

<http://dx.doi.org/10.4314/gjl.v10i1.11>

DISCOURSE STRUCTURES OF HATE DISCOURSES IN NIGERIA

Sopuruchi Aboh

Bestman Odeh

Abstract

By adopting the semantic and syntactic-related structures of van Dijk's (1997) political discourse analysis, this research paper examines twenty-one (21) hate discourses by selected political actors in Nigeria. The hate discourses were obtained from the Nigerian online newspapers as well as from the Twitter handle of political actors. The first set of analyses examines the semantic-related structures of hate discourses and discovers that they contain implicit and explicit structures where hate speakers make propositions with positive predicates about the hate speakers' own group rather explicit than implicit. The finding also reveals that the selected hate discourses manifest the semantic structure of local discourse coherence where the negative actions of in-group members are treated as an exception whereas those of out-group are overgeneralised. The findings obtained from the syntactic-related structures of hate discourses reveal that hate speakers use pronouns to emphasise *their* bad deeds and emphasise *our* good deeds. The research also discovers that in hate discourses, stereotypical words are topicalised as a way of showing emphasis. These findings suggest that hate discourses in Nigeria conform to the syntactic and semantic aspects of discourse structures as enunciated in van Dijk's (1997) political discourse analysis. The study also discovers that hate speech hinders Nigeria's national development because of inter-ethnic tensions caused by doubt, lack of trust and suspicion. Together, these findings provide important insights in the way political actors use hateful tags on each other in order to secure political power.

Keywords: Semantics, Syntax, Hate discourses, Nigeria, Political discourse analysis

1. Introduction

Language is ubiquitous. One of the areas where language is employed is politics. Politics is concerned with the State or political society and ways which a body of people is clearly organised as a unit for the aim of governance (Appadorai, 1975). Aristotle in his *Politics* establishes a link between language and politics when he refers to man as a political animal. As cited in Fairclough and Fairclough (2012:18-9), he avers:

But obviously man is a political animal in a sense in which a bee is not, or any other gregarious animal. Nature, as we say, does nothing without some purpose; and she has endowed man alone among the animals with the power of speech. Speech is something different from voice, which is possessed by other animals also and used by them to express pain or pleasure.... Speech, on the other hand, serves to indicate what is useful and what is harmful, and so also what is just and what is unjust. For the real difference between man and other animals is that humans alone have the perception of good and evil, just and unjust, etc. It is the sharing of a common view in these matters that makes a household and a state.

From the above excerpt, it can be deduced that one of the things that characterise a state is the ability to discern what is good and evil. In an attempt to hold on to this philosophy, politics was created and leaders who will ensure that there is a just world were appointed or elected. Their decrees and proclamations were then communicated through ‘speech’ (language). The role of language in politics is further buttressed by Waya and Nneji (2013) when they opine that most political activities like manifesto, campaign, rally, election, victory/inauguration, policy formulation and implementation are attainable because of language. The language used in these political activities qualifies as political discourse (Chilton, 2004). Gee (1999) asserts that politics and language are intertwined. He further remarks that an interest in politics demands that one should undertake empirical details of language and interaction.

Language has been used in different ways by politicians and public office holders. One of the ways in which Nigerian politicians utilise language is to incite violence. The form of language, which they often employ can be described as hate speech or hate discourse. Hate discourse has been prevalent in Nigeria since Independence. Osaghae and Suberu (2005) observe that the principal factor that led to the Nigerian-Biafran war of

1967-1970 can be traced to hate discourse between Igbo and Hausa/Fulani traders in Northern Nigeria. This war took the lives of over three million Igbo people (Madiabo, 1980). In the present dispensation, hate discourse appears to be the order of the day as it manifests between the ruling party and the opposition party even among ethnic groups.

Hate discourse has received critical attention by researchers from different perspectives: feminism (Lilian, 2007); racism (Hernandez, 2011); hate discourse in media (Iroka, 2013; UNESCO, 2015; Ayegba, 2017); electoral violence (Ezeibe, 2015; Chidozie, 2016; Waya, 2017; Okafor & Olanrewaju, 2017; International Foundation of Electoral Systems, 2018). From a political perspective, Okafor and Olanrewaju (2017) conceive hate discourse as a sum total of all negative speeches, which incites violence against individuals or group of persons because of their race, gender, age, ethnicity, nationality, religion, sexual orientation, gender identity, disability, language ability and moral or political views. International Foundation for Electoral Systems (2018) avers that electoral violence is sparked by hate discourse with elected officials, political parties, candidates, other opinion makers, and members of the 'civil' society as perpetrators. Among the researches on hate discourses in Nigeria, an analysis of the structures of hate discourses appears to be relatively unexplored. This is the research problem that this study seeks to address. Deriving from the research problem, the objectives of the study are to: examine the discourse structure of hate speeches; identify and describe the discourse devices employed in constructing hate discourses; and describe the implications of hate discourses to Nigeria's national development.

Studying the whole hate discourses in Nigeria will be a herculean task to undertake. As a result, the researcher selects some politically-based hate discourses in Nigeria that will be of relevance to the objectives of the study. Although there are many approaches or models, which can be used to analyse the topic under study, the researcher adopts political discourse analysis which, according to van Dijk (1997), is the analysis of political discourse from a critical viewpoint. Hate discourse data can be elicited from different online sources but online newspapers and Twitter were chosen for this study. The choice of online newspapers is because of their availability whereas Twitter was chosen because political actors use such medium to make statements and comments they believe will reach a wide range of audience. The data for this study were collected between April and October 2018.

The findings from this research will help scholars in political science and other related fields in humanities and the social sciences as it adopts an interdisciplinary study of politics, language, and society in the study of hate discourses. From this research, students of political science will come to a better understanding of the discourse devices

used by political actors. Also, this research work will add to empirical works on political discourse analysis. It will also add to the knowledge in the discourse structures of hate discourses.

2. Hate discourses¹

The concept of hate discourse has been viewed from different angles. Generally, hate discourse is seen as any form of language, mostly in the form of text and talk that is defaming, abusive and provoking, which is directed to an individual or group of people due to differences in race, sex, gender, religion etc. The aftermath of hate speeches could be violence, insecurity and hatred.

The European Court of Human Rights (ECHR) (2017) conceives hate discourse as every means of expression, which expands, stimulates, propagates, or justifies racial hatred, xenophobia, anti-Semitism or other forms of hatred based on intolerance expressed by aggressive nationalism and ethnocentrism, discrimination, and hostility towards minorities, migrants, and people of immigrant origin. From this definition, it could be seen that hate speech is often uttered by a ‘highly placed group’ to ‘a lowly placed group or individuals.’

For Tsesis (2002:211), hate discourse is an “...antisocial oratory that is intended to incite persecution against people because of their race, color, religion, ethnic group, or nationality, and has a substantial likelihood of causing . . . harm.” Jidefor (2012) remarks that hate discourse is a terminology for speech aimed at degrading a person or group of people based on their race, gender, age, ethnicity, nationality, religion, sexual orientation, language ability, ideology, social class, occupation, appearance, mental capacity, and any other distinction that might be considered by some as a liability. According to the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation (2015), hate discourse can be conveyed through text, images, or sound for the purposes of dehumanising and diminishing of members of a group to which the hate speeches are addressed.

From an electoral perspective, the International Foundation for Electoral Systems (IFES) (2018) contends that the hate directed at women during election is hate discourse. IFES further remarks that the purveyors of hate discourse during electioneering period are elected officials, political parties, party candidates, other opinion makers, the media and the masses. The reason for the use of hate discourse in election, according to Denton (2000), is that campaigns provide fecund ground for hate speeches and incitement to hatred.

¹ Hate discourse as used in this paper is synonymous with hate speeches.

Another phenomenon attributed to hate discourse is the debate on whether or not hate discourse should be legislated against. Joel (2013) avers that there has been no official reaction or guiding principle to ban hate discourse in Nigeria, although there are laws against slander and perjury. The reason for this absence might not be far-fetched because the enactors of the law against hate discourse might be the first to flout it. In recent times, the Vice President of Nigeria, Yemi Osinbajo, regarded hate discourse as a crime at a National Security Conference in Aso Villa, Abuja thus: “The Federal Government has drawn a line on hate speech. Hate speech is a species of terrorism; terrorism, as it is defined popularly, is the unlawful use of violence or intimidation against individuals or groups, especially for political ends” (Adetayo, 2017)².

Some scholars have examined the consequences of legislating against hate discourses (Mills 1978; Sunstein 2003; Mendel 2006; and Schelffler 2015). Mills (1978) argues that if hate discourse is legislated against, true views about certain phenomenon will be masked and left unspoken because of the fear to face the law as a result of the embargo placed on free discourse. Sunstein’s (2003) argument hinges on the opinion that legislating against hate discourses will be conceived as a social loss because political disagreements counteract conformity and false conventional wisdom. On the other hand, Mendel (2006) remarks that free discourse is one of the principal ways of discovering the truth. He further opines that to restrict freedom of expression diminishes man’s dignity. Schelffler (2015:8) observes:

...in Rwanda, hate speech legislation provides a tool for the government to suppress the opposition, media representatives, civil society actors, and the general public for legitimate speech and dissent. And in Kenya, high-level hate-mongers escape with impunity. Clearly, something has gone wrong in both cases.

Schelffler’s view entails that in legislating against hate discourses, efforts must be made to avoid impeding freedom of speech and allowing derogatory comments. For Iroka (2013), hate discourse is a precursor to serious harmful acts; most violent attacks on any group have their foundation in hate discourse.

Levin (2010) adopts the middle of the road approach in the debate as to whether hate discourses should be legislated against or not. She mediates between Mill’s *On Liberty* and

² The hate speech bill in the Nigerian Senate for considerations.

his harm principle to posit that in some cases, government should allow individuals to exercise their freedom of speech as well as maintain neutrality because it is a catalyst to equality. On the other hand, when individuals go beyond their freedom to violate the rights or vital interests of others, government should intervene. This then means that the state must interfere to avert actions of its own or of others, which violate fundamental human rights.

Therefore, as Scheffler (2015) submits, words are poisonous and they are catalyst of wars. In some countries like Nigeria, hate speeches are seen as acts of terrorism although no law has been signed in that regard. Koestler (1978) as cited by Richter (2010:1) avers, “Wars are not fought for territory, but for words. Man’s deadliest weapon is language. He is susceptible to being hypnotized by slogans as he is to infectious diseases. And where there is an epidemic, the group mind takes over.” Levin (2010) enunciates that harming people through words and actions retards the development of the country. For this study, hate speeches are implicit or explicit defamatory words directed to individuals through face to face or electronic-mediated discourses, which incite violence between people from different social background.

3. Previous studies

Quite a number of researches have been carried out on hate speeches, verbal abuse or foul language. Most of these works are recent, which shows that hate speech has been an important issue that requires studying. Iroka (2013) explored the level of prominence in the use of abusive language in four Nigerian national dailies namely: *The Nation*, *Daily Sun*, *Daily Trust* and *Guardian*. She adopted content analysis as the research design and uses Dell Hymes’ (1962) ethnography of speaking and face threatening acts of Brown and Levinson (1987) as her theoretical framework. The research discovered that when individuals are confronted by unfavourable and unpleasant situations, most resort to sentimental abusive language as an escape or reprisal route. The findings of the research further revealed that media reports on government attitudes towards insecurity attracted more abusive comments than the reports on corruption. The research concluded that most people spent time on abusing others instead of addressing issues. It recommended that individuals should use constructive criticisms aimed at correcting wrongs than words that only destroy people’s reputations. The point of convergence between Iroka (2013) and the present research lies in the fact that both look at abusive/hate use of language in Nigeria. But the perspectives are different. The former looked at abusive language in the media and

adopted ethnography of speaking and face threatening acts theories while the current study examines hate speeches in political context by adopting the theory of political discourse analysis.

Scheffler (2015) examined hate speech legislation in Rwanda and Kenya. The research aimed at ascertaining the positive and negative effects of legislating against hate speeches in Rwanda and Kenya. Based on the analyses of Rwandan and Kenyan cases, hate speech legislation is not an appropriate tool to prevent harm emanating from hate speech. The researcher observed that the empirically verifiable costs of the legislation by far outweigh its putative benefits. The research found out that in Rwanda, for instance, opposition politicians are convicted for criticising government policies, while journalists are sentenced to decades of imprisonment for covering sensitive issues. These journalists were held in pre-trial detention for years and they are finally acquitted, they are driven into exile and are forced to practise self-censorship. More so, whole news media are suspended or completely closed down for providing platforms for anti-government stances. Scheffler (2015) showed that persecution of individual politicians and journalists have a great negative impact on society because access to unbiased information is impeded and the 'Marketplace of Ideas' destroyed. All these inhibit Freedom of Expression (FoE). The present research does not engage in the debate of legislation on hate speech, rather, it looks at, among others, the discourse structures of hate speeches and the factors motivating hate speeches in Nigeria.

Ezeibe (2015) conducted a research on the role of hate speech in electoral violence in Nigeria. In the study, emphasis was laid on the effects of hate speech on pre, during and post-election violence in Nigeria from 2010-2015. The data for his analysis were elicited from interviews of religious leaders, youth leaders, traditional leaders and leaders of civil society groups selected from the six geopolitical zones in Nigeria. He adopted content and discourse analyses. From the study, it was discovered that hate speeches, used mostly by politicians, have become a campaign strategy in Nigeria. The paper further revealed that both the print and electronic media in Nigeria also played an antidemocratic role during the election period because they documented and reported these hate speeches and campaign for individuals, ethnic groups, political parties and geopolitical zones. The paper recommended that the Independent National Electoral Commission should prosecute any person that incites violence through the use of hate speeches. Whereas Ezeibe (2015) was interested only on the effects of hate speeches on electoral behaviour, the present study is primarily concerned with the discourse structures of hate speeches.

Alkali, Faga and Mbursa (2017) investigated audience perception of hate speech and foul language and their moral and legal implications. The researchers adopted both quantitative and qualitative methodology in the study. Alkali, Faga and Mbursa (2017) employed the survey research methodology to sample 384 respondents using questionnaire and focus group discussion as instruments for data collection. The quantitative method was used to analyse the respondents' responses while the qualitative method was used to analyse the moral and legal implications of hate speeches. The findings of the paper revealed that the respondents understand that hate speech and foul language attract legal consequences and they do not know what obligations are created by law against perpetrators of hate speech and foul language in Nigeria. It recommended for a legislation against hate speech by executing monitoring projects like the UMATI (a nonpolitical organisation that caters for the wellbeing of citizens) in Kenya. The area of divergence between Alkali, Faga and Mbursa's (2017) research and the present study is that the latter's tool for analysis is PDA.

From these empirical works, it was discovered that none of them adopted PDA in its analysis and none of the reviewed researches done on hate speeches in Nigeria has employed data beyond 2015 (at the time of writing). These form the gaps, which this present research seeks to fill.

4. Political discourse analysis (PDA)

Political discourse analysis (hereafter PDA) is the analysis of political discourse from a critical perspective (Fairclough and Fairclough, 2012). It focuses on the reproduction and contestation of political power through political discourse. "PDA should answer genuine and relevant political questions and deal with issues that are discussed in political science" (van Dijk 1997:12). In discussing PDA, three major scholars have contributed to PDA in terms of theory and method. These scholars include: van Dijk (1997), Chilton (2004), and Fairclough and Fairclough (2012). Van Dijk's approach will be centered on.

van Dijk (1997) gives an adequate explanation on the theory and application of PDA. According to him, PDA is about political discourse as well as a critical enterprise. It is a critical enterprise because it is an offshoot of CDA. He further contends that the relationship between CDA and PDA lies in the fact that CDA is interested in how power, power abuse and dominance are reproduced and that one cannot isolate power when discussing politics.

For van Dijk (1997), political discourse simply means 'doing politics.' He notes that not all discourses that mention 'politics' is qualified to be called political discourse. He

identifies certain factors that determine if a discourse is actually a political discourse. These factors include; *actors* or *authors*, viz., *politicians*; *activities* or *practices*; and *context*. Aside politicians who are both the actors and authors of political discourses, “we therefore should also include the various recipients in political communicative events, such as the public, the people, citizens, the masses, and other groups or categories” (van Dijk, 1997:13).

On the other hand, it is not all the actions performed by politicians and other participants that can fit in as political discourse. Thus, van Dijk (1997) contends that it is not enough to conclude that a discourse is political because a politician partakes in it; rather, the *activities* and *practices* of the participants constitute factors that will determine if a discourse is political or not. Political discourses must have political *implications* and *functions*. van Dijk (1997) highlights that political activities or practices of participants could be participating in political actions, such as governing, ruling, legislating, protesting, dissenting, or voting.

In addition to activities and practices, van Dijk recognises *context* as another important factor in determining a political discourse. Just like in any other model of discourse analysis, context is an indispensable tool for arriving at an unbiased and objective result. van Dijk (1997:14) opines thus,

Participants and actions are the core of such contexts, but we may further analyse such contexts broadly in terms of political and communicative events and encounters, with their own settings (time, place, circumstances), occasions, intentions, functions, goals, and legal or political implications. That is, politicians talk politically also (or only) if they and their talk are contextualized in such communicative events such as cabinet meetings, parliamentary sessions, election campaigns, rallies, interviews with the media, bureaucratic practices, protest demonstrations, and so on.

In addition, the outcome of such contexts must be political in nature such as enactment of laws and norms, distribution of social resources etc. van Dijk (1997) remarks that gender, medical, corporate and educational discourses, even though the outcomes affect people, do not fall under political discourse.

As it concerns the structures of political discourse, which is the thrust of this study, van Dijk (1997:29) posits local semantics and syntax are some of the structures of political discourse. One of the semantic strategies, which a political party can employ in political

discourses is making in-group rather explicit than implicit, rather direct than indirect, and stated rather than presupposed. On the aspect of syntax, pronouns are carefully chosen, good deeds are repeated and bad deeds deleted. The syntactic structure of political discourse has elements of ‘Emphasis/De-Emphasis of Our/Their Good/Bad Actions’ which are often possible through pronoun manipulation. He further contends that sometimes, “relevant categories are altogether deleted if the information in that category is dispreferred for political reasons.”

In this study, the aspects of local semantics that are explored include local coherence, implicit and explicit meaning and disclaimer. The syntactic components that are examined include pronouns and word fronting, which is a component of variations of word order. The choice of PDA for the analysis of hate discourse data is because PDA is a model or perspective of discourse analysis, which is concerned with analysing politically related discourses. It is more appropriate because since the study is on hate speeches used in the Nigerian political domain, it then became imperative to adopt PDA to enable us highlight the political discourse structures of hate speeches and achieve other objectives of the paper. More so, PDA is an approach that seems to be minimally applied to the study of hate discourses. The hate discourses that form the data for this study qualify as political discourse because they were uttered by political actors, in a political context and about a political activity.

5. Methods

The research design employed in this work is the emergent research design. Emergent research design is based on grounded theory, which bases its arguments on data and reaches a conclusion based on the data. According to Pailthorp (2017), emergent design refers to the ability to adapt to new ideas, concepts, or findings that arise while conducting qualitative research. However, this research design is adopted in this research because of the nature of data employed. Hate discourses are not static as they emerge every day.

The population of the study are one hundred (100) hate discourses drawn from online newspapers and Twitter. Twenty-one (21) politically-based hate discourses form the research sample. These discourses are selected using the purposive sampling technique. These selected hate discourses are believed to help in providing answers to the research questions. The data used in this research were elicited from the internet. The researchers surfed the internet and gathered hate discourses from these online media: *premiumtimesng.com*, *vanguardngr.com*, *punchng.com*, *saharareporters.com*, *the*

nationonline.net, *dailypost.com*, *dailytrust.com*, and *opera.pulse.ng*. Data are also obtained from Twitter. The choice for these online platforms is because of their accessibility.

The data used in this research work are analysed qualitatively. This implies that no form of statistical analysis is used. This qualitative analysis makes use of the basic tenets of van Dijk's discourse structure especially with regards to syntax and semantics.

6. Data analysis

In this section, twenty-one (21) hate discourses, which form the data for this research will be presented and analysed simultaneously. The hate discourses have been numbered from one to twenty-one in the appendix and for ease of reference, the abbreviations HD1, HD2 etc. represent Hate Discourse 1, Hate Discourse 2 respectively. The data will be analysed in line with the objectives of this research. The structures will be analysed alongside the devices.

6.1 Semantic-related structure of hate discourses in Nigeria

Semantics is the study of meaning. In PDA, one of the discourse structures is local semantics. Under local semantics, indirect or implicit versus explicit messages, local discursive coherence and disclaimer *inter alia* are examined. The hate discourses used in this research will be subjected to these parameters.

6.1.1 Implicit versus explicit structures

One main semantic strategy employed by hate speakers is to make propositions with positive predicates about the hate speakers' own group rather explicit than implicit. In HD1, this attribute manifested in the sense that Omokri did not make known the state of PDP when Modu Sheriff has not been ejected as the Chairman of the Party but was explicit about the current state of APC now that they are unable to eject Oshiomole by saying that APC now resembles Oshiomole's physical appearance. By so doing, Omokri made APC's current state explicit/direct and made PDP's state implicit/indirect.

In HD2, Olusegun Agbaje through his statement that slicing someone's head does not mean that Osun rerun was not peaceful made implicit the claim that the election was characterised by malpractices. More so, in HS4, Sam Onwumedo made it explicit that the owners of the party have upper hand over "ordinary" members. On the other hand,

Onwumedo was explicit and direct in his statement that the “food-is-ready” politicians’ aim is to destroy the party; but he failed to make explicit the reason these politicians want to “destroy” the Party.

Continuing, in HD7, Nnamdi Kanu was explicit about the personalities of the Yoruba ethnic group and was implicit about the personalities of Igbo people. He purported:

No Igbo man should attend any Church where the pastor is a Yoruba man, they are criminals and fools.

From the above hate discourse, Yoruba pastors were described explicitly as “criminals” and “fools.” In HD8 also, the Arewa Youths Forum was explicit in describing the North as a “critical player in the Nigerian project” while nothing was explicitly said about the Igbo people. In HD9, the speaker explicitly accused the Federal Government of bringing shame in Nigeria, and those in the entertainment industry were explicitly regarded as those who cover the shame brought by the Federal Government.

In HD10, the Buhari Media Support Group (BMSG) was direct and explicit in referring to Fayose as a “serial liar,” “born agent of confusion” and someone who thrives in “hate speeches and campaigns of calumny.” On the other hand, BMSG was silent on briefing Nigerians on the health status of Mr. President. In HD11 as well, Nnamdi Kanu was explicit about the killings of Igbo people. He also was direct in referring to Buhari as being mad. The statement below illuminates this explicitness:

They are **killing** my people in public, after killing my people they want to try me in private? That person is **mad**. I won’t allow it. Tell Buhari that’s what I said; that he is **mad**. He cannot jail me. He cannot jail me. He is a **mad** man.

Similarly, in HD13, Femi Fani-Kayode was direct in saying that his opponents are not proficient in the English language that he (Kayode) and his supporters are willing to invite a translator and interpreter for easier understanding of the proceedings. In the same vein, Buhari in HD14, instead of making explicit whether cabals have taken over his government as claimed by his wife, Aisha Buhari, rather made it explicit that he does not know which party his wife belongs to. In essence, he understood that providing a direct answer to the question might not be the best option for him. In HD16, Femi Fani-Kayode made explicit what he thinks of herdsmen in the statement below:

These herdsmen have become the **pests** of our nation. They are like the **East African tse-tse fly**; wherever they go they suck the life blood out of their hosts and like the **locust**, they destroy everything in their path. They are **leeches**: they indulge in a **parasitic mode of nutrition** and they **suck** the blood of the carcass until their victim is left for dead.

From the above statement, it was made explicit that the herdsmen in question are pests of the nation who bring nothing good to those they come in contact with. The speaker alluded to these herdsmen as tse-tse fly, leeches, and locusts who indulge in a parasitic mode of nutrition.

In addition, HD17 provides an example where Patience Jonathan was explicit about the meticulousness employed by her people in childbearing. She opined, “Our people no dey born shildren wey dem no fit count” (Our people do not give birth to children they cannot quantify). In HD18, Oba Akiolu made it explicit that everybody listens to him and that those who are not indigenes of Lagos has no right to vote for any other candidate aside the person chosen by him. Similarly, in HD21, Afikuyomi made it explicit that Obanikoro is the Lord’s chosen and his political opponents are agents sent by the devil.

From the foregoing, it can be deduced that in most of the hate discourses, speakers make explicit their group’s good deeds and/or make explicit their opponent’s bad deeds. On the other hand, they make explicit their opponent’s bad policies while making their own group’s bad policies implicit. All these are for the purposes of scoring political or ethnic points.

6.1.2 Local discourse coherence

Local discourse coherence in PDA is of two types: conditional and functional. Conditional relations are often of the causal or temporal kind and crucial in various types of explanation. Explanations may depend on one’s ideological conception of the world in general and may be a function of politically based explanation of events or state of affairs. On the other hand, functional relation of generalisation and specification allow the expression of biased mental models of political events and states of affairs. Thus, if political in-group (we) have done something bad, we may be expected to be treated as an exception and as an incident so that such description will hardly be followed by generalisation. In contrast, the opponent’s bad acts tend to be seen as typical and hence will be described in detail and also

be generalised or a general statement will be made about them, which will then be backed up with detailed specifications or examples/stories (van Dijk, 1997).

In the hate speeches used in this research, there are instances of conditional relations or local discourse coherence. The explanation of Omokri in HD1 is conditional due to the fact that he opined that what differentiates APC from PDP is that the former had no time to remove their Party Chairman whereas the latter had that opportunity. In essence, APC's ability to excel in the 2019 general elections is dependent on their Party Chairman not just on the Party's flag bearer. In HD2, the statement made by Agbaje is based on his efforts to defend the Independent National Electoral Commission (INEC), because he is an INEC commissioner in Osun state. In attempt to defend INEC from news circulating that the Osun rerun was rigged, he alleged that the murder of a person during the electoral process does not make the rerun not to be peaceful. One begins to wonder what "peaceful" means for Agbaje. In HD5, Dukku's defence of the killings by alleged herdsmen was based on her politically biased explanation of social factors where she declared that the life of a cow is more important than the life of a human being.

From the functional local discourse coherence perspective, in HD1, a general statement was made about APC's inability to remove Oshiomole in time just as PDP did with Sheriff. This general statement made Omokri to liken the state of APC to Oshiomole's physical appearance. Similarly, the expression of biased mental models of state of affairs is seen in HD4 where Buhari charged the army to be ruthless as possible to cattle rustlers and criminals without including herdsmen who kidnap and massacre people in their communities. In this case, the activities of bandits and criminals were generalised whereas those of herdsmen were treated as an exception. In the same vein, in HD5, the speaker also exhibited the feature of functional local discourse coherence in that the killings by herdsmen were treated as an exception. Dukku said:

Yes, the herdsman values even the life of the cow more than his own life. That is how God has created him.

The killings by herdsmen were defended with the claim that God created them to value the life of a cow more than the life of a human being. This supports van Dijk's (1997) assertion that if political/ethnic in-group (we), have done something bad, they may be expected to be treated as an exception and as an incident so that such description will hardly be followed by generalisation.

In HD9, a generalised statement was made by Nnamdi Kanu, the leader of IPOB, about Yoruba pastors. According to him, they are “criminals and fools.” This is in line with the generalisation aspect of functional local discourse. It seems quite impossible that Nnamdi Kanu have had dealings with all Yoruba pastors. He might have come in contact with one or two Yoruba pastors but not all of them. Due to the fact that Yoruba people belong to the ethnic out-group, Nnamdi Kanu generalised that all Yoruba pastors are “criminals” and “fools.” Another instance of generalisation based on political out-group (THEM) occurred in HD10 where BMSG concluded that Fayose is “a serial liar and born agent of confusion over the years who thrives in hate speeches and campaigns of calumny.” In this case, Fayose’s bad acts tend to be seen as typical and hence were described with specific details. More so, in HD11, Nnamdi adopted the generalisation technique when he remarked that Buhari is a mad man for killing his people in public and wanting to try him in private. In HD13 as well, Fani-Kayode generalised that his opponents have few challenges with the English language.

6.1.3 Disclaimer

Another aspect that is taken into consideration under local semantics of PDA discourse structures framework is disclaimer. Disclaimer is a semantic move that aims at avoiding a bad impression when saying negative things about others. In the discourse of racism, as illustrated by van Dijk (1997), such disclaimers are well known as cases of apparent negation (I have nothing against Blacks, but...) and/or apparent concession (There are also smart blacks, but...). From the data gathered, a direct (with the word, but) apparent negation is seen in HD14 where Buhari said:

I don’t know which party my wife belongs to, but she belongs to my kitchen and my living room and the other room.

In the above statement, Buhari said that he does not know the party (political) his wife belongs to but that she belongs to his kitchen, living and other rooms. Through this statement, Buhari used to avoid saying negative things about his wife. Inasmuch as he tried avoiding saying negative things about his wife about her statement on cabals hijacking Buhari’s government, Buhari ended up saying negative things about his wife, which are that his wife has no say in political events and she is meant to be his cook, a thing to be admired and a sex object (cf. Krisagbedo and Agbedo, 2018).

6.2 Syntactic-related structure of hate discourses in Nigeria

For van Dijk, the use of the political plural *we* (or possessive *our*) has many implications for the political position, alliances, solidarity, and other socio-political position of the speaker, depending on the relevant in-group being constructed in the present context. The principle of exclusion, which is at play here, replicates the partisan strategies of power in the political process. Here, the analysis will be based on how political actors manipulate the use of pronouns and word order for polarisation.

6.2.1 Manipulation of pronouns for polarisation

Polarisation comes in the forms of evaluations, descriptions, and references. The polarity appears in the forms of positive self-representation and negative other-representation, where one emphasises one's good deeds and de-emphasises 'their' good deeds or emphasises 'their' bad deeds. PDA theorists claim that descriptions and references to politicians, public figures and organisations and their actions are a function of politically and ideologically based opinions. Whereas 'we' are democratic, 'they' are not. Through this, one positively evaluates oneself and negatively evaluates others. This feature of polarisation appears frequently in hate discourses through pronoun manipulation.

In HD1, the polarisation or evaluation is between PDP and APC as described by Omokri. Omokri accepted the fact that one thing common with PDP and APC is the incompetence of their party chairmen: Modu Sheriff and Adams Oshiomole respectively. But Omokri being a member of PDP emphasised his party's capability of ejecting Modu Sheriff and emphasised APC's inability to eject Oshiomole. In essence, PDP has the time to come out of the mess they have found themselves before the election whereas APC does not have such time because the 2019 general election is few months away.

Suffice it to note that hate speeches do not only occur at the inter-party level. It can also be seen at the intra-party level. This is evident in HD4 where two factions of a party are at loggerheads over the choice of the party's flag bearer in the gubernatorial election that will take place in Imo State in 2019. A faction of the party supports Nwosu, an in-law to the incumbent Governor of the State, Rochas Okorochoa whereas the other rejects the arrangement. The former, in reaction to the latter's refusal to endorse Nwosu, made a statement that shows polarity. This statement has the 'we/us/our' and *they/them/their* polarity. The speech reads:

Their target is to destroy APC but **they** must be resisted by owners of the Party of the state. **They** are food-is-ready politicians. Otherwise, why won't **they** look for a virgin Party and file behind one of them as candidate and let **us** see how far **they** can go (emphasis, mine).

From the above statement, 'we' are those that started the party and the decision lies in 'our' hands whereas 'they' are 'food-is-ready politicians' who came into the party after 'we' have toiled day and night to place the party where it is today.

Similarly, the 'us' versus 'them' polarity appeared in HD6 where Nnamdi Kanu presented Biafra and Biafrans in good light and presented Buhari and his followers in a bad light. He remarked:

I'm a Biafran and **we** are going to crumble the zoo. Some idiots who are not educated said that **they**'ll arrest **me**, and **I** ask **them** to come. **I** am in Biafra land. If any of **them** leaves Biafra land alive know that this is not IPOB. Tell **them** that's what **I** said.

In the above excerpt, Biafrans were presented as educated and literate set of people who have all it takes to defeat non-Biafrans. On the other hand, non-Biafrans were presented as uneducated and barbaric. Nnamdi Kanu also in HD7 and HD11 made a polarisation between Igbo people and the Yoruba people on the one hand and himself and Buhari on the other hand. He opined in HD7 and HD11 respectively thus:

No **Igbo man** should attend any Church where the pastor is a **Yoruba man**, **they** are criminals and fools.

They are killing **my** people in public, after killing **my** people **they** want to try **me** in private? That person is mad. **I** won't allow it. Tell Buhari that's what **I** said; that **he** is mad. **He** cannot jail **me**. **He** cannot jail **me**. **He** is a mad man.

In HD7, the Yoruba people, using a Yoruba pastor as a reference point were described by Nnamdi Kanu as 'criminals' and 'fools' and as such, no Igbo man should attend any Church headed by a Yoruba pastor. Implicitly, he referred to Igbo people as non-criminals and wise people while tagging Yoruba people 'criminals' and 'fools' In HD11, Kanu employed the positive self-representation and the negative other-representation evaluation. He referred to Buhari as 'mad' and speaks against the killing of 'his people,' the freedom fighters.

More so, the feature of polarisation appeared in HD9 between the Federal Government and Peter Okoye, a Nigerian artiste. The artiste remarked:

Dear FG, for *your* information. All the shame way *una* dey bring for dis our country na *we* dey entertainers dey cover *una* Nash! Ndi ala (Dear FG, for your information. All the shame you bring in this country are being covered by those of us in the entertainment industry. Mad people!)

The positive self-representation and negative other-representation ideologies also manifested in the statement above. From the statement, the government officials were seen as those who bring shame to the country while those in the entertainment industry took it upon themselves to be effacing the shame. Here, one can see the polarity of “‘they’ bring shame vs. ‘we’ cover the shame.” This is typical of emphasising their bad deeds on the hand and emphasising our good deeds on the other hand.

In addition, another instance where polarisation occurred is in HD12 between Timi Frank, an acting publicity secretary of APC (when he made the statement) and some persons in the party. In the statement made by Timi Frank, he describes his position as the acting publicity secretary as something worth retaining whereas APC probe panel was described as a ‘Kangaroo committee.’ The statement is presented hereunder:

I will do everything possible to defend **my** position as acting publicity secretary of this party. I won’t appear before *APC probe panel*, it is a *Kangaroo committee*.

The polarisation of negative other-representation and positive self-representation manifests also in HD13 below:

We know that *they* may have a few challenges with the English language. So if *they* like, *they* can even conduct the debate in the vernacular: **we** would be prepared to pay for a translator or an interpreter so that *they* could understand the proceedings.

From the above statement, ‘we’ were presented as literates and rich people who can afford to pay for an interpreter or translator whereas ‘they’ were presented as illiterates who cannot understand the English language.

In HD15, the polarisation did not appear in the form of pronouns or nouns, rather, it appeared as figures presented in percentage. This 95% versus 5% polarity or evaluation denotes that the former will be seen in good light while the latter will be seen in bad light. The case is still the same in HS18 where all manner of parasitic features were attributed to herdsman by Femi Fani-Kayode below:

These herdsmen have become the pests of **our** nation. **They** are like the East African tse-tse fly; wherever **they** go **they** suck the life blood out of **their** hosts and like the locust, **they** destroy everything in **their** path. **They** are leeches: **they** indulge in a parasitic mode of nutrition and **they** suck the blood of the carcass until **their** victim is left for dead.

In the same vein, in HD17, the former First Lady of the Federal Republic of Nigeria, Dame Patience Jonathan, in a statement said, “**Our** people no dey born shildren wey **dem** no fit count.” From this statement, the polarity that can be seen is: ‘OUR’ people are calculative while ‘THEIR’ people are not. In HD20, Dame Patience also referred to Buhari as an old man without brain while indirectly referring to Goodluck Jonathan as a young and intelligent man. She opined:

Wetin **him** dey find? **Him** dey drag with **him** pikin mate. Old man wey no get brain, **him** brain don die pata pata.

Oba Rilwan Akiolu in his statement mandating the Igbo people and other ethnic groups in Lagos State to vote for Ambode in the 2015 gubernatorial elections exhibited the polarity of landlord versus tenant relationship where the landlord decides what the tenant does: house rent, when to serve quit notice, and among others. The Oba of Lagos saw himself and his Yoruba brothers as rightful owners of Lagos whereas other ethnic groups are strangers. This made him to emphasise his indigenious status and also emphasise their stranger/visitor status. This he made clear in the statement below:

On Saturday, if anyone, **I** swear in the name of God, goes against **my** wish that Ambode will be next Governor of Lagos state, the person is going to die inside this water... For the Igbos and others in Lagos, **they** should go where the Oba of Lagos heads to. When **they** were coming to the state, **they** didn’t come with

all *their* houses. But now *they* have properties in the state. So *they* must do **my** bidding.

In HD19, Governor Shema of Kastina State charged his followers to crush the opponents because they are cockroaches. Here, Shema emphasised that the opponents should be killed and at the same time emphasised the agility and strength of his supporters. Finally in HD21, the polarisation appeared in the form of God’s child versus Devil’s children as highlighted hereunder:

...Next Step. To become the popularly elected Governor of Lagos state in 2007, by the grace of God and the will of the people. Because **he** whom God favours, no amount of *witches and wizards with broomsticks* can prevent against! Musiliu Obanikoro For Lagos state Governor 2007.

In the above excerpt, Musliu Obanikoro was described as the God favoured one whereas the opponents were described as witches and wizards, which invariably tags them as children of the devil.

6.2.2 Word fronting

Word fronting simply implies the choice of using a word first before the others. This technique is often used either as a sign of importance, issue at hand or emphasis. In HD1, Omokri fronted the name of Adams Oshiomole before that of Modu Sheriff because his emphasis is on Oshiomole. If the statement, “Adams Oshiomole is to @OfficialAPCNg, what Modu Sheriff was to @OfficialPDPNg” made by Omokri was to be made by an APC member, the statement will take a new form: “Modu Sheriff was to @OfficialPDPNg what Adams Oshiomole is to @OfficialAPCNg.” Word fronting observed in HD5 also reflects the importance of “the life of the cow” over “his (herdsman) own life.” More so, Buhari in HD14 demonstrated that food comes first for him, followed by relaxation and then sex. This is the syntactic implication of his statement:

I don’t know which party my wife belongs to, but she belongs to my kitchen and my living room and other room.

In addition, the placement of 97% before 5% in HD15 shows that the constituencies that gave Buhari 95% of the vote in the election will be treated better than those who gave 5%. In essence, the words speakers use first reveal the level of importance they accord to a particular entity or individual.

7. Implication of hate discourses to Nigeria's national development

Hate discourse, as has been generally defined, is harmful to the addressee. It is borne out of hate for an individual, group, race, tribe, ethnic or religious affiliations. Since individuals make up a nation and since the growth of a nation depends on the nature of relationship that exists among its citizens, hate speeches among citizens result in national underdevelopment. The challenges hate speeches pose to the development of Nigeria made the Vice President, Yemi Osinbajo at a National Security Conference in Aso Villa, Abuja in 2017 to proclaim, "The Federal Government has drawn a line on hate speech. Hate speech is one of the species of terrorism; terrorism, as it is defined popularly, is the unlawful use of violence or intimidation against individuals or groups, especially for political ends" (Adetayo, 2017). Hate discourses in Nigeria are increasing exponentially to the extent that Nigerians feel indifferent when talks on how to tackle injustice, poverty, sickness, corruption and underdevelopment are raised but are proactive in laying ethnic foundations that easily beset the unity of the country (Ogwuonu, 2017). The reason behind this is that many Nigerians see other ethnic groups as competitors or the reasons why they are not getting what is due to them, as such, they resort to hate discourses to unleash their frustrations on the out-group (Adibe, n.d).

The Vice President of Nigeria, Yemi Osinbajo, remarked that derogatory and aggressive words can lead to genocide while the former Vice President, Atiku Abubakar, averred that hate discourses can set the country on fire just as it happened between the Tutsi and Hutu of Rwanda. Based on these statements, it is evident that hate discourse is a potent weapon of inter-communal and inter-ethnic tension, conflicts, civil unrest and underdevelopment. From the data obtained in this research, political discourse actors spend the time that should be used in implementing policies that will boost the nation's economy to exchange hate discourses. It has become a norm in the Nigerian political terrain that hate speeches are used during electoral periods. Different political parties speak ill of one another so as to score cheap points in the voting process. In his article on the architects of hate speeches, Femi Fani-Kayode implied that hate discourse should not be legislated

against because those who want to legislate against it came into power through hate discourse. Femi Fani-Kayode remarked:

When they called the opposition People’s Democratic Party (PDP) “a bunch of criminals and looters” it was not described as hate speech. When they called President Goodluck Jonathan “incompetent,” “weak”, “gutless” and “clueless” it was not described as hate speech. When they described him as a “drunken sailor”, a “drunken fisherman”, “a kindergarten President” and insulted members of his family it was not described as hate speech.”

The statement above shows that the affairs of Nigeria have been politicised where political opponents destructively criticise an out-group’s policies. It is worthy of note here that when an individual or group commits a crime or makes a mistake and one speaks against the religion, gender, or political party of the offender, one is also in the process of being faulted for hate discourse.

Hate discourses hinder Nigeria’s national development because of inter-ethnic tensions caused by doubt, lack of trust, and suspicion. No country can grow where hate discourses thrive and the best way to reduce hate discourse and its consequences are to ensure that the rights of citizens from all parts of the country are respected, and the wealth due to them given.

8. Conclusions

The semantic structure of hate discourses in Nigeria have features of implicit statement about the bad policies of the in-group and explicit statement about the bad policies of the out-group. The finding also reveals that the selected hate discourses manifest the semantic structure of local discourse coherence where the negative actions of in-group members are treated as an exception whereas those of out-group are overgeneralised. The research also revealed that negative terms are used to describe the opponents (HS1, HS7, HS9, HS12, HS18, and HS21).

The findings obtained from the syntactic structures of hate discourses reveal that hate speakers use pronouns to emphasise *their* bad deeds and emphasise *our* good deeds. The research also discovers that in hate discourses, stereotypical words are topicalised as a way of showing emphasis. This study has discovered that hate discourses have the structure of polarisation where ‘they’ are destroyers and ‘we’ are restorers (HS4), ‘they’ bring shame

and ‘we’ efface the shame (HS11). This is a clear instance of positive self-presentation and negative other-presentation.

This research has shown that political discourse analysis, as an aspect of discourse analysis, can be used to account for hate speeches by political actors in Nigeria. PDA is apt in accounting for the discourse structures of political discourses. Based on the analysis, it can be concluded that hate speeches in Nigerian political context exhibit, to a great extent, the semantic and syntactic discourse structures highlighted under PDA. In the Nigerian political arena, members of the in-group use negative terms to describe the members of the out-group as well as de-emphasising ‘our’ bad deeds and emphasising ‘their’ bad deeds. PDA, therefore, is a good approach for analysing politically based hate discourses in Nigeria and beyond because since the study is on hate speeches used in the Nigerian political domain, it then became imperative to adopt PDA to enable us highlight the political discourse structures of hate speeches.

References

- Adetayo, Olalekan. 2017. Osinbajo declares hate speech as terrorism. Retrieved from punchng.com/breaking-osinbajo-declares-hate-speech-as-terrorism. Accessed on 27/11/2018.
- Adibe, Jidefor. n.d. Ethnicity, hate speech and nation-building. Retrieved from www.gamji.com/adibe/adibe19.htm. Accessed on 27/11/2018.
- Alkali, Terfa, Hemen Philip Faga, and Jinatu Mbursa. 2017. “Audience perception of hate speech and foul language in the social media in Nigeria: Implications for morality and law.” *Academicus - International Scientific Journal* 161-178.
- Appadorai, Angadipuram, 1975. *The Substance of Politics* (11th ed.). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Aristotle. 1932. *Politics: With an English Translation by H. Rackham*. London: Heinemann.
- Ayegba, Monday. 2017. A pragmatic analysis of the use of verbal aggression by Nigerian politicians. A Ph.D Seminar, Department of Linguistics, Igbo and Other Nigerian Languages, University of Nigeria, Nsukka.
- Brown, Penelope and Stephen Levinson. 1987. *Politeness: Some Universals of Language Use*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Chidozie, Frederick. 2016. Verbal aggression in Nigeria: A case study of the 2015 general elections. M.A. thesis, Department of Linguistics, Igbo and Other Nigerian Languages, University of Nigeria, Nsukka.
- Chilton, Paul. 2004. *Analyzing Political Discourse: Theory and Practice*. London: Routledge.
- Denton, Robert. Jr. 2000. *Political Campaign Ethics: Any Oxymoron?* Westport: Praeger.
- European Court of Human Rights, 2017. Fact sheet–hate speech. Retrieved from http://www.echr.coe.int/Documents/FS_Hate_speech_ENG.pdf. Accessed on 13/05/2018.
- Ezeibe, Christian. 2015. Hate speech and electoral violence in Nigeria. Retrieved from <http://www.inecnigeria.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/07>. Accessed on 13/05/2018.
- Fairclough, Isabela and Norman Fairclough, 2012. *Political Discourse Analysis: A Method for Advanced Students*. New York: Routledge.
- Gee, John. 1999. *An Introduction to Discourse Analysis: Theory and Method*. New York: Routledge.
- Hernandez, Tanya. 2011. Hate speech and the language of racism in Latin America: A lens for reconsidering global hate speech restrictions and legislation models. *University of Pennsylvania Journal of International Law* 32.3: 805-841.
- Hymes, Dell. 1962. The ethnography of speaking. In Thomas Gladwin and William Sturtevant, eds., *Anthropology of Human Behavior*. Washington DC: Anthropological Society of Washington, Pp. 13-53.
- International Foundation for Electoral systems. 2018. *Countering Hate Speech in Elections: Strategies for Electoral Management Bodies*. Arlington: Author
- Iroka, Jovita. 2013. Sociolinguistic profiling of the use of abusive language in Nigeria: A print media perspective. M.A. dissertation, Department of Linguistics, Igbo and Other Nigerian Languages, University of Nigeria, Nsukka.
- Jideofor, Adibe. 2012. Ethnicity, hate speech and National building. Retrieved from saharareporters.com. Accessed on 06/05/2018.
- Joel, Jennifer. 2013. Ethnopolitics and ethno- religious hate speech in Nigeria. Retrieved from <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/236268158>. Accessed on 25/04/2018.
- Krisagbedo, Ebere and Chris Agbedo. 2018. The ‘other room’ metaphor as a linguistic marker of sexism and gender-based violence. A paper presented at 2018 International Conference/Chinua Achebe Memorial Lecture, Faculty of Arts, University of Nigeria, Nsukka on 8 – 13 April, 2018.

- Levin, Abigail. 2010. *The Cost of Free Speech: Pornography, Hate Speech, and Their Challenge to Liberalism*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Lillian, Donna. 2007. "A thorn by any other name: Sexist discourse as hate speech." *Discourse & Society* 18(6), 719-740.
- Madiebo, Alexander. 1980. *The Nigerian Revolution and the Biafran War*. Enugu: Fourth Dimension Publishers.
- Mendel, Toby. 2006. Study on international standards relating to incitement to genocide or racial hatred: For the UN special advisor on the prevention of genocide. Retrieved from http://www.concernedhistorians.org/content_files/file/To/239.pdf. Accessed on 06/05/2018.
- Mill, John Stuart. 1978, 1859. *On Liberty*. Indianapolis: Hackett.
- Ogwuonuonu, Frank Eneawaji. 2017. The effect of inciting statement in Nigeria. Retrieved from www.thenewswriterng.com/?p=19605. Accessed on 27/11/18.
- Okafor, Virginia and Alabi Olanrewaju. 2017. A speech act analysis of hate speeches in the 2015 general election campaign in Nigeria. *IMPACT: International Journal of Research in Humanities, Arts and Literature (IMPACT: IJRHAL)*, 5(6): 61-72.
- Okakwu, Evelyn and Josiah Oluwole. 2017. Lawyers speak on military declaration of IPOB as terrorist group. Retrieved from www.premiumtimesng.com/news/headlines/243398-lawyers-speak-military-ipob-terrorist-group.html. Accessed on 24/10/2018.
- Osaghae, Eghosa and Rotimi Suberu. 2005. "A history of identities, violence, and stability in Nigeria." *CRISE Working Paper*, 6: 1-27.
- Pailthorpe, Brittany. 2017. Emergent design. Retrieved from www.researchgate.net/publication/320928488. Accessed on 05/05/2018.
- Scheffler, Andrea. 2015. *The Inherent Danger of Hate Speech Legislation: A Case Study from Rwanda and Kenya on the Failure of a Preventative Measure*. Windhoek: Fesmedia Africa, Friedrich-Ebert-Stiftung.
- Sunstein, Cass. 2003. "Free speech." In *Why Societies Need Dissent* edited by Cass Sunstein, 96-110. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Tsesis, Alexander. 2002. *Destructive Messages: How Hate Speech Paves the Way for Harmful Social Movements*. New York: New York University Press.
- UNESCO. 2015. *Countering Online Hate Speech*. France: Author.
- van Dijk Teun. 1997. "What is political discourse analysis?" In *Political Linguistics* edited by Jan Blommaert and Chris Bulcaen, 11-52. Amsterdam: Benjamins.

- Way, David and Ogechukwu Nneji. 2013. “A pragmatic analysis of victory and inaugural speeches of President Jonathan: A measure for transformation and good governance in Nigeria.” *Innovare Journal of Social Sciences* 1(2): 17-21.
- Way, David. 2017. A comparative study of the patterns of hate speeches during the Nigeria 2015 and USA 2016 presidential campaigns. Ph.D seminar, Department of Linguistics, Igbo and Other Nigerian Languages, University of Nigeria, Nsukka

Appendix

1. “Adams Oshiomole is to @OfficialAPCNg, what Modu Sheriff was to @OfficialPDPNig. The only difference is that PDP had enough time before the election to eject Modu Sheriff, while the APC has no such luxury. Alas, today APC now resembles Oshiomole’s physical appearance” – Reno Omokri on his Twitter handle (October 22, 2018).
2. “That someone’s head was sliced with a machete does not mean that the rerun was not peaceful” – Olusegun Agbaje, Osun State REC on Channels TV (September 28, 2018).
3. “Nigerians are looking up to you [the Army] and us to secure the country. What is happening in the areas of operations are disgraceful. I’m very pleased with the way officers and men are firmly putting it down and I want you to be as ruthless as humanly possible. Nigerians deserve some peace.” Buhari in reaction to operations Sharan Daji and Diran Mikiya against bandits, criminals in Zamfara and neighbouring states (August 25, 2018).
Source: <https://www.premiumtimesng.com/new/top-news/281336/>
4. “Their target is to destroy APC but they must be resisted by owners of the Party of the state. They are food-is-ready politicians. Otherwise, why won’t they look for a virgin Party and file behind one of them as candidate and let us see how far they can go.” - Sam Onwumedo, Chief Press Secretary to the Governor of Imo State, Rochas Okorochoa in reaction to those who criticised the Governor during the APC ward congress (May 12, 2018).
Source: <https://www.vanguardngr.com/2018/05/988400/>
5. “Yes, the herdsman values even the life of the cow more than his own life. That is how God has created him.” – Aishatu Dukku; January 27, 2018.

Source: punchng.com/benue-killings-knocks-over-lawmakers-comparison-of-cow-with-human-life/

6. "I'm a Biafran and we are going to crumble the zoo. Some idiots who are not educated said that they'll arrest me, and I ask them to come. I am in Biafra land. If any of them leaves Biafra land alive know that this is not IPOB. Tell them that's what I said." – Nnamdi Kanu; August 27, 2017.

Source: saharareporters.com/2017/08/27/nnamdi-kanu-anyone-who-tries-arrest-me-biafraland-will-die-the-cable/

7. "No Igbo man should attend any Church where the pastor is a Yoruba man, they are criminals and fools." – Nnamdi Kanu; September 29, 2017.

Source: dailypost/2017/09/29/biafra-nnamdi-kanu-terrorist-asked-ipob-members-kill-yorubas-group/

8. "From today, June 6, 2017, when this proclamation is signed, the North, a critical player in the Nigerian project, hereby declares that it will no longer be disposed to coexisting with the Igbos and shall take definite steps to end the partnership by pulling out of the current federal arrangement." – Arewa youths on June 6, 2017.

Source: saharareporters.com/2017/06/06/northern-youths-declare-war-Igbos/

9. "Dear FG, for your information. All the shame way una dey bring for dis our country na we dey entertainers dey cover una Nash! Ndi ala." – Peter Okoye in response to FG's step on discouraging the production of Nigerian movies and music outside the country on July 18, 2017.

Source: www.premiumtimes.com/news/more-news/237359-peter-okoye-p-square-mocks-group-calling-arrest.html/

10. "The comments of Fayose did not come as a surprise because of his penchant for exhibiting the characteristics of a serial liar and born agent of confusion over the years who thrives in hate speeches and campaigns of calumny." – Buhari Media Support Group on Fayose's statement that Buhari has been on life support in the last 20 days, on June 29, 2017.

Source: dailypost.ng/2017/06/29/buhari-fayose-serial-liar-enjoys-hate-speeches-bmsg/

11. "They are killing my people in public, after killing my people they want to try me in private? That person is mad. I won't allow it. Tell Buhari that's what I said; that he is mad. He cannot jail me. He cannot jail me. He is a mad man." – Nnamdi Kanu on December 14, 2016.

Source: opera.pulse.ng/news/local/nnamdi-kanu-tell-buhari-he-is-mad-ipob-leader-says-video-id5894478.html/

12. “I will do everything possible to defend my position as acting publicity secretary of this party. I won’t appear before APC probe panel, it is a Kangaroo committee.” – Timi Frank on October 28, 2016.

Source: <http://www.dialytrust.com.ng/news/politics/i-won-t-appear-before-apc-probe-panel-frank/169052.html>

13. “We know that they may have a few challenges with the English language. So if they like, they can even conduct the debate in the vernacular: we would be prepared to pay for a translator or an interpreter so that they could understand the proceedings.” – Femi Fani Kayode on May 29, 2016.

Source: www.dailypost.ng/2016/05/29/

14. “I don’t know which party my wife belongs to, but she belongs to my kitchen and my living room and the other room.” – President Muhammadu Buhari on October 14, 2016.

Source: punchng.com/wife-belongs-kitchen-buhari/

15. “I hope you have a copy of the election results. The constituents, for example, who gave me 97% [of the vote] cannot, in all honesty, be treated on some issues with constituencies that gave me 5%” – President Muhammadu Buhari on July 23, 2015.

Source: punchng.com/buharis-presidential-salvos-from-foreign-lands/

16. “These herdsmen have become the pests of our nation. They are like the East African tse-tse fly; wherever they go they suck the life blood out of their hosts and like the locust, they destroy everything in their path. They are leeches: they indulge in a parasitic mode of nutrition and they suck the blood of the carcass until their victim is left for dead.” – Femi Fani-Kayode on September 29, 2015.

Source: vanguardngr.com/2015/09/the-herdsmen-from-hell-by-femi-kayode/

17. “Our people no dey born shildren wey dem no fit count” – Patience Jonathan on March 3, 2015.

Source: www.vanguardonlinenews.com/

18. “On Saturday, if anyone, I swear in the name of God, goes against my wish that Ambode will be next Governor of Lagos state, the person is going to die inside this water... For the Igbos and others in Lagos, they should go where the Oba of Lagos heads to. When they were coming to the state, they didn’t come with all their houses. But now they have properties in the state. So they must do my bidding.” – Oba Rilwan Akiolu of Lagos on April 3, 2015.

Source: www.premiumtimesng.com/news/180657-oba-of-lagos-rilwan-akiolu-relunctant-to-clarify-anti-igbo-comments.html/

19. “They are cockroaches, crush and kill anyone on your way.” – Kastina State Governor, Shema on February 2, 2015.

Source: www.premiumtimes.com

20. “Wetin him dey find? Him dey drag with him pikin mate. Old man wey no get brain, him brain don die pata pata.” – Dame Patience Jonathan on February 24, 2015.

Source: www.vanguardngr.com/2015/03/now-buharis-brain-is-bracing-up/

21. “...Next Step. To become the popularly elected Governor of Lagos state in 2007, by the grace of God and the will of the people. Because he whom God favours, no amount of witches and wizards with broomsticks can prevent against! Musiliu Obanikoro For Lagos state Governor 2007” – Senator Afikuyomi (Punch, Friday March 16, 2007: 36) (Culled from Omuzuwa & Ezejideaku, 2008).