



## A Pragmatic Analysis of Language Use of Nigerian Army on Parade Ground

**Esther Olayinka Bamigbola**

Adekunle Ajasin University, Akungba-Akoko, Ondo State, Nigeria

[bamigbolayinka@yahoo.com](mailto:bamigbolayinka@yahoo.com)

**Bola Margaret Tunde-Awe**

Adekunle Ajasin University, Akungba-Akoko, Ondo State, Nigeria

[bolajokotundeawe@gmail.com](mailto:bolajokotundeawe@gmail.com)

DOI: <http://doi.org/10.36892/ijlls.v4i2.844>

**APA Citation:** Bamigbola, E. O, & Tunde-Awe, B.M. (2022). A Pragmatic Analysis of Language Use of Nigerian Army on Parade Ground. *International Journal of Language and Literary Studies*. 4(2).347-360. <http://doi.org/10.36892/ijlls.v4i2.844>

**Received:**

08/02/2022

**Accepted:**

12/04/2022

**Keywords:**

Pragmatics,  
Communication,  
Military Language,  
Perlocutionary,  
Illocutionary,  
Implicature.

**Abstract**

*The parade is a significant activity in the military involving different forms of communication and the accompanying responses. Thus, the use of language on the parade ground deserves to be studied comprehensively. The focus of this study is to examine the language used in the daily routines of the Nigerian Army to give insight into its significant operations. The study uses pragmatic tools to interpret the utterances and the symbolic actions that occur during parade exercises in the Nigerian Army. The study is empirical and uses Austin's Speech Act theory. Searle's Indirect Speech Act and Bach and Harnish's Intention and Inference are also used. The data analyzed in the study were recorded during a parade in a Nigerian Army Division at Ilorin, Kwara State, Nigeria. Participant observation was also employed. It was found that activities on the parade ground are carried out using verbal and non-verbal communication. Symbols, iconicity, kinesics, proxemics, dress and appearance are significant non-verbal features in the Nigerian Army. The parade exercise is full of more commands and movements than conversation. The study also revealed that regular use of authority in the military mirrors the illocutionary force of command; therefore, the language is more often than not forceful rather than persuasive. As such, 'alerting,' 'informing,' and 'commanding' acts are prominent in parade language. It was also found that communication among the military enjoys a context of mutual understanding and shared world knowledge. The context of language use has a social-caucus-induced undertone, making the language use idiolectal.*

### 1. INTRODUCTION

The phenomenon of language, that hallmark of the nobility of the human race (Mey, 2000) and the greatest gift of God to man above all other creatures, is so crucial to communication that it occupies an excellent study focus, not only by linguists but also anthropologists, psychologists, sociologists, and philosophers. Thus, the importance of language is underscored in its various forms. Wallwork (1969) affirms that life without language is an apparent disaster. In its broadest sense, all living things use language to communicate. Even the clouds in the sky can be said to communicate the imminence of rain as well, as we realize that the computer can answer back (Wallwork, 1969; Al-Ghamdi et al., 2019). This work will be restricted to

examining verbal and non-verbal cues, which is human language, the study of which has been of great concern and interest to man for thousands of years.

In any society, it is generally believed that the bases of peaceful co-existence include effective and meaningful communication and understanding of the peculiarities of each subset of individuals in a society. Therefore, the construction of meaning in language is a sine qua non of mutual relationships in a communication situation. This study focuses on communication among members of the Nigerian Army (NA) in a particularly organized context. Regarding communicative signification viz-a-viz the NA, what is mostly involved is the use of exclusive linguistic variety. In other words, most of the utterances in the linguistic repertoire of the NA, especially in the context of their regimented activities, apparently sound strange to non-members. Okongor (2015) describes the language of the military as a specialized variety with distinctive features. Jauro et al. (2013), in a previous study, found that the language used by soldiers in the barracks in Nigeria is not only an effective and convenient tool for institutionalized occupational communication but also a reflection of the educational realities of the soldiers. Opoola (2018) also observed that vowel lengthening is a prevailing phonological feature in the language of the Nigerian Army on parade. Ogundele (2016) observed that understanding the linguistic and nonlinguistic resources that project the style deployed by the Nigerian Army enhances thorough interpretation.

The above studies detail the language use of the military, which is generally restricted to the barrack and pertains to an aspect of utterances during the parade. The parade is a major activity in the military which involves several modes of communication and responses. As such, the use of language during a parade should be studied comprehensively. This study, therefore, examines the use of the language of the Nigerian Army on the parade ground to give insight into its major operations. The study also examines the largely iconic activities accompanying these utterances on parade.

## **2. LITERATURE REVIEW**

### **2.1. Pragmatics**

Stalnaker (1972) defines pragmatics as the study of linguistic acts and the contexts in which they are performed. According to Yule (1996), pragmatics is concerned with the study of meaning as communicated by a speaker (or writer) and interpreted by a listener (or reader). It has more to do with the analysis of what people mean by their utterances than what the words or phrases in those utterances might mean by themselves. According to Mey (2001), pragmatics studies the use of language in human communication as determined by the conditions of society. A pragmatic perspective will focus on the societal factors that make a certain language use more or less acceptable (Mey, 2001; Ahmed et al., 2021; Khammari, 2021).

Different theories of pragmatics have been developed to explain how context and utterance relate to language. Some of these theories that are relevant to this work include Austin's (1962) speech act theory, John Searle's (1969) indirect speech act theory, Grice's (1975) co-operative principle and Bach and Harnish's (1979) intention and inference. Austin (1962), who introduced the concept of speech acts, noted that certain types of verbs are closely associated with speech acts and seem to contain the core of the meaning or force of a speech act. Such verbs are called PER-FORMATIVES (as against CONSTATIVES, statements that are either true or false). The performatives include verbs like 'warn', 'promise', 'request', and so on. In fact, any verb that can be used meaningfully together with words like 'I hereby', is

likely to be performative Austin (1962, p.162). Furthermore, Austin noted that performatives carry out three kinds of act: the locutionary act, the illocutionary act and the perlocutionary act. Chimonbo and Roseberry (1998) added that the locutionary act is the physical (phonological) act of uttering the speech act. The illocutionary act can be regarded as the force with which an utterance is made – relating to the status of utterance, whether it is an order, a request, a warning, and so on. According to Searle (1976, p. 1), an illocutionary act is “the basic unit of human linguistic communication”. Perlocutionary acts are the effects of the utterance on the listener.

Searle’s (1969) contribution was greatly influenced by Austin’s posture REPHRASE. However, Searle further proposes a detailed classification of the major categories of speech acts. Most importantly, he points out the necessity of considering the social institution within which it was produced in the analysis of a speech act. He opines that speaking a language is engaging in a rule-governed form of behaviour, a series of conditions that, if properly applied, should take care of anomalous utterances, especially with the category of promising. Furthermore, Searle (1979) propounds the theory of ‘Indirect Speech Act’. According to Searle, an indirect speech act is one performed by means of another.

Grice’s Cooperative Principle and its related conversational maxims arise from the same tradition of ordinary language philosophy discussed by Austin. Grice attempts to explain how a hearer gets from what is said to what is meant; from the level of expressed meaning to the level of implied meaning (precursor to Searle’s indirect speech act). ‘Implicature’ is an additional conveyed meaning – a primary illustration of more being communicated than is said, though needing an assumption of some basic cooperative principles for interpretation (Yule, 1996). Grice goes on to distinguish between conversational implicature and conventional implicature. In conversation, the basic assumption is that unless otherwise indicated, the participants are adhering to the cooperative principles and the maxims. ‘Conventional implicatures’, on the other hand, are not based on the co-operative principle or the maxims or depend on special contexts for interpretation. Rather, they are associated with specific words, the results of which are additional conveyed meanings.

Bach and Harnish (1979), having studied preceding authorities, contributed to pragmatics by paying attention to the process employed by a hearer in identifying an illocutionary act and how meaning is worked out in an indirect speech act (Osisanwo, 2003). They made an impact for their submissions on Mutual Contextual Beliefs (MCBs), Linguistics Presumption (LP) and Communicative Presumption (CP). MCB is the process of inferencing, which begins from the recognition of the intention of the speaker based on mutual understanding between the speaker and the hearer. The LP relates to what members of the same speech community share while CP covers the illocutionary intent with which a speaker says something to another member (Osisanwo, 2003: 104). Other contributions of Bach and Harnish (1979) include:

- i. The inferences of a hearer are based on what the speaker says, as in MCBs.
  - ii. To regard a speech act as successful, the speaker’s illocutionary intention should be recognised by the hearer.
  - iii. Perlocutionary acts are limited to the intentional production of effects on the hearer.
- Other pragmatic tools which are essential to this study are discussed below.

## **2.2.Context**

Mey (2000:39) explains that context is what has been said (text) plus that which is yet to be spoken – the ‘ensemble of conditions under which text production and consumption takes place. According to Halliday and Ruqaya (1985), Malinowski needed a term that would express the total environment of an utterance. This includes the verbal and the situation in which the utterance was made. This was how in 1923, Malinowski coined the term ‘context of situation’ by which he meant the total environment of a text. Prior to this time, the concept of context in English had meant **con-text** – the words and sentences before and after the particular sentence that one was looking at.

Firth (1957), the first professor of general linguistics in a British University, was interested in the cultural background of the language. So he took over Malinowski’s notion of the context of the situation and built it into his linguistic theory. He saw linguistics as *the study of meaning and all meaning as a function in a context* (Firth, 1957). Firth’s description of context of situation could be well placed under the following headings:

- i. The participants in the situation: These are the persons/personalities involved.
- ii. The action of the participants: This is what the participants are doing - including verbal and non-verbal.
- iii. Other relevant features of the situation: These include the surrounding objects and events in so far as they have some bearing on what is going on, ostensibly to enable a clearer understanding of the situation.
- iv. The effects of verbal action: What changes were brought by what the participants in the situation had to say?

Since that time, according to Halliday (1985) there has been several other outlines or schemata by which linguists set out to characterize the situation of a text. Among these, he claimed, the best known was probably that of the American anthropologist Dell Hymes (1964), who, in his work, also proposed a set of concepts for describing the context of a situation similar to those of Firth’s. He identified the form and content of the message; the setting; the participants; the intent and effect of communication; the key; the medium; the genre; and the norms of interaction

From the preceding, it could be concluded that to understand an utterance; one must know the circumstance surrounding it’s being uttered; for, taken in isolation, not many utterances make sense. Therefore, for unambiguous interpretation, the context of what is uttered is important and should be understood as comprising the totality of the environment in which words are spoken. This totality represents the cultural, political and economic environments and, in extension, the world view of the people involved. In summary, success in communication is enhanced when we can discern what the other person is going to say, that is, having a good idea of what is coming next (to make predictions). Here, the linguist’s interest, and the first step, is to consider the context of the situation, which gives participants a great deal of information about the meanings being exchanged and meanings likely to be exchanged. This is most important in human communication; and more so in military interactions, especially on parades, where verbal orders/commands are to be responded to stereotypically, that is as prescribed (accepted/permitted/approved) by the structure.

### **2.3.Non-Verbal Communication**

Lyons (1977) categorically states that normal language behaviour has non-verbal and verbal components. The non-verbal component consists of non-vocal and vocal phenomena; the vocal component comprises prosodic and paralinguistic parts. Oyewo (2000) described non-verbal language as communication without using words but employing other means like the tone of voice, facial expression or body language, distance and the manner of speaking to transmit messages. Adegbija (1999) states how non-verbal meaning can be conveyed through the sense of smell, taste, sight and touch. Facial expression, eye movement and proximity are also means of expressing meaning non-verbally.

Chimombo and Roseberry (1998, p.177) opine that non-verbal language “consists of a mixture of meaning drawn from situational and cultural norms”. Related concepts regarded as largely synonymous with the non-verbal include paralanguage, paralinguistics, and extra-linguistic codes. In other words, any type of communication (prosodic, gestural or expressive) in any form without the benefit of the verbal component, but understanding is an intentional superimposition of the verbal aspect for full, meaningful realisation, is a non-verbal code of communication. It is used to complement, accompany or reinforce verbal codes.

Non-verbal language is also capable of providing information that differs from words. Ekman and Friesen (1973, p.134) regard this function as ‘deception’, which could either be ‘alter deception’ or ‘self-deception’. While in the first case, the ego (speaker/deceiver) conceals information from the other ‘interactant’ (alter), the second is a situation where the ego himself is the object of his deception, concealing information for (or from) himself. While the former could be a natural phenomenon, the latter, more often than not, is a delusion, which is said to be a psycho-physiological problem. Usually, this is a medical case. Different forms of non-verbal communication described by various linguists include voiced related, kinesics, proxemics, icons/symbols, dress and appearance.

#### **2.4.THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK**

In this study, the speech act theory of Austin (1962) is chiefly employed in analysing utterances used on the NA parade ground. Some pragmatic tools were also drawn from Grice’s (1975) and Bach and Harnish’s (1979) theories to explain the process of arriving at the meaning component in the analysed parade utterances. The pragmatic tools employed in analysing the parade utterances include speech acts, presupposition, world knowledge (MCB), context and non-verbal components of communication.

#### **3. METHODOLOGY**

The study uses pragmatic tools to interpret the utterances and the symbolic actions that occur during parade exercises in the Nigerian Army. It employs Austin’s Speech Act theory, supported with Searle’s Indirect Speech Act and Bach and Harnish’s Intention and Inference. The data analyzed in the study were recorded during a parade in a Nigerian Army Division at Ilorin, Kwara State, Nigeria. Participant observation and interviews were also employed. Precisely, participant observation was carried out by an officer of the Nigerian Army who served as the informant and helped record the parade activities. The interview was conducted by one of the authors of this paper.

The parade activities are divided into six phases: the call (summon for gathering), dressing, report, drill, changing and dismissal. The recorded data are therefore divided into six phases for analysis. The analysis exposes how pragmatic tools like locution, illocution, perlocution, context, presupposition, mutual contextual beliefs, and nonverbal communication come into play in the military.

#### **4. DATA ANALYSIS**

The utterances in the analysed data are mostly used by the Company Sergeant Major (CSM) and the officer handling the parade. In the analysis, the three acts - locution, illocution, perlocution, and other tools like mutual contextual belief, non-verbal communication, context, presupposition, implicature, and inference are examined. Utterances used on the parade are not only conventional but also discretionary. The following key is to facilitate the reference process: **KEY:** P(1) = Phase 1; P (2) = Phase 2; P(3) = Phase 3; P(4) = Phase 4; P(5) = Phase 5; P(6) = Phase 6; U = Utterance; R = Response; CSM = Company Sergeant Major.

#### **5. SPEECH ACT ANALYSIS**

##### **PHASE 1: SUMMONING**

###### **Locutionary Acts**

U.1 – CSM: Fall in, fall in, fall in, etc

U.2 - CSM: Praiiiiid

U.3 – CSM: Praiiiiii - chon

U.4 – CSM: Standaaaa-aiz (stand at ease)

These commands could be repeated as many times as the CSM wishes, waiting for the parade commander (senior officer) to come and take over.

U.5 – CSM: Stand easy.

###### **Illocutionary Acts**

- Commanding, which generates additional forces of: alerting, informing, warning

###### **Perlocutionary Effects**

R.1 Soldiers: (*from their various places hurry to the parade ground and stand in ranks (lines), usually in threes*).

R.2 Soldiers: (*alert, with hands behind their backs, legs slightly apart, raise their chests in extended position ready for further command*)

R.3 Soldiers: (*in unison, bring and bang their feet together in attention and stand still*)

R. 4 Soldiers: (*open their legs in unison and in a prescribed manner*)

R. 5 Soldiers: (*bring down their chest and relax*)

##### **PHASE 2: DRESSING**

Dressing in the military does not only mean putting on the uniform. Soldiers on parade may have positioned themselves (in their ranks) in a disorderly manner that requires to be straightened up.

###### **Locutionary Acts**

U.1. CSM: praiiiid, praiiii-chon

U. 2. CSM: “Praiiiiiii – chon”. Dressing, in open order, raiiiiiiiiit dress.

U.3 CSM: Praiiiiid, stand a a a-hai

U.4 CSM: Stand easy

###### **Illocutionary Act – Alerting**

###### **Perlocutionary Effects**

R.1 Soldiers: *Stand more properly, chest out, ready for the next word of command.*

R. 2 Soldiers: Soldiers dress their lines. (*Respond various ways as mutually understood. The soldiers in the front rank take a pace forward and those in the rear (3<sup>rd</sup>) rank take a*

*pace backward; those at the centre remain still. As this is going on, the first three soldiers at the extreme right of the ranks (lines) turn to their right, take some paces, halt, and turn round to face their lines and dress them. They do this by talking to the soldiers asking them to move right or left). When they see that the ranks are straight, the three give the following orders one after the other.*

Soldiers 1: Stand still, front rank.

Soldiers 2: Stand still, centre rank

Soldiers 3: Rear rank, steady. At “up” (a cue said by one of them) the three of them march to join their ranks. They halt and ensure they too are in a straight line.

R.3 Soldiers: (*respond by opening their legs*)

R.4 Soldiers: (*relax*).

### **PHASE 3: REPORTING TO THE SENIOR OFFICER**

Parade is reported when the superior officer (or the parade commander) comes in.

#### **Locutionary Acts**

U.1 CSM: (comes to attention) Praiiiiid, praiiiii chon

U.2 CSM: (*turns round - marches towards the officer, halts and salutes*). Morn, sir.

U.3 Officer: Morning CSM

U.4 CSM: Parade form up, thirty (any number present) on parade, ready for your take over, sir.

U.5 Officer: fall in, CSM.

U.6: Officer: Standaaaa-hai. (*Addresses the soldiers. He could inform them of the reason for the parade by saying something like*): today, we will continue with our foot drill - slow and quick march. Am I clear?

U.7 Officer: CSM, carry on.

#### **Illocutionary Acts**

The direct illocutionary acts are: Directive, Command and Submission.

#### **Prelocutionary Effects**

R.1 Soldiers: (*respond by coming to attention*)

R.2 Officer: (*The officer too comes to attention and returns the salute*)

R.3 CMS: (*informs the officer that parade has been formed*)

R.4 Officer: (*Tells the CMS to take his position in the parade.*)

R.5: CSM: (*turns back and marches to his position in front of the soldiers*).

R.6 Soldiers: (*Respond by opening their legs*) and say “Yes Sir”.

R.7 CSM: (*Turns to the officer and salute*)

As the CSM and the officer engage in U2-5 the soldiers remain at attention.

### **PHASE 4: THE DRILL**

#### **Locutionary Acts**

U.1 CSM: Praiiiiid, praiiiii chon

U.2 CSM: (*turning to the officer*) Sir, permission to carry on, Sir.

U.3 Officer: carry on CSM, well done.

U.4 CSM: (*turning to face the parade*) Move to the right in threes, raiiiii-turn.

U.5 CSM: By the right, quick march

U.6 CSM: (*CSM dictates the pace*) lef, rai, lef, rai, lef, rai, etc.

U.7 CSM: (*can ask the soldiers to move right, left, or turnabout*) e.g. move to the left in threes, abooooou-turn (about turn).

**Illocutionary Acts**

Alert and Command, Submission, Request and Permission

**Perlocutionary Effects**

R.1 Soldiers: (*with the correct timing to which they are supposed to be familiar, they turn right*).

R.2 Officer: (*Grants permission to the CMS to carry on with the parade*)

R.3 CSM: (*turns to face the parade and gives command*)

R.4 Soldiers: (*Respond to the command by turning to the right maintaining their positions*)

R.5 Soldiers: (*start marching while CSM dictates the pace*)

R.6 Soldiers: (*Continue marching as the CSM dictates the pace*)

R.7 Soldiers: (*Continue marching*)

**PHASE 5: CHANGING TO SLOW MARCH**

**Locutionary Acts**

U.1 Breaking ... slow march

U.2 Continue your movement, by the right, sloooooo–march, Left right, left right etc

**Illocutionary Acts**

Commissive command, allegiance, obedience, submission

**Perlocutionary Effect**

R.1 The soldiers obey given order in slow march.

R.2 Soldiers turn to the left marching slowly.

**PHASE 6: END OF DRILL SESSION**

**Locutionary Acts**

U.1 CSM: Praiiii - halt

U.2. CSM: Parade will advance, left turn

U.3 CSM: (turning to the officer) Sir, we have come to the end of the drill. May I have your permission to carry on?

U.4 Officer: Carry on

U.5 CSM: (turns to the soldiers and dismisses them)

**Illocutionary Forces**

Directive, Command, Informing, Submission, Request, Permission

**Perlocutionary Effects**

R.1: The soldiers stop moving, obeying given order

R.2: Soldiers turn to left on hearing the command

R.3: The officer listens as the CSM ask for permission

R.4: The CSM listens to the officer's response

R.5: The CSM turns to the soldiers, gives them dismissal ritual and the soldiers turn right, take a salute and fall out

**Parade utterances and their meanings**

**Parade utterance**

**Meaning**

Praiiid

Parade

Praiiii – chon

Parade, attention

Standaaa-aiz

Stand at ease



raiiiiit dress	Parade dress
lef, rai	Left, right
abooooou-turn	About turn
sloooooo–march	Slow march

### Summary of Illocutinary Forces in the Six-Phase Parade

According to Khammari (2021), “the illocutionary act appears to be the most frequently referred to and discussed.” It is the social function of the utterance, (Austin, 1962). Language in the military parade is used to perform the following main functions: alerting/informing, summoning, commanding, submitting, permitting and reporting. These illocutionary acts occurred all through the utterances analyzed in the six-phase military parade. There are thirty (30) utterances in the six phases analyzed. Based on the corresponding responses to the thirty utterances, alerting illocutionary act occurred in five instances; the summoning act occurred four times, the commanding fifteen times, submission three, permission two and reporting, one. The summary is presented in the table below:

**Table 1:** *Frequency and Percentage for Occurrence of Illocutionary Forces in the Analyzed Data*

Illocutionary act	Number of occurrence	Percentage
Alerting/informing	5	16.7
Summoning	4	13.3
Commanding/ordering	15	50.0
Submitting	3	10.0
Permitting	2	6.7
Reporting	1	3.3
Total	30	100%

The above table shows that the illocutionary act that is most frequently employed by the military on parade is “command/order/authority” which occurred fifteen times in the six phases. It is important to point out that this illocutionary force is so strong that it forms the foundation on which all others are built. For example, a soldier will have to take a particular posture and do some precautionary acts before an officer, to pledge, be permitted, or to even be listened to. The second illocutionary act that tends to be frequently used is that of “alerting/inform” that occurred five times followed by “summoning”, “submitting”, “permitting” and “reporting”, appearing in the frequency of four, three, two, and one respectively.

Considering the peculiarity of occurrence of the illocutionary forces, it is clear that language has been used in the analyzed utterances to command, control, suppress, and to demonstrate firmness and force – all of which have been intentionally packaged in the doctrine of the military. Ironically, participants have their reasons for this, but that is not within the purview of the current study. With the preponderance of command, it may seem that language has been used to humiliate, suppress, relegate, debase and dehumanize the subordinate. The nature of the system does not give way for any alternative. The percentage of the occurrence of the commanding illocutionary force is 50%. The occurrence of “alerting”/“informing” illocutionary force shows that language has been used to announce, notify, make aware, pre-

### **A Pragmatic Analysis of Language Use of Nigerian Army on Parade Ground**

inform and intimate. This comes next with 16.7% in the table, and the related force of “summoning” is next with 13.3%. “Submitting”, which takes 10% shows that language, whether spoken or unspoken can be used to demonstrate submission, acceptance, acquiescence, compliance, obedience and concurrence. It must be pointed out that in actual sense, submission goes with all forms of command, alerting, pledging, reporting, etc. “Permitting”, 6.7% and “Reporting”, 3.3%, take the rear positions to show their relative insignificance, but they are nonetheless employed.

## **OTHER PRAGMATIC FEATURES IN THE UTTERANCES**

### **CONTEXT**

During parade, the CSM is addressing a group of soldiers who usually are inferior to him. He gives commands, which are to be obeyed (conventional implicature) and he can change his mind if he has given a wrong command by saying “ajuwaya” (as you were). The context of situation here does not give room for interlocution. It is not a conversational exercise but that, which requires only non-verbal means of communication. From P1 to P6, the CSM gives commands to the soldiers on parade. The encoding and decoding processes among the CSM, the soldiers and the officers enjoy a context of mutual understanding. The inferential processes prove easy to the three because of their world knowledge. The military is known for force, firmness, alertness, obedience without complaints, and total submission to whoever is in the position of authority, even if delegated.

The language of the military on the parade ground is telegraphic - commands and directives are presented in apt, precise and laconic manner; thus obeying Grice’s Maxims of quantity, quality, relation and manner, while at the same time avoiding obscurity and ambiguity. In other words, all information from the CSM, no matter how it is said (just to convey similarity with already known terms, words and commands) secures quick uptake with the soldiers who have had prior training in the use of language and operate within the same linguistic contexts that is strange or foreign to laymen (bloody civilians - other members of the society who are not, and have not served in the military).

It is pertinent to note that even though the Nigerian military is a fibrous of the mother British military force, the language employed in its day-to-day activities is an amalgam of the British tradition and the outcome of the lack of education of the natives who took over. In this wise, a lot of adulteration and approximations characterize their language use, especially on parades, which are more or less rituals. One can thus say that certain idiosyncrasies - slogans and clichés - have been imbibed and assimilated into the Nigerian military system since the pre-colonial, the colonial and even, post-colonial times. The context of language use in the military has a social-caucus-induced undertone, which can tempt one to conclude that it is idiolectical in nature.

### **PRESUPPOSITION AND SHARED BACKGROUND KNOWLEDGE**

The Company Sergeant Major (CSM) expects the soldiers to understand the call and be ready to suspend every other activity they might be engaged in and come for parade. He does not need to tell them it is time for parade, except as conveyed by the prompt – “fall in”.

In the military, the message being conveyed with the utterance “fall in” conventionally is a call to “parade”. The word “Praid” is to alert the soldiers; and when they hear “praiiii - chon” they already know what to do. After the CSM’s command, the soldiers respond variously

as mutually understood. The first three soldiers at the extreme right of the ranks turn to their right; take some paces, halt and turn to face their lines. As this is going on, the other soldiers in the front rank take a pace backward and those in the rear (3rd) rank take a pace backward. In threes, soldiers on their ranks simultaneously move to the right or left to ensure they are in straight lines. This kind of exercise is a routine in the military and every soldier knows and is used to it and even anticipates the next order for known reaction. No room is given for defiance.

Upon dismissal, the soldiers already know that they have to turn, take a few steps, salute, before they go their different ways. This is indicative of the conventional rules guiding all the activities in the military. The ranks are stratified and officers are superior or inferior to one another. The illocutionary force of informing as done by the CSM is military. The soldiers know they are to “fall out” just as they “fell in” at the beginning.

### **NON-VERBAL COMPONENTS**

The military parade exercise contains commands and movements more than interaction. It is only the CSM and the parade commander who gives command verbally. The soldiers on parade only respond through movements (kinesics) to whatever order is given. They respond to commands by saluting, banging their feet, and turning to the left or to the right, making a roundabout turn and halting, as the case may demand.

### **6. FINDINGS AND CONCLUSION**

It is evident from the analyses of the six-phase parade utterances that language accentuates the impulses in a military parade. Language is used with elements of force, autocracy and militancy to perform the following main functions: alerting/informing, summoning, commanding, submitting, permitting and reporting. The language of the military sounds ‘masculine’ rather than ‘feminine’. Little wonder why ‘alerting’ ‘informing’ and ‘commanding’ are more prominent in the data analyzed. Utterances in a military parade may carry double illocutionary forces; for instance, saying ‘praiiii-chon’ may alert, inform and command the soldiers. Soldiers react to these forces by way of perfunctory submission and obedience. Thus, it could be seen that flouting or violation of Grice’s maxims is not a common phenomenon in military circles. And when it occurs, it is met with prescribed sanctions.

Grice’s cooperative principles and his four maxims are exceptionally relevant in Army parades. By training and calling, participants in parade situations are bound to cooperate. This is why the ‘orderer’, that is, the parade commander, is strictly guided to ensure especially the maxims of quantity (saying no more or less than necessary) and manner (clarity and brevity, not obscurity and ambiguity). In the army, especially on parades, neither violation nor opting is allowed. Equally, no opportunity whatsoever is given for explanations or arguments. Most importantly, the rule-governed behaviour posture is of relevance to the Army in which the participants have been schooled, trained or drilled.

In the military, the performative is more relevant and more presupposed. Constatives (true or false) or infelicitous (inappropriateness) are not usually in contention. More than not, the speaker and the hearer share the same worldview and mutually understand the context. If the order given contradicts their shared worldview and context, the ‘orderer’ immediately recognizes the fault in his order (locution) and gives a counter-order, saying such things as “ajuwaya” (meaning as you were). If he does not do so, the result is confused responses in his hearer(s) and then conflicting perlocutionary behaviours.

### **A Pragmatic Analysis of Language Use of Nigerian Army on Parade Ground**

Based on Bach and Harnish's 'intention and inference' approach, for a speaker to perform an illocutionary act, the listener must have the understanding of such acts. A most relevant aspect of their approach can be found in their submission on Mutual Contextual Beliefs (MCBs). In the Army, the listener (the soldier taking the order) largely bases his reference on the shared contextual knowledge he has with the officer giving the order especially on parades. For example, in marching, if the 'pacer' (the soldier calling steps to take) says '*lef, hai, lef, hai*' or similar sounds, the soldiers marching under this command understand that he is actually saying 'left, right, left, right' ... to which they comply. Apart from vowel lengthening which has been identified to be prevalent in the use of English of the Nigerian Army, another phonological feature observed in this study is deletion and replacement of vowels and final consonant sounds in words. There is also the joining of two or more words as one word, e.g. Standaaaa-aiz (stand at ease).

The army parade could be regarded as largely mono-directional, in which case, the parade commander dishes out orders, which the troops obey perfunctorily. Even if the order is not stated in the 'normal' way, the commander's intention is carried out based on, among other things, the participant's mutual beliefs, understanding, world view and peculiar particular relationships.

To a very large extent, the non-verbal means of communication impacts on the military setup - permeating all the facets of their interaction (office, reaction, quartering, etc.) where relative distances (proxemics) must be strictly maintained. For instance, officers' and soldiers' quarters and their recreation (relaxation) places are poles apart. Even at the hospitals, the wards meant for officers and their relations are separated. On parade, officers and soldiers fall in separately. Even the officer who is to conduct the parade for soldiers is expected to keep a certain distance to give orders. During parade, utterances alone do not count as there are some other methods of communication such as movements, dressing, marching, turning, saluting, and banging of the legs, and so on.

The other very significant non-verbal aspect of the military is the use of icons. Symbols used include flags, caps, lanyards, shoes, sewing and wearing of the uniform, colours and logos. All of these have their signification which should be reacted to appropriately at all times. An area that stands out clearly is the ranking structure. All members in the military are grouped and recognized according to the rank they wear. These ranks are symbolically displayed either on the arm or shoulder of the uniform for early recognition to engender 'perlocutionary acts' without being told (without verbal cues). For the soldiers, their ranks range from Private to Army Warrant Officer; and from Second-Lieutenant to Field Marshall, in case of the officers. While the ranks of the soldiers are sewn on the sleeves of their uniforms, the officers have theirs on the shoulder.

### **REFERENCES**

- Adegbija, E. (1982). A Speech Act Analysis of Consumer Advertisements. PhD Dissertation: Indiana University, USA.
- Adegbija, E. (1999). "Titbits on Discourse Analysis and Pragmatics", in *The English Language and Literature in English: An Introductory Handbook*. edited by E. Adegbija, Ilorin: University of Ilorin, Department of Modern European languages.
- Ahmed, H., Mohammad, O. S., Arcelus, J., Amir, S., & Mansoor, A. (2021). Speech act analysis of President Jalal Talabani's address at the UN general assembly on September

- 25, 2008. *Linguistics and Culture Review*, 5(S1), 252-265.  
<https://doi.org/10.21744/lingcure.v5nS1.1377>
- Akinmade, A. (2015). "Multilingual practices in Nigerian Army Barracks" in *Journal of African Identities*. 14(1): 38-58.
- Al-Ghamdi, N. A., Almansoob, N. T., & Alrefae, Y. (2019). Pragmatic Failure in the Realization of the Speech act of Responding to Compliments among Yemeni EFL Undergraduates. *3L: Southeast Asian Journal of English Language Studies*, 25(4).  
<https://doi.org/10.17576/3l-2019-2504-14>
- Anthony, S. C. (2004). "Non-Verbal Language"  
[htmhp.www.susancanthy.com/index.html](http://htmhp.www.susancanthy.com/index.html).
- Austin, John Langshaw (1962). *How to do Things with Words*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Bach, K. and Harnish, R. M. (1979). *Linguistic Communication and Speech Acts*. Cambridge: The M.I.T. Press.
- Chimonbo, M. and Roseberry, R. L. (1998). *The Power of Discourse: An Introduction to Discourse Analysis*. London: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Ekman, P. and Friesen, W. V. (1973). "Non-Verbal Leakage and Clues to Deception" in *Social Encounters: Readings in Social Interaction* edited by Michael Argyle, London: Penguin Books.
- Firth, J. R. (1957) *Papers in Linguistics 1934–1951* London: Oxford University Press.
- Fowler, R. (1974). *Understanding Language: An Introduction to Linguistics*. Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Grice, H. P. (1975). "Logic and Conversation", in *Syntax and Semantics* edited by Peter Cole and Jerry, L. Morgans Vol. 3. 43-58. New York: Academic Press.
- Halliday, M. A. K. and Hassan, R. (1985). *Language Context and Text Aspects of a Language in a Social-Semiotic Perspective* Australia: Deaton University.
- khammari, H. (2021). "Strategies and mitigation devices in the speech act of disagreement in American English" in *Studies in Pragmatics and Discourse Analysis*, 2(1), 26–39.  
<https://doi.org/10.48185/spda.v2i1.243>
- Khammari, H. (2021). Disagreeing in Tunisian Arabic: a Politeness and Pragmatic Study. *International Journal of Linguistics and Translation Studies*, 2(3), 46–64.  
<https://doi.org/10.36892/ijlts.v2i3.141>
- Lyons, J. (1977). *Semantics: 1*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Malinowski, B. (1923). "The Problem of Meaning in Primitive Languages" in *The Meaning of Meaning* edited by Ogden, C. K. and I. A. Richards, 296-336.
- Mey, J. L. (2000). *When Voices Clash: A Study in Literary Pragmatics*. Trends in Linguistics 115. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter
- Mey, J. L. (2001). *Pragmatics: An Introduction* 2nd Edition. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.
- Nigerian Army. (2002). *Nigerian Army Dairy*. Nigeria: Nigerian Army.
- Ogundele, T. (2016). "Language and Style in the Nigerian Army Parade Interaction" in *Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences Review*. 05(01):315–328
- Okongor, T. A. (2015). "A Lexico-Semantic Analysis of Military Language" in *International Journal of Humanities and Cultural Studies*. Vol. 2(3), 652-664.
- Opoola, B. T. (2018). "A Linguistic Analysis of Vowel Lengthening in the Language of Military Parades" - <http://yadda.icm.edu.pl/yadda/element/bwmeta1.element.psjd>
- Osisanwo, W. (2003). *Introduction to Discourse Analysis and Pragmatics*. Lagos: Femous Fetop.
- Oyewo, Y. (2000). "Human Communication: An Introduction" in *Studies in English language* edited by Babajide, A. O. Ibadan: Enicrown Fit Publishers.
- Searle, J. (1969). *Speech Acts: An Essay in Philosophy of Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University.

**A Pragmatic Analysis of Language Use of Nigerian Army on Parade Ground**

- Stalnaker R. C. (1972) "Pragmatics" in *Semantics of Natural Language* edited by Davidson D. and Harman G. Synthese, Library Monographs on Epistemology, Logic, Methodology, Philosophy of Science, Sociology of Science and Knowledge, and on the Mathematical Methods of Social Behavioral Sciences, Vol. 40, 380-397. Dordrecht: Springer.
- Thomas J. (1995). *Meaning in Interaction: An Introduction to Pragmatics*. London: Longman.
- Wallwork, J. F. (1969). *Language and Linguistics: An Introduction to the Study of Language*. Heinemann: London.
- Yule, G. (1996). *Pragmatics*. New York: Oxford University Press.

**AUTHORS' BIO**

*Esther Olayinka Bamigbola is a senior lecturer in the Department of English Studies, Adekunle Ajasin University, Akungba-Akoko, Ondo State, Nigeria. Her research areas include pragmatics, sociolinguistics, applied linguistics, semantics, discourse analysis and bilingualism. She is personally interested in the development of curricular and extracurricular activities for an enhanced English-speaking and writing culture.*

*Bola Margaret Tunde-Awe is a senior lecturer of English Education at Adekunle Ajasin University, Akungba-Akoko, Ondo State, Nigeria. Her research interests include language education, applied linguistics and literacy education.*