



doi <https://doi.org/10.58256/njhs.v6i3.962>

Research Article

Section: Literature, Linguistics & Criticism



Check for updates



Published in Nairobi, Kenya
by Royallite Global.

Volume 6, Issue 3, 2022



Article Information

Submitted: 15th August 2022
Accepted: 30th November 2022
Published: 6th December 2022

Additional information is
available at the end of the
article

<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>

ISSN: 2520-4009 (Print)
ISSN: 2523-0948 (Online)

To read the paper online,
please scan this QR code



How to Cite:

Udoumoh, O. B., & Orabueze, O. F. (2022). (Im)politeness studies of selected 2015 political campaign hate speeches in Nigeria. *Nairobi Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences*, 6(3). <https://doi.org/10.58256/njhs.v6i3.962>

(Im)politeness studies of selected 2015 political campaign hate speeches in Nigeria

Onyinyechi Blessing Udoumoh & Onyebuchi Florence Orabueze
Department of English and Literary Studies, University of Nigeria,
Nsukka

Correspondence: onyinyechi.udoumoh@unn.edu.ng

 <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-6914-6137>

Abstract

The work examined hate speech in context of political campaign discourse, using an aspect of Brown and Levinson's politeness model of Face Threatening Acts (FTAs) and Culpeper's impoliteness model to appraise eight purposively selected 2015 campaign speeches of politicians from the People's Democratic Party (PDP) and the All Progressive Congress (APC) of Nigeria. The data constitute eight transcribed 2015 political campaign extracts, from notable Nigerian on-line newspapers, found to contain hate speeches. Political campaigns in Nigeria, in recent times, have witnessed an increase in the use of hate speech and searing language. This has become the motivation for this study since hate electioneering campaign may portend incitement, violence and face loss for the parties involved. The result of the study showed that hate speech during political campaigns is embedded in impoliteness strategies targeted at the rival political players and translates to the electorate as face threatening acts, as they become the indirect victims of the forcefulness of such speech acts. Whereas negative politeness FTAs of advice, warnings, and reminding a hearer to do an act were mostly employed by political speakers to coerce the electorate for their votes; negative impoliteness strategies such as, ridicule, frighten and off-record impoliteness strategy of unpleasant implicatures were deployed to flout, threaten and disrepute political rivals. Thus, hate speech in political campaigns is typified by a preponderance of impoliteness strategies and FTAs recurring throughout such speeches without redress, emphasizing the deliberation of such speech acts.

Keywords: face threatening acts, hate speech, (im)politeness, Nigeria, political campaign



© 2022 The Author(s). This open access article is distributed under a Creative Commons Attribution (CC-BY-NC-SA) license.

Publication Interest Statement

The research contributes to the study of politics, particularly the use of language in political campaigns. It introduces the reader to the various impoliteness strategies used in political campaign speeches, as well as the consequences for the individual and the general public at large. The findings will be of great importance to the political practitioners in correcting the use of hate speech in their political speech acts, revealing the need for the constructive use of language. The findings will also shed more light on the importance of politeness strategies in communication and provide a general understanding of the significance of language use.

Introduction

Disciplinary diversities and professions have embraced language as a means of translating and achieving set goals and objectives. In this vein, politicians are not exempted. In political and social policy, language has been pivotal in interaction and communication (Danladi, 2013). In the words of Adedimeji: 'it is important to point out that language and politics meet at the threshold of power' (2005a, p. 4). Although language and rhetorics are important parts of political life (Utych, 2012) and that linguistic analysis intimates that there is a close relationship between language, power, manipulation, coercion and resistance (Yieke, 2014), language must not be misused in any speech context. In the guise of promoting freedom of speech, there has been frequent abuse of language during political campaigns and debates, which deserve some scholarly attention. Language can create a peaceful environment in which harmonious co-existence with one another thrives or breed an atmosphere of confusion, hatred, fear, bloodshed and war as typified in the Kenyan 2007/2008 electoral violence; the 1994 Rwandan mass violence against civilians; the Bosnia Herzegovinian massacre and the Nazi propaganda that led to the massive killings of the Jewish people (Sambuli, et al. 2013; United State Holocaust Memorial Museum, 2009).

In recent years, Nigeria has experienced an upsurge of political practitioners who have great penchant for hate speech. In this vein, Adedimeji (2005b) outlines and discusses the hallmark of political language in Nigeria. They include: rhetorics, grandiloquence or bombasts, sheer cloudy vagueness, or linguist exuberance, illiteracy, innuendoes, exaggerations, lies, scathing remarks, verbal violence, meaningless words, conflicts and resolutions. Since Nigeria adopted a democratic system of government in 1999, many political parties have evolved, each contesting to wield the affairs of the country. The People's Democratic Party of Nigeria (PDP) formed in August, 1998 became the first ruling party that took over a democratic government after the military ruled for sixteen years. The party ruled Nigeria from 1999 to 2015, when they lost the election to the All Progressive Congress (APC). APC was formed on the 6th of February 2013 in anticipation of the 2015 elections. The party came into existence as a result of an alliance of Nigeria's three biggest opposition parties which include, the Action Congress of Nigeria (ACN), the All Nigeria's People's Party (ANPP), the Congress for Progressive Change (CPC) and a part of the All Progressive Grand Alliance (APGA). These political parties merged to form a strong opposition party and to challenge the long-age jinx of the People's Democratic Party in Nigeria's leadership. As a result of the motive behind the formation of APC, which was to wrestle power away from the PDP, the ruling party since the inception of democracy in 1999, the floor was then thrown open for brouhaha. The People's Democratic Party was challenged to a bout. During the 2015 political campaign, the two parties were noticeably locked in bitter exchange of hate speech, which has the capacity of inciting violence and destroying the self- image of the politicians involved.

Campaign Speeches in Nigeria

Extant literatures in linguistics have examined several political speeches in the world at large and Nigeria, in particular. Scholars have made several attempts at analyzing political campaign speeches, putting to work various linguistic theoretical models and methodologies. A handful of political speeches

have been analyzed using J. L Austin's pragmatic theory of Speech Acts to find out the extent to which such speeches have been able to violate or align with the theoretical framework. Some of these attempts include: 'Pragmatics of Former President Olusegun Obasanjo's Speeches on Corruption in Nigeria', Krisagbedo (2010); Igwedibia's 'Pragmatics of Selected Political Speeches of President Barack Obama' (2012), in which she analysed five political speeches of President Barack Obama of the United States of America; 'Pragmatic Analysis of the Victory and Inaugural Speeches of President Umaru Musa Yar'Adua' by Omoniyi (2012), in which he examined the roles of locution, illocution and per-locution of some the president's speeches. A comprehensive study of 'Chief Obafemi Awolowo's and M. K. O. Abiola's Acceptance of Nomination Speeches was also attempted, using the Speech Acts Theory of pragmatics by Akinwotu (2013). Other linguistic appraisal of political campaign speeches include: Akimbiyi's, (2006) 'Inclusion and Exclusion in Political Discourse: Diexis in Olusegun Obasanjo's Acts of Persuasion'. The work employs the use of diexis to analyse Obasanjo's political speeches. Mohammed (2014) using Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA), made a cross-examination of political speeches of some African leaders from 1981 – 2013. The research investigates the use of language by politicians across Africa to unearth some political ideologies as well as their political position.

More related works to the present study; (Ezeibe, 2015; Fasakin, et al, 2017; Ayansola and Oamen, 2019; Chiluwa, Taiwo and Ajibode, 2020; Obiora and Aboh, 2021; Asiru and Babangida, 2022), examined political hate speeches in Nigeria, using various approaches and models. For instance, Asiru and Babangida (2022) appraised the pragma-semantic implications of seven selected hate speeches made by Nigerians, from 2013-2015, applying, Searle's Speech Act Theory (SAT). The study reveals that hates speeches perform explicit and implicit functions, as well as assertive, expressive and directive functions. Ayansola and Oamen (2019) discuss how hate speeches are legitimized and foregrounded as a contemporary, socio-cultural phenomenon, via online dissemination of hate discourse. Deploying the Social Responsibility Theory, Fasakin, et al, (2017) argues that in 2015 political electioneering campaign in Nigeria, political actors who engaged in hate speeches deserve to be punished under the electoral law. Obiora and Aboh(2021), using Critical Discourse Analysis(CDA), note that in 2015 political campaign, hate speeches manifested in the guise of accusations, judgement and mockery of the rival party.

The studies reviewed, defer from the present study as our focus is to examine how Face Threatening Acts(FTAs) and impoliteness strategies deployed in the 2015 electioneering campaigns impede the 'face' of the interlocutors, thus involved.

Hate Speech

Hate speech as a discourse is a multi-disciplinary concept, which broadly relates to diverse fields of study. Several phrases have been used in relation to it. Such phrases include: 'injurious speech' (Butler, 1997, p. 2), 'linguistic violence' (Gay, 1999, pp.13-35), 'dangerous speech' (Benesch, 2012, p.1), 'taboo words' (Babou, 2014, pp.110-111), 'inflammatory speech' (Learner, 2016, pp.1-5). Scholars have agreed that no universally accepted definition of hate speech exists and that the understanding of the concept varies from place to place, although its use is common and has remained contentious (Weber, 2009; Sambuli, et al 2013; Woodward, 2014). The phrase 'hate speech', has become rather controversial as the puzzle constitutes a most proper definition for it, how to identify the language of hate, where to draw the line between hate speech and other related terms like incitement(United States Holocaust Memorial Museum, 2009). Caruana (2016) convinces that the failure to understand the term is probably the reason why most people use it. Despite the contentions, some definitions of hate speech have emerged. Weber gives the definition of hate speech as proffered by the Council of Europe's Committee of Ministers Recommendation as that which:

...shall be understood as covering all forms of expressions which spread, incite, promote or justify racial hatred, xenophobia, anti-semitism or other forms of hatred based on

intolerance, including intolerance expressed by aggressive nationalism and ethnocentrism, discrimination and hostility against minorities, migrants and people of immigrant origins (qtd. in Weber, 2009, p.3).

The Centre for Information Technology and Development in Nigeria (CITAD, 2015) outlines and gives a broader view of what the term includes, based on Benesch's (2012) framework of categorizing hate speech which shall be adopted for this work. According to CITAD, hate speech include those statements which insult, abuse, express contempt, disparage or ridicule religion, linguistic affiliation, place of origin, gender, disability, symbols of cultural or religious practices and institutions.

Political Speeches and (Im)politeness

Politeness strategies have been defined by Nordquist (2020) as 'speech acts that express concern for others and minimize threat to self-esteem ('face') in particular social context' (Para. 4). On the other hand, impoliteness strategies are the opposite of politeness strategies. While politeness strategies are used to enhance 'face' by avoiding blazing confrontation, impoliteness strategies are deployed to attack the interlocutor's face and create social disorder (Fauziati, 2014). Yasmeen, et al. (2014) argues that the purpose of politeness maxims is to minimize 'the force of friction, roughness of behaviour, conflict and rudeness between a speaker and the hearer in personal conversation' (p.1). They discover that mixed vocabulary and less formal language which border more on the contents rather than style are common in political speeches of most Pakistani politicians, although Bald on Record politeness strategy was used at interval to maintain some social distance. In a similar study on electoral debates in Spain, Fernandez (2014) states that the use of impoliteness strategies is quite common in political debates. Two probable reasons for impoliteness in electoral debates explored in the study include that: the driving motif of the speaker whom besides seeking the approval of his audience is also to defeat his political rival through his speech act and that the major way through which such a speaker aims to achieve his purpose subsumes a painstaking criticism of his opponent(s). Fernandez subsequently adds that 'when impoliteness appears, whether face attacks to adversaries, anticipated or not, it becomes harmful to the public image of that opponent, using the exact opposite of what is conventionally regarded as polite cognition' (pp. 60-89).

Furthermore, Ojo (2016) analyzing Obasanjo and Fayose's fracas, applying the politeness theory, notes that the language of Nigerian politicians has some confrontational undertones and serves as a meeting ground for battle of supremacy and the survival of defeatist. Impolite remarks are freely traded and lancinating expressions are deliberately exchanged. These impolite strategies are usually invoked to castigate opponents and get the approval of the electorate. Likewise, Ezeifeka (2012) remarks that political speeches in Nigeria are interlaced with the presentation of a political speaker as a self-acclaimed messiah whose speech is dotted with self-eulogy and idealization while his rival is portrayed as a rapscallion; a villain, who legalizes 'contentious social vices' (p.244). In most cases, the good aspects of his opponents are downplayed in derisive terms while intentionally enskying himself. Aremu (2015) looked at 'Invective Songs of Western Nigerian Politicians (WNPs), using the pragmatic theory of Community of Practice (CoF). He notes that invective songs are largely used by Western Nigerian politicians for campaign and that such songs are full of blazing impoliteness, burning language, indirect speech, adversarial political behaviours, among others, to attack interlocutors. Such invective songs openly tarnish the image and 'face wants' of their interlocutors (pp.1-14).

Methodology

The study utilized qualitative-descriptive research method, specifically, an aspect of Brown and Levinson's politeness model (FTAs) and Culpeper's impoliteness model, to provide a descriptive and analytic structure to the research. The work made a detailed descriptive study of eight campaign speeches of

eight selected politicians in Nigeria. The purposive sampling technique was further deployed in selecting 2015 political campaign speeches that contain hate speeches. This technique has been deemed as the most appropriate for this study as it gives room to sample specific political speeches found to contain hate speeches, since not all the campaign speeches of 2015 are implicated, hence the need to be selective.

Research Population and Instrument for Data Collection

Since this study deals with the analysis of political hate speeches in Nigeria, the population constitutes eight purposively selected politicians from the two most prominent parties in Nigeria, the People's Democratic Party (PDP) and the All Progressive Congress (APC). Although there are several political parties, the two chosen parties for this study are the ruling parties and most popular among the masses during 2015 election. Four Politicians with great penchant for making hate speeches were carefully selected from each party respectively and a transcribed speech of their 2015 campaign speeches found to have contained hate speech was extracted from various Nigerian newspapers online. The newspapers include: the Vanguard Newspaper, Nigerian Bulletin, Premium Times, Sahara Reporters and the Daily Post.

Theoretical Framework

Brown and Levinson's Politeness Theory (1978/1987)

Brown and Levinson's politeness model is based on the concept of 'face' and presents two aspects of face, 'Positive and Negative Face'. Face they define as 'the public self- image that every member want to claim for himself' (1987, pp.62). In addition, negative face has been defined as 'the want of every competent adult member that his actions be unimpeded by others', while positive face is 'the want of every member that his want be desirable to at least some others' (p.62). This notion of face, Brown and Levinson allude to Goffman's (1967) and the layman's expression of face in terms of 'loosing face', implying embarrassment and humiliation. Therefore, face can be emboldened, lost, held or enhanced and should consciously be 'attended to' in interaction, since 'everyone's face depends on everyone else's being maintained...' (1987, pp. 62-63).

Face Threatening Acts (FTAs)

A very important feature of Brown and Levinson's politeness theory is that of Face Threatening Acts (FTAs), which are acts, verbal or non-verbal that threaten the face wants of either the speaker or the hearer. Brown and Levinson make a distinction between acts that threaten an addressee's negative face from acts that threaten addressee's positive face.

- (a) *Acts that threaten an addressee's negative face include:* orders and requests, suggestions and advice, reminding a hearer to do an act, threats, warning, dares, promises and compliments, expressions of envy or admiration and expressions of strong negative emotions.
- (b) *Acts that threaten an addressee's positive face include:* expressions of disapproval, criticism and contempt or ridicule, complaints and reprimands, accusations, insults, contradictions or disagreements, challenges, expressions of violent out of control emotions, irreverence and mention of taboo topics, raising of dangerously emotional or divisive topics, blatant non-cooperation in an activity and use the of address terms and other status-marked identifications in initial encounters (Brown and Levison 1987, pp. 65-66).

Further distinctions are made between acts that threaten a speaker's positive face and negative face.

- (c) *Acts that threaten a speaker's negative face include:* expressing thanks, acceptance of thanks,

apology, excuses, and acceptance of offers, responses to hearer's *faux pas*, unwilling promises and offers.

- (d) *Acts that threaten a speaker's positive face include:* apologies, acceptance of compliments, breakdown of physical control over body such as bodily leakage and stumbling, self-humiliation, confessions and emotion leakage such as non-control of laughter or tears (1987, p. 67).

Brown and Levinson argue that with the awareness of the harm between the speaker and the hearer in doing an FTA, both are to hold each other's face in a conversation. Moreover, to determine the degree of an FTA, three variables are taken into consideration: The Social distance (D) between a speaker (S) and hearer (H) in asymmetric relation, the relative power (F) of a speaker (S) and a hearer (H) in an asymmetric relation and the absolute ranking (R) of impositions in particular a culture. (71-74).

Impoliteness Super Strategies

Culpeper's impoliteness strategies are modeled after Brown and Levinson's (1978/1987) politeness strategies which are linked to the degree of an FTA. The politeness super-strategies such as bald on-record, positive politeness, negative politeness, off-record and withhold the FTA have opposite impoliteness super strategies, the difference being that while Brown and Levinson's politeness strategies are meant to enhance an interactant's face, Culpeper's impoliteness strategies attack and cause face loss. The impoliteness strategies are listed below.

(1) *Bald on-record Impoliteness:* this is an FTA performed in a 'direct', 'clear', 'unambiguous' and 'concise' manner, in situations where face is not 'irrelevant' or 'minimised' (Culpeper 1996, p. 356). The major difference between Culpeper's impoliteness bald on record super strategy and Brown and Levinson's politeness bald on record is that little face is at stake and the intention of the speaker is not to attack the face of the hearer, while Culpeper's bald on-record is clearly to attack the hearer's face in a most direct and clear manner.

(2) *Negative impoliteness:* this implies the use of FTAs fashioned to attack the negative face wants of the addressee.

(3) *Positive politeness:* it is the use of FTAs targeted to attack the positive face wants of the addressee.

(4) *Off-record Impoliteness:* this is a super strategy proposed by Culpeper (2005, pp.43-44) as a replacement for sarcasm or mock impoliteness in his (1996) impoliteness model. Off-record impoliteness strategy involves the use of indirectness to communicate impoliteness. A speaker may deny or modify an offensive expression. Although the FTA is done in an indirect manner, it is suggestive of the intended offensive meaning attached to it which is often achieved by the way of implicatures. This strategy is the exact opposite of Brown and Levinson's Off-record politeness strategy.

(5) *Withhold politeness:* this involves the total absence of politeness work where it is anticipated. One instance cited by Culpeper is refusing to thank someone for a gift the person gives to you (Culpeper 1996, pp. 355-357).

Positive and Negative Impoliteness Super Strategies

(a) *Positive impoliteness output strategies include:* ignore, snub the other, exclude the other from an activity, disassociate from the other; deny association or common ground with the other, be disinterested, unconcerned and unsympathetic, use inappropriate identity markers, use obscure or secretive language, make the other feel uncomfortable, use taboo language and call the other names.

(b) *Negative impoliteness output strategies include:* frighten, condescend, scorn or ridicule, be contemptuous, invade the other's space, explicitly associate the other with a negative aspect and put the other's indebtedness on record (Culpeper 1996, pp. 357-358).

Furthermore, Culpeper (2013, p.8, 2011: pp. 6-135) outlines few linguistic instances of realizing these impoliteness strategies which include the use of vocatives, which mostly involves: calling names and using derogatory tags, personal negative evaluations, such as the use of dismissals, silencers and threats. Other impolite linguistic patterns include, pointed criticism and complaints, challenging questions and unpalatable presuppositions, use of condescension, message enforcers, curses, ill-wishes and non-supportive intrusions.

Data Presentation and Analysis

This segment is an appraisal of the 2015 campaign speeches of the former first lady of Nigeria, Mrs. Patience Goodluck Jonathan, the incumbent governor of Ekiti State, Mr. Ayodele Fayose, the director of media and publicity secretary of the PDP, Mr. Femi Fani Kayode, the former Kastina State governor, Mr. Ibrahim Shehu Shema of the PDP, the former publicity secretary of the APC party, Mr. Lai Mohammed, the traditional ruler (‘the Oba’) of Lagos State, Mr. Rilwan Akiolu, the APC 2015 presidential flag-bearer, currently the president of Nigeria, General Muhammadu Buhari, and the national leader of the APC party and former governor of Lagos State, Mr. Asiwaju Ahmed Tinubu. The number of speeches has been limited to a speech per individual. It is imperative to mention at this point that there are two addressees, sometimes addressed at the same time in the speeches analyzed, the electorate who are the direct audience and the rival party and its candidates who are the major target of the hate speeches used. It should also be noted that while all the data adopted for this study clearly attacked the self-esteem of both the electorate and the rival party and may cause face loss, not all fully consist of hate speech, specifically, the part addressed to the electorate, except in the case of Mr. Rilwan Akiolu’s speech to the Igbo electorate in Lagos State, whom he perceived to be PDP supporters and clearly used hate speech to intentionally attack them.

Table 1: FTAs to the Electorate

S. N	Negative FTAs to the Hearer (Electorate)	Number of Occurrence	Total Number of Negative FTAs Occurrence (20)	Percentage (100%)
1.	Warning	3	3	15%
2.	Suggestions and advice	9	9	45%
	Reminding a hearer to do an act	3	3	15%
4.	Order	2	2	10%
5.	Request	1	1	5%
6.	Threats	2	2	10%
	To the speaker	0	0	0
	Positive FTAs to the Electorates	0	0	0
	Total		20	100%

Table 2: Impoliteness Super Strategies to Rival Parties

S.N	Impoliteness Super Strategies	Realizations	Number of Occurrences	Total Number of Occurrences (60)	Percentage (100%)
1.	Bald on record	direct, unambiguous and clear statements	14	14	26%
2.	Negative Impoliteness	(a)scorn or ridicule and be contemptuous (b)frighten (c)explicitly associate the other with a negative aspect	9 11 5	25	46%
3.	Positive Impoliteness	(a)call the other names (b)be unconcerned and unsympathetic	4 2	6	11%
4.	Off-record Impoliteness	Indirect and insincere politeness strategies	9	9	17%
5.	Withhold Politeness	Snub	0	0	0%
	Total			54	100%

Data presentation and interpretation

(Former First Lady, Mrs. Patience Goodluck Jonathan at Ado-Ekiti PDP Women's Rally, Nigerian Bulletin, October 24th, 2015).

Extract 1

Text1: '... If you drink APC, you will die.

Text 2: Since my father was born, they have been around changing from one name to another.

Text 3: Very soon, they will answer Ebola.

Text 4: The name can't change you; it is only performance that can change you.

Text 5: If you like, change it 100 times.

Text 6: Nigerian women shine your eye.

Text 7: Don't go for analogue, go for digital.

Text 8: PDP is digital, APC is analogue.'

Politeness Face Threatening Acts (FTAs) In Extract 1: Text 1, 6 and 7

The excerpt above is a hate campaign delivered by the former first lady of Nigeria, Mrs. Patience Jonathan at the Ado-Ekiti PDP women's rally. Obviously, the speaker addresses both the electorate, who

are her audience and the APC party; the major target of the hate speech. Our primary concern here is to analyse the unintentional use of politeness FTAs to address the electorate, since the goal of the speaker in addressing her audience- the electorate is not to intentionally hurt, insult or make them lose face but to solicit their votes by employing all manner of rhetoric and persuasive language to convince them. Note that the speaker's address to the electorate is not hate speech. (Henceforth, this explanation applies to all the address to the electorate by the speakers from both APC and PDP parties, except in the case of Mr. Rilwan Akiolu's speech to the PDP supporters in Lagos, which shall be analysed using impoliteness strategies).

In Text 1, the speaker uses negative FTAs of *warning* and *threat* to alert the electorate of the danger in voting for the rival party, APC, thus: '*If you drink APC, you will die*', which impedes the face wants of the electorate in making rational decisions as full-fledged adult citizens to vote a candidate of their choice. In Text 6, Mrs. Patience uses negative FTAs of *order and reminding a hearer to do an act*, when she charges the electorates to 'shine' their eyes, which implies that they should be wise and at alert. Finally in Text 7, Mrs. Patience uses *advice* and *suggestion* when she instructs the women thus: '*don't go for analogue, go for digital*.' The remaining part of this extract is addressed to the rival party APC and is accounted for below, applying Culpeper's impoliteness model.

Impoliteness Strategies in Extract 1: Texts 1-5 and 8

Off-record impoliteness, Negative Impoliteness, Positive Impoliteness and Bald-on record

In Text 1, Mrs. Patience uses off-record impoliteness to attack the opposition party, APC when she indirectly insinuates that they are poison capable of causing instant death if ingested, which is destructive to the self-image of the APC party before the electorate. Similarly in Text 2, the speaker employs negative impoliteness strategy of *scorn, ridicule* and *be contemptuous* to impede the face wants of the APC party, when she exaggerates that the party has been there since her father was born changing from one name to another. Although humorous, it suggests that the party is immature, confused and incapable of handling any serious responsibility in the country since they could not do a simple thing as to decide what name to bear. Moreover, the speaker in Text 3 uses positive impoliteness strategy of '*call the other names*' when she states that one day APC will answer 'Ebola', a name of a killer disease.

In addition, negative impoliteness strategies of *scorn, ridicule and be contemptuous* can also be inferred from the name-calling. In Text 4, Mrs. Patience uses bald on record impoliteness strategy of '*be direct*' and the use of *unambiguous statement* when she uses the second person pronoun 'you' to attack the face want of the APC party without redress: '*The name can't change you, it is only performance that can change you*.' In Text 5, both bald on record impoliteness strategy and positive impoliteness strategies of '*be unconcerned and unsympathetic*' are employed by the speaker while being direct, to dismiss the addressee's face wants of being at least apologetic thus: '*If you like, change it 100 times*.' Three impoliteness strategies are implicated in Text 8, as Mrs. Patience declares that: '*PDP is digital and APC is analogue*.' In the first instance, the statement is bald on record as the FTA is done in a *direct and unambiguous manner*, without redress. Secondly, Positive impoliteness strategy of '*call the other names*' is used: '*...APC is analogue*', while Off-record impoliteness is equally employed, as the speaker indirectly suggests that APC is outdated- analogue while lauding her political party, PDP as contemporary and trendy- digital.

(Campaign Advert Released by the Incumbent Governor of Ekiti State, Mr Ayodele Peter Fayose of the PDP, Sahara Repoters, January 29th, 2015).

Extract 2

Text 9: *Nigerians Be Warned!*

Text 10: *Nigeria- I have set before thee life and death.*

Text 11: *Therefore, choose life that both thee and thy seed may live.*

(Added to the advert are the pictures of three late Northern presidents who died while in office, with a question mark on the fourth picture of the opposition presidential contestant of the APC party, General Muhammadu Buhari and then the advert continues).

Text 12: *Will you allow history to repeat itself? Enough of state burials!*

Text 13: *Nigerians, vote wisely, vote Goodluck Jonathan.*

Text 14: *Northern presidency should wait till 2019.'*

Politeness FTAs in Extract 2: Text 9 to 11 and 13

The speaker in the above extract is Mr. Ayodele Fayose, the incumbent governor of Ekiti State in a hate advert he released in regards to the 2015 presidential campaign. In Text 9, the speaker uses negative FTA of *warning*: 'Nigerians Be Warned!' to jolt the electorate by drawing their attention to the ensuing message of the advert. In Text 10, Mr. Fayose buttresses the already done FTA in Text 9 by using *suggestions* to persuade the electorate thus: 'Nigeria – I have set before thee life and death.' Here, he makes reference to Deutronomy 30 verse 19 in the Bible, where Moses, the prophet presents the Israelites with choices of life and death, blessings and curses and enjoins them to choose life, so that they would live. The same reference runs through the proceeding texts. In Text 11, Mr. Fayose uses negative FTAs of offering of *advice*, *reminding a hearer to do an act* and *threat* to the electorates: 'therefore choose life that both thee and thy seed may live', and then Text 13 recaps the reason for deploying all these face threatening strategies in the previous texts: 'Nigerians, vote wisely, vote Goodluck Jonathan', which involves negative FTAs of *advice and suggestion*.

Impoliteness Strategies in Extract 2: Text 10, 12 and 14

Off-record Impoliteness and Positive Impoliteness

Texts 10, 12 and 14 in the excerpts are the main carriers of the hate message of Mr. Fayose to the rival party APC. In Text 10 and 12, the speaker employs Off-record impoliteness strategy of 'be direct' and the use of implicatures to threaten the face want of the APC presidential candidate, General Muhammadu Buhari '... I have set before thee life and death.' It is obvious from the foregoing that the PDP presidential candidate, Mr. Goodluck Jonathan represents 'life' while the APC candidate, General Buhari represents 'death.' Likewise in Text 12, the speaker performs more FTAs by the use of implicatures: 'will you allow history to repeat itself? Enough of State burials! Here, the speaker supposes that the APC presidential candidate General Muhammadu Buhari will die in office just like the other past presidents from the North and this message he subtly conveys to the electorates in a most sarcastic 'polite' manner, using question hedge. Finally, in Text 14, Mr. Fayose dismissively recaps his intentions for deploying these impoliteness strategies: 'Northern presidency can wait till 2019', which is a positive impoliteness strategy of 'be disinterested, unconcerned and unsympathetic'.

(Campaign Speech Released by the director of media and publicity secretary of PDP, Mr. Femi Fani Kayode during the 2015 presidential election, Daily Post, Jan 7th, 2015).

Extract 3

Text 15: *'It is our intention to expose General Muhammadu Buhari for what he really is, what he stands for and the great dangers that his candidacy portends for the unity of the Nigerian State, peace and well-being of the Nigerian people.*

Text 16: *We believe that it is struggle between light and darkness.*

Text 17: We believe that General Buhari represents the darkness and that president Jonathan represents light.

Text 18: We believe that General Buhari represents a return to an ugly past which is best forgotten while President Jonathan represents our hope for greater and better future.

Text 19: We believe that APC on which platform General Buhari is contesting the presidential election represents everything that is unholy and unwholesome in our society and that the People's Democratic Party represents all that is decent and good.

Text 20: We believe the much vaunted 'change' campaign of the General Buhari represents nothing but a change from good to evil, if you want a positive change, you cannot expect to get it from a man like General Buhari whose democratic credentials are questionable and whose record in public office is shameful and disastrous.

Text 21: We do not believe that Nigeria ought to be run by a man that is not capable of tolerating dissent or by a political party like APC that has no sense of remorse, restraint or decency and that is not capable of accepting a plurality of views.'

Politeness FTAs in Extract 3: Text 20

This extract contains the hate campaign released by Mr Femi Fani Kayode of the PDP against the rival presidential contestant General Muhammadu Buhari and his party APC in his bid to discourage the electorate from voting him as well as attacking the APC flag bearer and his party. The only place that the speaker directly addressed the electorate is in the Part B of Text 20, where he, Mr. Kayode issues negative FTAs of *advice* and *warning* to the electorate when he states clearly that no positive change should be expected from the APC presidential contestant, General Mohammadu Buhari thus: *'...if you want a positive change, you cannot expect to get it from a man like General Buhari ...'*

Impoliteness Strategies in Extract 3: Text 15 to 21

Negative Impoliteness, Bald on record, Positive Impoliteness and Off-record Impoliteness

In Text 15, Mr. Kayode employs negative impoliteness strategy of *explicitly associate the other with negative aspect* as he relates the candidacy of General Buhari as being dangerous to Nigeria's unity and the wellbeing of the people. Further, in Text 16, the speaker uses Off-record impoliteness by the way of implicatures and indirectness in the statement: *'... it is struggle between light and darkness*, implying that the electioneering process is a fight between light- the PDP and darkness- the APC party. The use of bald on record in the proceeding Text 17 makes the hurtful intention behind the use of the off-record Impoliteness strategy in Text 16 more glaring and direct as the speaker plainly and bluntly states that General Buhari stands for 'darkness' and Jonathan stands for 'light'. Positive impoliteness strategy of *name calling* can also be inferred as Mr. Kayode calls APC 'darkness' while extolling PDP, his party as 'light'. In Text 18 to 20, Mr Kayode deploys negative impoliteness strategies of *explicitly associate the other with negative aspect, be contemptuous, condescend and scorn* when he states that Buhari stands for a return to an ugly past that should have been otherwise forgotten. In Text 19, APC represents: *'...everything that is unholy and unwholesome in our society...'* while praising his PDP party which represents everything that is 'decent' and 'good'. Further in Part A of Text 20, Mr. Kayode ridicules the much publicized 'change' slogan of General Buhari's campaign as nothing but only a change from 'good' to 'evil'. Finally in Text 21, the use of negative impoliteness strategy of *be contemptuous and explicitly associate the other with negative aspect* continues as Mr. Kayode maintains that Nigeria is not supposed to be run by APC and its presidential contestant who have no sense of 'remorse', 'restraint' or 'decency....' These impoliteness strategies are intentionally deployed to attack the APC party and its presidential contestant, General Muhammadu Buhari and make them lose face before the very electorates they are soliciting their votes.

(Campaign Speech delivered by the Former Kastina State governor, Mr. Ibrahim Shehu Shema of the PDP, Premium Times, Nov.19th 2014).

Extract 4

Text 22: 'You should not be bothered with cockroaches of politics.'

Text 23: Cockroaches are only found in the toilet even at home.

Text 24: If you see cockroach in your house, crush them!'

Politeness FTAs in Extract 4: Text 22 and 24

The above extract is a campaign speech delivered by the former governor of Kastina State, Mr. Ibrahim Shehu Shema of the PDP at a rally in.... This is a hate campaign which is rather a clear instance of incitement and a call for genocide by Mr. Shema to his PDP supporters against their APC counterparts. First in Text 22, the speaker uses negative FTA of *advice* to the electorates when he encourages them not to be troubled by the 'cockroaches of politics.' In Text 24, Mr. Shema employs negative FTAs of *order* and *reminding a hearer to do an act* when he instructs his massive supporters to crush any cockroach they find in their homes. The use of FTAs of *advice*, *reminding a hearer to do an act* and *order* impede the face of the electorates, as their future actions are dictated to them in a situation where they have the right to decide.

Impoliteness Strategies in Extract 4: Text 22 and 23

Positive Impoliteness and Negative Impoliteness

Mr. Shema in Text 22 employs positive impoliteness strategy of 'call the other names' by the use of the phrase: 'cockroaches of politics' to attack the face of the rival party, APC. Here, the APC party members are reduced to insects as a means of verbally assaulting them and attacking their self-esteem. In Text 23, negative impoliteness strategies of *condescend*, *scorn* and *ridicule* and *be contemptuous* are employed by the speaker as he identifies the only place cockroaches can be seen- in the toilet at home, which further intensifies the FTA used in Text 22 and signifies how lowly, disgusting and irritating he portrays the rival party before the electorates. The impoliteness strategy in Text 23 reinforces that of Text 22 and shows the intentionality to harm behind the hate campaign against the APC rival party.

(Campaign Speech on Lagos State Gubernatorial Election, Delivered to the Press by the Former Publicity Secretary of APC, Alhaji Lai Mohammed, Premium Times, April 10th 2015).

Extract 5

Text 25: 'The meeting in Lagos was aimed at devising a strategy to distribute the fake sheet that were packed into the SUV, which will be free to move around (because of its plate number) despite the restriction on vehicular movement during elections.'

Text 26: It is sad that the same president, who conceded defeat in the presidential election and then followed up with a speech in which he said he would like his 'legacy' of free and fair election to endure is the one who is presiding over a desperate move to steal the people's vote on Saturday.

Text 27: How can President Jonathan's legacy endure when one of his last acts in office is a seeming vengeance mission to lead his party to capture Lagos, because the PDP sees the state as a cash cow that they can milk to death, with the party's gravy train at the federal level having derailed?

Text 28: In their desperation over Lagos election, they have shamelessly divided the people along ethnic, religious and regional lines, thus setting the stage for the condemnable hate speeches to which they have in turn latched on to further whip-up primordial sentiments.

Text 29: This party (PDP) and its leader, the president has divided Nigerians in general and Lagos residents in particular more than any individual or group at any time in history.

Text 30: *If today things are being said that should not have been said, it is direct consequence of the PDP's divisiveness.*

Text 31: *Lagosians, please come out en masse on Saturday and vote in a peaceful manner for a candidate of your choice.*

Text 32: *Say no to coercion, defend your votes and repudiate all architects of divisiveness and rigging.'*

Politeness FTAs in Extract 5: Text 31 and 32

The context of this extract is a campaign speech released to the press by Mr. Lai Mohammed, the former national publicity secretary of APC in relation to the Lagos State gubernatorial election of 2015, after the former president Goodluck Jonathan had lost his presidential seat to his opponent, General Mohammadu Buhari of the APC party. Texts 31 and 32 are obviously the only fragments of the speech addressed to the electorates which are face threatening. Mr Lai Mohammed engages negative FTAs of *request and advice*, when he says: *Lagosians please come out en masse on Saturday and vote in a peaceful manner for a candidate of your choice*, while in Text 32 he uses *orders*: *Say no to coercion, defend your votes and repudiate all architects of divisiveness and rigging.'*

Impoliteness Strategies in Extract 5: Texts 25 to 30 and 32

Negative Impoliteness, Bald on record and Off-record Impoliteness

The speaker in Text 25 deploys off-record impoliteness when he indirectly and subtly reveals 'the reason' behind the political meeting in Lagos which is '*...aimed at devising a strategy to distribute the fake sheet that were packed into the SUV, which will be free to move around (because of its plate number)...*', implying that the rival party, PDP is set to rig the Lagos State gubernatorial election even without mentioning them clearly. In Text 26 to 27, negative impoliteness strategies of *scorn or ridicule* and *be contemptuous* are used as Mr. Lai Mohammed wittingly ridicules Mr. Jonathan's acceptance of defeat in the presidential election and derides his 'enduring legacy of free and fair election' as '*... a desperate move to steal the people's vote on Saturday*'. In Text 27 also: '*...when one of his last acts is seeming vengeance mission to lead his party to capture Lagos, because PDP sees the state as a cash cow that they can milk to death with the party's gravy train at the federal level having derailed?*' The former President, Goodluck Jonathan and his party are presented as parasites when the speaker insinuates that they are ready to devour the economy of Lagos State without any restraint which further intensifies the FTAs done.

Bald-on record impoliteness strategy is adopted to perform the FTA in a clear and 'direct' manner in Text 28 to 29. The speaker pointedly attacks Mr Goodluck Jonathan and his party PDP as he directly referred to them with such pronouns as 'their' and 'they' thus: '*In their desperation over Lagos election, they have shamelessly divided the people along ethnic, religious and regional lines...*' Similarly in Text 29, Mr Lai Mohammed uses bald on record when he pointedly insists that: '*This party (PDP) and its leader, the president have divided Nigerians in general and Lagos residents in particular, more than any individual or group at any time.*' The speaker has employed this impoliteness strategy to attack his targets in a most direct manner by the use of the phrase 'this party (PDP) and its leader', without mincing words to show the directedness of the attack which is obviously intentional. Consequently, the speaker successfully engages negative impoliteness strategy of *explicitly associate the other with a negative aspect* in Text 30 when he blames the PDP party for bringing divisiveness. Finally in the Part B of Text 32, the speaker uses off-record impoliteness strategy of indirectness when he refers to the rival Party, PDP as: '*...architects of divisiveness and rigging*'.

(A Campaign speech delivered by Mr. Rilwan Akiolu of APC, the traditional ruler (Oba)of Lagos State during a meeting with the Igbo leaders, in light of Lagos State gubernatorial elections. Premium Times April 7th, 2015).

Extract 6:

Text 33: ' I am not ready to beg you. I am not begging anybody, but what you people cannot do in Onitsha, Aba or anywhere, don't do it here.

Text 34: if you do what I want, Lagos will continue to be prosperous for you, if you go against my wish, you will perish in the water.

Text 35: On Saturday, if anyone of you go against Ambode who [sic] I picked, that is your end. If it doesn't happen within seven days just know that I am a bastard and it is not my father who gave birth to me.

Text 36: ... By the grace of God, I am the owner of Lagos for the time being. This is an undivided chair...

Text 37: On Saturday, if any of you, I swear in the name of God, goes against my wish that Ambode will be the next governor of Lagos State, the person is going to die inside this water.'

Impoliteness Strategies in Extract 6: Texts 33 to 37

Bald on record and Negative Impoliteness

This is a campaign speech delivered by Mr. Rilwan Akiolu, the 'Oba' of Lagos State as a warning to deter the Igbo people residing in Lagos State, whom he perceives to be PDP supporters from ever voting against Mr. Akinwunmi Ambode, his APC gubernatorial candidate. The excerpt above is categorized under hate speech as it is a clear call to genocide and shall be analyzed using the impoliteness (FTAs) model since the FTAs are intentionally deployed to clearly threaten the face of the supposed 'PDP supporters' addressed in the speech without any attempt at mitigating the FTAs done. Throughout the speech, there is a preponderance of bald on record and negative impoliteness strategies. Mr. Akiolu employs bald on record impoliteness strategy to do the FTA in a most *direct* and *unambiguous* manner in Text 33, when he uses the first and second person pronouns 'I' and 'you' and commands thus; '*I am not ready to beg you*', '*...but what you people cannot do in Onitsha, Aba or anywhere, don't do it here.*' In Text 34 to 35, he deploys both negative impoliteness strategy of '*frighten*' and bald on record strategy to coerce the Igbo electorates to vote for his own candidate: '*if you do what I want, Lagos will continue to be prosperous for you, if you go against my wish, you will perish in the water.*' Note that Mr. Akiolu uses conditional threat in a direct and clear manner to frighten and intimidate his addressees by employing the first and second person pronouns 'I' and 'you'.

The same pattern runs through Text 35 thus: '*On Saturday if anyone of you goes against Ambode who {sick} I picked, that is your end*'. The speaker further shows his anger by using swear words to buttress his threats: '*If it doesn't happen within seven days just know that I am a bastard and it is not my father who gave birth to me.*' In Texts 36, the speaker employs off-record impoliteness to fortify the threats he made previously by using indirect strategies to communicate impoliteness thus: '*... By the grace of God, I am the owner of Lagos for the time being. This is an undivided chair...*' On the periphery, the statement above appears to be a compliment but a more conscientious look at the statement would reveal the hidden hurtful intentions attached to it. Being that Mr. Akiolu has threatened his addressees with drowning them in the lagoon, if they do not vote his APC candidate, he also intimates that he has the powers to fulfill his threats since he owns Lagos State and decides what happens. Hence, there is no hiding place for the Igbo electorates if they fail to comply. Again in Text 37, the speaker reinstates his threat by using bald on record and negative impoliteness strategy of '*frighten*' in the last statement: '*On Saturday, if anyone of you, I swear in the name of God, goes against my wish that Ambode will be the next governor of Lagos State, the person is going to die inside this water.*'

5.1. (Campaign Speech released to the Press by the APC presidential contestant, General Mohammadu Buhari, Vanguard Newspaper, May 15 2012).

Extract 7

Text 38: 'God willing, by 2015 something will happen.

Text 39: They either conduct a free and fair election or they go a disgraceful way.

Text 40: If what happened in 2011 (alleged rigging of the election) should happen again in 2015, by the grace of God, the dog and the baboon would all be soaked in blood'.

Impoliteness Strategies in Extract 5: Texts 38 to 40

Negative Impoliteness, Bald on record, Off-record and Positive Impoliteness

This is a hate speech delivered by General Mohammadu Buhari, the APC presidential flag bearer prior to the 2015 presidential election, after he had contested and lost to Mr Goodluck Jonathan of the PDP in the 2011 presidential race. Since the FTAs used in the excerpt are directed at the rival party, we shall only deploy impoliteness strategies in the text analysis. In Text 38, the speaker, Mr Buhari employs a negative impoliteness strategy of 'frighten' to jolt, capture and retain the attention of his political rivals and apparently, all who will be involved in 2015 presidential electioneering process to pay attention to the ensuing message when he threatens that something detrimental will definitely happen by 2015.

Bald on record is deployed as the impoliteness strategy in Text 39, as the speaker states his intentions in a *direct* and *unambiguous* manner: *They either conduct a free and fair election or they go a disgraceful way*, using the third person pronoun 'they', obviously referring to the PDP led government of Mr Goodluck Jonathan which will conduct the election. Again, negative impoliteness strategy of 'frighten' can be inferred from the statement as the speaker threatens the PDP party with the plans of ousting them out of power. In Text 40, Mr Buhari uses off-record impoliteness strategy of *indirectness* at the beginning of the statement when he declares by the way of implicature that if what happened in the year 2011 should repeat itself again, apparently referring to the PDP alleged rigging of the 2011 presidential election. The swear phrase and its ensuing message: *'...by the grace of God the dog and the baboon would all be soaked in blood'* - obviously threatening an imminent bloodbath and war on Mr Goodluck Jonathan and his PDP supporters. This is a negative impoliteness strategy of 'frighten', as the statement is meant to scare and intimidate the rival party, PDP. Also, the expression: 'the dog and the baboon' is a positive impoliteness strategy of 'use obscure or secretive language as the meaning is vague.

5.3. (Campaign speech delivered by the former Lagos State governor and national leader of the APC party, Mr Asiwaju Ahmed Tinubu at Ladoko Akintola University of Technology, Ogbomoso, Vanguard Newspaper, April 24, 2014).

Extract 8

Text 41: 'It will be rig and roast.

Text 42: We are prepared not to go to court but to drive you out.

Text 43: We will not take it anymore.

Text 44: If you mess up in Ekiti and Osun States, you will see our reactions.

Text 45: For every action, there must be a reaction.'

Impoliteness Strategies in Extract 8: Texts 41 to 45

Negative Impoliteness and Bald on record

In the above excerpt, Mr Asiwaju Ahmed Tinubu of the APC party in a campaign hate speech targeted at the PDP party, prior to the gubernatorial elections in Ekiti and Osun States uses FTAs. The impoliteness FTAs employed in the speech are in no doubt intentional as they are deployed to openly attack the face of the rival party without redress. The speaker in Texts 41 to 45 makes use of negative impoliteness strategy of 'frighten', when he announces at the beginning of his address that *'it will be rig and roast'*

and that the APC party is not ready to legally handle any case of rigging in court but to drive their major opponent, the PDP out. Such alarming and inciting remarks of violence are targeted not just at cowering the opposition party, PDP but also to create an awareness of what would be an aftermath of an unfavourable election among the electorate. Consequently, the use of bald on record statements run through texts 42 to 45, to buttress the harmful intentions of the speaker at disconcerting and frightening his opponents as well as their supporters as indicated by the use of such direct and unambiguous expressions as: '*We are prepared not to go to court but to drive you out*', '*We will not take it anymore*', '*If you mess up in Ekiti and Osun States, you will see our reactions*', and '*For every action, there must be a reaction.*' These threats are conveyed in such simple, clear and most direct way possible to the PDP party in order to dissuade them from daring to win the election either legally or illegally as the underlying meaning of 'rigging' is when the PDP wins the election at the detriment of their opponent.

Conclusion

The findings of the study show that 75% of the campaign speeches analysed were hate speeches, full of blazing impoliteness strategies, intentionally wielded to attack, hurt, disrepute the opponents addressed and have the capacity to incite violence. While only 25% of the campaign speeches were not hate speeches but addressed to the electorate as face threatening strategies of warnings, ordering, and advising the electorate to vote in favour of the speaker, without stating the goals the speaker is set to accomplish, if elected. Among the impoliteness strategies used by the speakers against their rivals, negative impoliteness strategies of *condescend, scorn or ridicule and contempt, frighten and explicitly associate the other with negative aspects*, rank highest with (48%), while bald on record, the use of direct and unambiguous face attacks follows with (23%) and off-record: indirect statement and the use of negative implicatures take third with (20%). Positive impoliteness is the least, taking only (9%) as there was no case of withheld politeness as the study used only transcribed copies of the speeches and since this strategy can only be observed in actions. Finally, the research further reveals that impoliteness strategies are closely knitted with hate speech discourse.

Funding: This research received no external funding.

Conflict of Interest: The authors declare no conflict of interest.

Disclaimer: This work is a part of an unpublished M.A. thesis submitted to the Department of English and Literary Studies, University of Nigeria, Nsukka in March 2017, which bears my maiden name Ozurumba, Onyinyechi Blessing and not Udoumoh, Onyinyechi Blessing, the married name which I now bear. Therefore, it should be known that Ozurumba, Onyinyechi Blessing with the registration number, PG/MA/14/76036, with the unpublished M.A. thesis titled: 'Hate Speech: An Impoliteness Study of Selected 2015 Political Campaign Speeches In Nigeria', is the same person as the present author, Onyinyechi Blessing Udoumoh. The theses was supervised by Prof. F.O. Orabueze, the co-author of the present work. Excerpts were taken from chapter 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5 of the work.

Biographies

Onyinyechi Blessing Udoumoh

Onyinyechi Blessing Udoumoh lectures in the Use of English Unit, School of General Studies, University of Nigeria, Nsukka. She holds a B.A. in Combined Arts,(History/English); an M.A. in English Language and is currently doing her PhD in English Language, all in the University of Nigeria, Nsukka. She is a young curious researcher with interest in Pragmatics and Discourse Studies.

Onyebuchi Florence Orabueze

Onyebuchi Florence Orabueze is a professor of English and Literary Studies with the University of Nigeria, Nsukka. She holds a B.A.in English Language, B.L in Law, M.A. in Teaching English as a Second Language and PhD in English and African Literature from the University of Nigeria, Nsukka. The core areas of her teaching include: Morphology and Syntax, Stylistics, Advanced Prose Composition and other courses.

References

- Adedimeji, M. A. (2005a, April). *The Politics of Language in Nigeria: A Modest Proposal*. Paper presented at a National Conference on Democracy and Development, Faculty of Business Administration and Social Sciences, University of Illorin, Illorin.
- Adedimeji, M. A. (2005b, June). *The Language of politics in Nigeria: Conflicts and Resolution*. Paper Presented at a National Conference on Crisis and Conflict Management in Nigeria since 1980, Ejoor Hall, Nigeria Defence Academy,
- Akinbiyi, A. (2006). Inclusion and Exclusion in Olusegun Obasanjo's Speeches. *Journal of Language and Linguistics*, 5(2), 177-191.
- Akinwotu, S. A. (2013). A Speech Act Analyses of the Acceptance of Nomination Speeches of Chief Obafemi Awolowo and Chief M.K.O. Abiola. *Journal of Linguistics Research*. 2(1), 43-51.
- Aremu, M. A. (2015). Being Politically Impolite: a Community of Practice; Analysis of Invective Songs of Western Nigerian Politicians. *Journal of Society, Culture and Language*, 1-14.
- Asiru, H., and Ibrahim. (2022). Pragmatic study of political hate speeches in selected newspapers in Nigeria. *Nairobi Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences*, 6(1). Retrieved from <https://royalliteglobal.com/njhs/article/view/715>
- Ayansola, A. O. and Oamen, F. (2019). A Study of On-line Hate Speeches: Legitimation Processes by Nigerian Political Actors. *African Journals Online (AJOL)*, 16(1).
- Babou, M. (2014). A Sociolinguistic Analysis of Use and Perception of Insult: TLEMCEN Speech Community. *International Journal of Academic Research Reflection*. 4(2) 110-112.
- Benesch, S.(2012, Jan.). Dangerous Speech: a Proposal to Prevent Group Violence. Retrieved from [World Policy.org](http://WorldPolicy.org)
- Brown, P., and Levinson S. (1978). Universals in Language Usage: Politeness Phenomena. In Goody E. Ed.), *Questions and Politeness: Strategies in Social Interaction* (pp.56-310). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Brown, P., and Levinson, S. (1987). *Politeness: Some Universals in Language Usage.*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Brown, Penelope. (2015). Politeness and Language. *International Encyclopedia of the Social and Behavioural Sciences*, 1(8), 325-328.
- Buttler, J.(1997). *Excitable Speech: a Politics of the Performatives*. New York: Routledge.
- Caruna, C. (2016, Jan.4). Lack of Understanding about Hate Crime Speech.Retrieved from [www.http://Times of Malta.com](http://www.timesofmalta.com).
- Centre for Information Technology and Development. (2015). Report of One-Day Stakeholder's Forum on Hate Speech and the 2015 Elections in Nigeria. Retrieved from <https://CITAD.org>.
- Chiluwa, I., Taiwo, R., & Ajiboye, E. (2020). Hate speech and political media discourse in Nigeria: The case of the Indigenous People of Biafra. *International Journal of Media and Cultural Politics*, 16, 191-212.
- Culpeper, J. (1996). Towards an Anatomy of Impoliteness. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 25(3) 349-367.
- Culpeper J. (2011a). Politeness and Impoliteness. *Sociopragmatics, Handbooks of Pragmatics 5*. Andersen .G and Aijimer .K., (Eds.) Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Culpeper J. (2011b). *Impoliteness: Using Language to Cause Offence*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Culpeper, J. (2013). General Approaches to Impoliteness and Rudeness: Impoliteness: Questions and Answers. *Aspects of Linguistics Impoliteness*. Jannet, D., and Jobert M., (Eds.).Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- Danladi, S.(2013). Language Policy: Nigeria and the Role of English Language in the 21st Century. *European Scientific Journal*, 9(17).
- Daily Post. (2015, Jan.7).I will Expose 'Atrocities' Buhari Committed when he was in Power-Fani

- Kayode. Daily Post.
- Ezeifeke, C.(2012). Critical Discourse Analysis of Self Glorification and Derogation of Others in Selected Inaugural Political Speeches in Nigeria. *International Journal of Research in Arts and Social Sciences*, (4).
- Fauziati, E.(2014, Jan). Linguistic Impoliteness: a Brief Literature Review. *Prosiding Semina Nasional, January 25, 2014: Ketidaksantunan Berbahasa dan Dampaknya dalam Pembentukan Karakter*. Surakarta: Universitas Muhammadiyah Surakarta, 2014.
- Fernandez, G. (2014). Impoliteness, Pseudo-Impoliteness, Strategic Politeness: on the Nature of Communicative Behaviour in Electoral Debates. *Circulo de Linguistica Aplicada a la Comunicacion*, 60-89.
- Fasakin, A., Oyero, O., Oyesomi, K.O., and Okorie, N. (2017). Hate Speech and the 2015 General Elections in Nigeria. *IJASOS- International E-journal of Advances in Social Sciences*, 3, 948-953.
- Gay, W.(1999). *Linguistic Violence in Institutional Violence*. Robert,L., and Deane, C., (Eds.). Amsterdam: Rodopi..
- Igwedibia, E. A.(2012). Pragmatics of Selected Political Speeches of Barrack Obama. M. A.Diss. University of Nigeria, Nsukka.
- Krisagbedo, E. S.(2010). Pragmatics of Former President Obasanjo's Speeches on Corruption in Nigeria. MA Diss. University of Nigeria, Nsukka.
- Lerner, N. (1996). Is There a Right to Hate Speech? *Human Rights Brief*. Retrieved from <https://Wcl.com.america.edu>.
- Mohammed, I.(2014). Political Speeches of Some African leaders from Linguistic Perspective (1981-2013). *International Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences*. 4(3). 180-197.
- Nordquist, R.(2020, August). Politeness Strategies. *Glossary of Grammatical Rhetorical Terms*. Retrieved from <https://Grammar.about.com>
- Nigerian Bulletin.(2015, March 17). Please don't Vote Buhari, I'm not Ready to Take Food to Jonathan in Prison- Patience Jonathan.
- Obiora, H.C., Aboh, S. C., & Dioka, B.O. (2021). Critical Discourse Analysis of Selected Nigerian Political Hate Speeches. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, 12, 494-500.
- Ojo, S.(2016). Doing Politics with words: a Pragmatic Analysis of News Reports on Obasanjo's and Fayose's Fracas. *International Journal of Humanities and Cultural Studies*. 2(4), 1028-1029.
- Omoniyi, M.(2012). Pragmatic Analysis of Victory and Inaugural Speeches of President Umaru Musa Yar'Adua. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*. 2(3), 461-468.
- Premuim Times. (2015, April 10). Lai Mohammed- Jonathan on Vengeance Mission, Desperate to Rig Lagos Election for PDP- APC. *Premuim Times, Nigeria*.
- Premuim Times.(2014, Nov.19). Kastina Governor, Shema Caught on Video Urging Supporters to 'Crush', 'Kill' Political Opponents.. *Premuim Times, Nigeria*.
- Premuim Times. (6 April 2015). Oba of Lagos Rilwan Akiolu, Reluctant to Clarify Anti-Igbo Comments. *Premuim Times, Nigeria*.
- Sambuli, N.(2013). Monitoring Online Dangerous Speech in Kenya. *UMATI:UMATI*. Morara and Christine, M., (Eds.).
- Sahara Reporters.(2015, Jan. 29) Fayose's Advert Offensive or Hate Speech?". *Sahara Reporters, Inc*.
- United States Holocaust Memorial Museum. (2009). Hate Speech and Group-Targeted Violence: the Role of Speech in Violent Conflicts. Retrieved from <https://Ushmm.org>
- Utych, S. M.(2012, July 12). *Negative Affective Language in Politics*. Paper Prepared for Presentation at the 35th Annual Meeting of the International Society of Political Psychology. Chicago: International Society of Political Psychology.
- Vanguard News.(2014, April 24). Ekiti, Osun Guber Polls'll be Rig and Roast- Tinubu. *Vanguard*

Media Limited.

Vanguard News. (2012, May 15). 2015 'll be Bloody if....- Buhari. *Vanguard Media Limited.*

Weber, A. (2009). *Manual on Hate Speech: Project Manuscript.* Council of Europe Publishing.

Woodward, M.(2014, March 22). Hate Speech, Dehumanization, Demonization and Violence: the Indonesian Islamic Defenders Front. *Retrieved from <https://Projekdialog.com>*

Yasmeen, R.(2014). Politeness and Language of Pakistani Politicians. *Journal of Academic Research International, 5(3),1-9.*

Yiekes, F. (2014, March19). OEAD Alumni Talks: Language and Power. Retrieved from <https://Oead.at.AlumniTalk.com>.