

A Comparative Study of the Patterns of Hate Speeches During Presidential Campaigns in Nigeria and the United States of America

Waya, David Tarhom Ph.D¹, Ugwuanyi John Ph.D², Ogbonna Alozie C^{3*}

¹Department of Linguistics and Nigerian languages, University of Nigeria

^{2,3}Department of Mass Communication, University of Nigeria

*Corresponding author

Abstract: This study compared the patterns of hate speeches uttered in the 2015 and 2016 presidential electioneering campaigns in Nigeria and USA. The total of 28 hate speeches was sourced from online posts and analyzed using the Dijk's model of Critical Discourse Analysis. The narratives of the hate speeches were on the question of party affiliation, religion, ethnicity/racism, personality/trust, health, education, and gender/sexual orientations. The examined hate speeches are linked to socio, economic, cultural and political realities in the respective countries. The speeches uttered by Nigeria politicians portrayed the state of intolerance in political differences, question of personality/trust or health status while in the USA, the gladiators focused more on religious intolerance, gender/sexual orientations and personality/trust of the individual candidates. Meanwhile, no attack was recorded on gender, hence the candidates were of the same sex in the case of Nigeria. Comparatively, the candidates in USA recorded more hate speeches than their supporters unlike in Nigeria. The paper therefore recommends issue-based campaigns in order to avoid possible violence often associated with hate speeches in political contests and debates.

Keywords: Nigeria, United State of America, politics, hate speech, campaign and political language.

I. INTRODUCTION

Politics is concerned with power: the power to decide, control assets, control other individuals' conduct, and control their qualities. In the law of certain countries, hate speech is depicted as discourse, motion or direct, composing, or show which is illegal in light of the fact that it actuates brutality or biased activity against or by a secured gathering or individual based on their enrollment of the gathering, or on the grounds that it criticizes or scares an ensured gathering, or individual based on their participation to a gathering. Essentially, such speeches rob others of their dignity. Therefore, United Nation (2016) opined that hate speech includes: (a) all dispersal of thoughts dependent on racial or ethnic prevalence or disdain, by whatever implies; (b) induction to scorn, disdain or oppression individuals from a gathering on grounds of their race, shading, plunge, or national or ethnic starting point; (c) dangers or prompting to savagery against people or gatherings on the grounds in (b) above; (d) articulation of put-down, criticism or defamation of

people or gatherings or support of contempt, hatred or separation on the grounds in (b) above, when it unmistakably sums to impelling to disdain or segregation; and (e) interest in associations and exercises which advance and actuate racial segregation.

Nigeria 2015 and America 2016 presidential campaigns were perhaps, the most bitterly contested in the annals of the countries' electoral histories. These were possibly the most divisive elections, drawing Nigerians and Americans into a devious web of mudslinging either on ethnicity, race or religious issues. In Nigeria, the election was historic because for the first time in the country's history, an incumbent president was defeated. While in America, it was the first time a major political party sponsored a female candidate. Also, it was the first time someone without a known political background in the history of American politics became elected as President. All over the world, election periods are characterised with series of events that increase the tempo of the political environment. More so, the situation is apparent in developing countries where electioneering events are accompanied by violence. Hate speech is especially malignant and powerful as a result of the manner in which it develops and politicizes in-gatherings and out-gatherings. In this unique circumstance, in-bunches allude to the culprits of hate speech and the more extensive network that share their perspectives or potentially additionally share in detest hate.

In reality, out-groups, that is, those are the victims of the hate speeches in any given society. The hate speeches in both countries were vituperative attacks on the dignity of the candidates themselves and the people. It is believed that some hate speeches in these respective countries were targeted at projecting the attributes of others in negative ways. While some hate speeches were intended to cause violence.

Interestingly, the use of hate speech is no longer common only with developing countries. In American political history, the 2016 presidential campaign was filled with helix of hate speeches. It is generally worrisome whenever hate speech form cardinal feature in political campaigns. Apparently, some politicians were conscious of

the violent nature of their speeches, but ignore them to achieve ulterior agenda. Ezeibe (2015), Stephen (2017) and Adisa, et al (2017) proved in their studies that hate speech is a deliberate instrument of campaign by politicians to gain power. However, Williams (2002) noted that expression of hatred toward any group is protected in U.S. law by the right to speak freely notwithstanding the mental and social mischief such articulation is broadly accepted to cause when coordinated toward minorities, sex e.t.c. So, hate speech in this context is the manifestation of an existing hatred of a particular group or individual to another.

The patterns of hate speeches in Nigeria and America during these respective campaigns were not based on the same focus and subject matter. The studies reviewed in this work focused either on Nigeria or USA. Based on the available literature, it is clear that no comparative study has been carried out on hate speeches drawn from the two countries from the linguistic perspective. Since Nigeria borrowed the system of democracy from the USA, it is imperative to compare these emerging scenarios.

Based on the aforementioned, the objectives are:

- i. to examine the features of the hate speeches used during the 2015 and 2016 presidential campaigns in Nigeria and USA.
- ii. to compare the patterns of hate speeches used during Nigeria and USA electioneering campaigns.

To this end, the following research questions are raised;

- i. What are the features of hate speeches used during the Nigeria 2015 and USA 2016 electioneering campaigns?
- ii. What are the similarities and differences in the patterns of hate speeches used in Nigeria and USA?

The study will be relevant to hate speech studies as it will provide additional information based on the similarities and differences that exists in political campaign strategies in the two countries. The study also will contribute to existing theoretical standpoint on hate speech studies in developing and developed countries. This study will equally be beneficial to security agencies in Nigeria and USA in their routine operations. It will also assist the media in conducting Reality Check on the content of political campaign speeches in order to discourage the perpetrators of hate discourse..

II. THEORETICAL BACKGROUND

According to Neisser (1994, 337), hate speech refers to “all communications (whether verbal, written or symbolic) that insults a racial, ethnic and political group, whether by suggesting that they are inferior in some respect or by indicating that they are despised or not welcome for any other reasons”. He argues that apart from causing danger of physical assault, hate speech risks violent reaction. Kayambazinthu and Moyo (2002) conceived hate speeches as wars waged on others by means of the word.

Zeynep (2014) proposed a revision of the speech act theory and integration into hate speech studies. According to him, hate speech cannot be separated from its specific social and cultural contexts. He notes that hate speech could be conceptualized from the perspective of speech act theory and named “hate speech acts.” In addition, it is believed that the concept of “hate speech” should be extended to “hate discourse” in the era of social media.

Matsuda et al (1993) and MacKinnon (1996) expressed that words can attack, harm and wound. As per Butler's (1997, 4), "definitions recommend that semantic damage acts like physical damage." From this point of view, despise discourse is illocutionary discourse act – saying something or essayist's goal. Notwithstanding, Butler (1997, 14) restricts their view, expressing that "referencing" of those damaging articulations in basic or legitimate talk "is itself restaging of the execution of hate discourse". Then again, Butler (1997) misreads one noteworthy part of hate discourse, its talk setting in which the speaker's or' essayist will probably condemn or rebuff the ones who express those articulations, that signifies "referencing" couldn't be arranged as despise discourse. As indicated by Matsuda et al (1993) and MacKinnon (1996), hate speech could exploit its recipient; accordingly, it has a few outcomes on the beneficiary. Be that as it may, Butler (1997, 15) accepts "favorable ramifications" of discourse acts expressing that "words may, through time, become detached from their capacity to harm and recontextualised in progressively positive modes.

Kamalu and Fasai (2018) examined elements of discourteous and face-undermining acts and listener reaction among students of state colleges in the southwestern part in accordance with Brown and Levinson's good manners hypothesis and Watt's social work. The examination saw that in spite of the bounty of devil/FTAs in the discussions, there is no disturbance or breakdown of discussions as listeners frequently slighted the tokens or made mellow remarks to demonstrate that they saw the pixie/FTAs while despite everything they continued the discussions. Kamalu and Fasai (2018) researched examples and elements of rude and face-compromising acts and listener reaction among students of state colleges in the southwestern part in accordance with Brown and Levinson's good manners hypothesis and Watt's social work. The investigation saw that in spite of the abundance of demon/FTAs in the discussions, there is no disturbance or breakdown of discussions as listeners regularly ignored the tokens or made mellow remarks to demonstrate that they saw the devil/FTAs while regardless they supported the discussions Politeness theory propounded by Brown and Levinson in 1978 and later revised in 1987 which was motivated by Goffman's work on face in 1967. The theory accounts for face which is the public self-image that every member of a society wants to claim for himself. According to them, there are positive and negative faces in every human interaction. According to Cutting (1986) 'negative' politeness

seeks to avoid disagreement or conflict. This form of politeness is more important than the 'positive' form of politeness, which seeks 'concord'. Politeness therefore, as a crucial aspect of social relationship can affect a linguistic choice.

To save face and to be appreciated in any conversation, Carter and Simpson (1986, 208) state that, 'there is the need to show politeness that involves showing friendly attitude'. It is possible for speakers to employ more than one maxim at once in an utterance. A form of politeness which equally appears among the political class is called 'politeness on record'. This is where an insult is passed in form of commendation or as a form of respect when in actual sense, the statement means an insult. The principle of politeness is a necessary supplement to Grice's (1975) Cooperative Principle (CP) and conversationalists in their attempt to look friendly and cooperative often (deliberately) break the cooperative principle for politeness sake.

As indicated by Hall (1992, 17), "a talk is a method for discussing or speaking to something. It produces learning that shapes observation and practice. It is mostly in which control works. Accordingly, it has ramifications for both the individuals who utilize it and the individuals who are 'oppressed' to it. Corridor (1992, 318) trusts that "... in changed and revamped shapes, this talk keeps on curving the picture of itself 'as well as other people', its feeling of 'us' and 'them', its practices and relations of intensity towards the rest. Gordon (1992, 23) states "any individual who is considered as 'other' can be the object of savagery, regardless of whether this can be on the grounds of skin shading, ethnic birthplace, religion or culture. 'Basic Discourse Analysis subsumes an assortment of methodologies towards the social examination of talk (Fairclough and Wodak 1997, Pêcheux, 1982, Wodak and Meyer 2001) which vary in principle, procedure, and the sort of research issues to which they will in general give noticeable quality. Van Dijk's (2004) attests that the hypothesis and routine with regards to CDA enable us to explore desultory practices all the more intently. It is appropriate into a profound investigation of the ideological underpinnings of specific discourses and how these are confined. This reminds Anderson's (1991, 73) definition of a nation which is "an imagined political community" and in this context, political campaign grounds could contribute to the construction of these imagined communities.

Hate speech in a political domain is generally analyzed with the different approaches in critical discourse analysis (CDA). In reference to academics working on the CDA, Fairclough and Wodak (1997) regard 'language as social practice' and search for the traces of social inequalities hidden in language.

Calvert (1997) analyzed harms caused by hate speech using Carey's (1989) Contrasting Transmission and Ritual Models of Communication. He observed that the transmission model directs the attention of courts and legislative bodies to effects

of hate speech, such as emotional and behavioural changes in the recipients of the speech. In contrast, the ritual model illustrates the reinforcement of racist attitudes and disparate treatment of minorities that occurs with the repetitive use of hate speech. The study looked at negative effect, psychological and transmission channel of hate speech. While the present study, compares the patterns of hate speeches from two countries to ascertain their similarities and differences.

Laura (2010) utilizing a clear methodology researched individuals' reactions to combustible abhor destinations found on the World Wide Web. The test demonstrated that the informative estimation of the articulation was low, while a second test proposed individuals saw a backhanded, treacherous risk as opposed to fast approaching rebellious activity. Review transient impacts as the legitimate mischief, the investigation saw that racial oppressor loathe talk is ensured discourse. Nicole (2005) examined the verbal and printed antagonistic vibe utilized by agitators, lawmakers and the media in Sydney (Australia) in December 2005 amid the fight over the Sutherland Shire's Cronulla Beach. It is seen that understanding the damages of despise discourse gives one the instruments important to make a progressively responsive system for condemning a few types of detest discourse as a fundamental procedure in diminishing or wiping out detest viciousness. This examination concurs that viciousness is made conceivable using hate discourse. Laura (2016) in the Comparative prologue to Hate Speech Laws in Brazil and the United States observed that despise discourse have expanded in the US, where the constitution furiously secures the privilege to free discourse. In Brazil, in any case, the constitution, which shield residents from despise discourse, is being focused by the administration in order to give enactment set up to deny detest discourse and detest wrongdoings.

Raphael (2016) in the study of hate and racist in USA observed that the American credo is comprised of strong belief in liberty and individuality and of strong anti-government sentiment. The assurance of political discourse is principal to the American majority rules system. As U.S. Constitution emphatically secures political discourse, it presents insurance likewise on despise discourse which is incorporated into the expansive meaning of political discourse. Erik (2011) in the investigation of abhor discourse and loathe wrongdoing with the emphasis on Western Europe and the United States observed that enactment and implementation of arrangements against instigation to racial scorn and violations are persuaded by racial inclination. He discovered that after some time, the pace of progress has more intently looked like a moderate drag than an elusive slant, and the degree of enactment and authorization has contrasted crosswise over nations in various areas. Additionally, Utych (2012) in the investigation of negative full of feeling language in American governmental issues utilizing Affect Infusion Model observed that the utilization of negative language, or

expressions of people have solid responses paying little respect to setting, strategies or legislators included.

Stephen (2017) in the study of hate speech as a threat on Nigerian democracy observed that hate speech in Nigerian politics has been there before and after independence. He further affirmed that some Nigerian politicians used hate speech as a strategy to have advantage over their political opponents during elections and this action has increased electoral violence, political tension and instability. Meanwhile, Adisa et al (2017) in the study of media, politics, and hate speech using CDA observed that during Nigeria's 2015 general election, hate speech was the focal point and the instrument of campaign. They also observed that the parade of hate speeches in several newspapers showed that media was used by politicians to stoke up hatred and stimulate violence among ethnic and political groups during the electioneering periods as well as in the daily life.

Ezeibe (2013) in the descriptive study of hate speech in Nigerian elections observed that hate speeches in Nigeria are mostly credited to political leaders and their ethnic, regional or religious based supporters. He also affirmed that political leaders in Nigeria neglect the provocative tendencies of hate speech so long as it enables them to capture and retain political power. However, the study was not situated within linguistics field. None of the reviewed works did a comparative study on the patterns of hate speeches in Nigeria and USA.

III. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

The framework employed in this study was that of Van Dijk's (2004) Critical Discourse Analysis. The tenets allow us to investigate discursive practices more closely. In this CDA framework model, Van Dijk elaborates ideological strategies among which is the fundamental dichotomy of 'self-positive-representation' and 'other negative representation' stand out. Positive self-representation or in-group favouritism is a semantic macro-strategy used for the purpose of 'face keeping' or 'impression management' (Van Dijk 2004, 17). Negative other-representation is another semantic macro-strategy regarding in-groups and out groups, that is, their division between 'good' and 'bad', superior and inferior, US and THEM. Dijk (2004, 18) CDA model also introduces these two major strategies in the form of an 'ideological square': 'Emphasize *Our* good things', Emphasize *Their* bad things', 'De-emphasize *Our* bad things' and 'De-emphasize *Their* good things'. Besides the general strategies of positive self-presentation and negative self-representation, Dijk (2004) introduces more detailed and subtle ideological discourse structures. However, the study hinges on three selected key terms of the framework for analysis are: *Polarization*: Categorizing people as belonging to US with good attributes and THEM with bad attributes, *Victimization*: Telling bad stories about people who do not belong to US and *Lexicalization*: an overall ideological strategy for negative

other-representation through the Semantic features of words (Dijk, 2004 ,18).

IV. METHODOLOGY

The study selected fourteen hate speeches each from the two countries. The total number of twenty-eight hate speeches posted within 2015 and 2016 campaigns by members of the APC (Buhari), PDP (Jonathan), Democratic Party (Clinton) and Republican Party (Trump) presidential campaign organizations were retrieved for analysis.

The twenty-eight hate speeches were systematically selected and subcategorized based on political association/Ideology, religion, race /ethnicity, Personality/Trust, education, Health, and gender/sexual orientation.

To arrive at the numeric and quantitative elaboration of the speeches, the researchers relied on the content of each hate speech and its classification. Then, the calculation of percentage of the speeches was based on the number of only the selected hate speeches and not the number of hate speeches under a particular country. Thus we have:

Number of selected hate speech per country under a sub categorization / 100

Total number of selected hate speeches x 1

The analysis and discussions of the data formed its basis from the formulae stated above.

V. DATA PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS

One: Hate speeches based on party affiliation and Ideology

(One a) AMEACHI: "vote outJanjaweed ideology" and this "PDpigs" and its "cockroaches"(Vote out PDPigs. www.issuu.com 18/2/2015).

The speaker portrayed members of PDP as people without ideology. The speaker in an attempt to discredit the party lexicalized and polarized *PDP as 'Janjaweed', 'PDpigs' and 'Crockroaches'* with the intention to create a negative representation of the party in the minds of the voters. The description is in line with the ideology of "Negative other-representation". Also, the concept of THEM as shown in the CDA depicts the political platform in bad light and posits the speech as a hate speech act. The features of lexicalization and polarization are evident in (1a).

(One B) Bola Tinubu: "If you are an agent of PDP here and you are sent to disrupt this rally, we will roast you" (APC campaigns in Osogbowww.dailytrust.com.ng1/2/2015)

In one B, the speaker displayed feature of polarization in the speech. He presumed that some PDP members in the midst were likely sent to disrupt the rally. The context and tone of the speech made it a hate speech act. There is a linguistic representation of uncertainty since the speaker failed to provide evidence to support the purported

suspicion. The speech categorized PDP as out group with potentials to create violence.

(One C) Shema: “They are cockroaches, crush and kill anyone on your way” (Shema, urging supporters to “crush”, “kill”.www.premiumtimesng.com 2/2/2015).

The ideological discourse structures of polarization, victimization and lexicalization are evident in the speech. What constitutes hate speech in this context is the manner the speaker described the APC members as pests (cockroaches). In addition, the speaker’s call for APC members to be treated like nocturnal insect aligns with the ideological notion of “Negative Other Representation”.

(One D) Clinton: “...At last night’s forum, Trump disrespected our generals, our country, and women in this military-but he praised Putin ([twitter@realhillaryclinton](https://twitter.com/realhillaryclinton) 8/9/16).

The speaker’s solidarity with generals and women in the military displayed a clear dichotomy of US (Americans) as “good” people and “THEM” (Russians) as bad people. Meanwhile, by mentioning President Vladimir Putin (President of Russia) in the speech is an act of telling bad stories about people who do not belong to US. In doing that, the speaker projected a common shared knowledge of the cold relationship that exists between America and Russia. According to Clinton, Trump emphasized Americans bad things, but de-emphasized President Putin’s bad things. A deep exploration of the ideology argument behind the statement may be seen as a strategy to remind Americans that Trump love enemies of America. It could also be a deliberate attempt by the speaker to project Trump as a bad option for America.

It is observed that the features of hate speeches in Nigeria under this domain were clearly on individual membership of a political party. In the case of the USA, the prominence was given to the contending candidates’ political ideologies rather than their political affiliations.

Two: Hate Speeches Based on Religious Sentiments

(Two A) Trump: “*Islam hates us*”(www.theatlantic.com/trump-muslims-islamophobia-hate-crime.12/9/2016).

In line with the theoretical framework for this study, it is important to evaluate the statement in relation to context, tone and target of the speaker. Trump has seized on American’s fears and anxieties on radical Islamic religion and polarized the whole Islam as a religion that hate American people. The used of collective pronoun ‘us’ clearly shows that both non extremists and American Moslems are also seen as out-group with bad attributes. The speaker’s statement falls under what Van Dijk referred as an ideological strategy of “Negative other-representation” which sees others as ‘bad’.

(two B) Bannon: “*Islam in the most radical religion in the world” and members of the faith had created a fifth column here in the United States*”.(Islam faith is bad .www.bbc.com.. 2/3/2016).

The speaker in two B is widely seen and described by some persons in America as Trump loyalist and anti-Islam or racist. The content of his speech is the litmus test of the allegation of his disdain or hatred for the Islamic religion. The speech emphasized the negative attributes of the Islam as a religion. The way the speaker also described members of the Islamic faith in the negative way fulfilled the discourse structure of *polarization*.

(two C) Priebus: “There are some aspects of Islamic faith that are problematic”. (www.bbc.com. Islam and the world 4/6/2016).

In two C, the speaker’s public condemnation of some aspects of the Islam is a further demonstration of religious differences between American Christians and Moslems. In line with CDA concept of THEM which is evident in two a-c and the speaker’s factoring of Islamic religion with attribute of negative values and faith made the statement a hate speech act.

(two D)Patience Jonathan: “*Our people no dey born shildren wey dis dem no dey fit count*”. (PDP women rally in Calabar /www.vanguardonlinenews.com25/3/2015).

The context and tone of the statement in two d have dualistic purposes. (see detail discussion under example three A).

The division between Christians and Muslims in Nigeria also accommodated regional sentiment. In America, opposing candidates were both Christians; however, the Americans perception of radicalism of Islam as a religion formed a critical subject of discourse during the 2016 presidential campaigns.

Three: Hate speeches based on racism/ ethnicity

(Three A) Patience Jonathan: “*Our people no dey born shildren wey dem no dey fit count*”. (PDP women rally in Calabar www.vanguardonlinenews.com25/3/2015).

In examples two and three (a) , the speaker demonstrated regional and religious sentiments by the use of the phrase ‘our people’ denoting either the Christians or Southern Nigerians. The common shared knowledge is that most of the Northern Moslems married many wives and by extension born many children. The phono-lexicalization of the word “children” as ‘shildren’ defines the regional background of the speaker. The major ideological discourse strategy is that, the speaker “de-emphasized the bad things in the South or among Nigerian Christians, but emphasized the bad things among northern Moslems. The socio -cultural and religious dichotomy between the Southern and Northern Nigerians as reflected in the statement gives the speech the features of both ethnic and religious coloration.

(Three B) Trump: “Our great African-American President hasn’t exactly had a positive impact on the thugs who are so happily and openly destroying Baltimore.” “Sadly, the overwhelming amount of violent crime in our major cities is committed by blacks and Hispanics ...” (donald-trump-quotes .www.marieclaire.co.uk/ -31/7/2016)

In three B, Trump projected the negative behaviourally picture of the African –Americans and Hispanics. The speech reflected feature of racial hate discourse act. The phrase “our great African –American president” has racial coloration. Also, by relating social vices as peculiar attributes of the African-Americans and Hispanics, the speaker fulfilled the discourse structure of polarization and manifests a sense of supremacy. The used of expression “our great African-American President” and then projecting the group as thugs and criminals is a strategy of THEM as bad. He also stated the specific location (Baltimore) for their activities in order to support his claim.

(three C) Trump: “I will build a great wall.I will build a great great wall on our southern border, and I will make Mexico pay for that wall” ...They’re bringing drugs. They’re bringing crime. They’re rapists”.(http://www.marieclaire.co.uk/entertainment/people/donald-trump-quotes- 3//3/2016).

The statements in three C clearly showed the speaker’s purported disdain to some bad activities linked to some Mexicans. The consistent used of the words like: ‘build’, ‘wall’ and the phrases such as: “they are bringing drugs”, “they are bringing crime” and “they are rapist” fall under the ideological strategy of the “negative other representation”. In other words, the statements presented the in-group (Americans) as ‘good’ and the out group (Mexicans) as ‘bad’. The content of hate speech showed the ideological discourse structure of polarization.

Under this domain, the study observed that hate speeches in Nigeria focused more on ethnic inclination while in the case of the USA, the hate speeches were centred on racism. It further revealed that America and Nigeria do not share similar ethno cultural and political histories, therefore their background necessitated the discourse directions.

(2) *Hate speeches based on personality and Trust*

(Four A) Kwankwaso: “President Jonathan is incompetent as Commander in-Chief.(Nigerians are dying/ www.premium.com January 4, 2015)

(Four B) Tinubu: “President Goodluck Jonathan does not understand what it means to govern. He knows nothing about good governance. He’s confused”.(Jonathan is confused, https://www.naij.com .2/3/2015).

(Four C) Jonathan: “Kwankwaso is a political “gambler” who is hallucinating.....”. (Jonathan

replies Kwankwasowww.premiumtimesng.com January 7, 2015).

(Four D) Clinton. We don’t want a puppet as a president” (twitter@realhillaryclinton2/2/2016).

(Four E) Clinton: “Donald is not just unprepared. He is temperamentally unfit to hold an office that requires knowledge, stability and immense responsibility. This is not someone who should ever have the nuclear codes because it’s not hard to image Donald Trump leading us into war(*Donald Trump Temperament /2/2/2026 http://time.com.*)

(Four F) Trump: “H.C just answered e mail differently last night than she had in the past. She is totally confused (twitter@realDonaldTrump 12/7/2016).

The excerpts in four a, b, d, and e centred on the personality questions. While the pattern of hate speeches in four c and f are based on trust and confidence. In examples four a, b,d, and e, the speakers projected out-groups as people without required competence or requisite knowledge. In the case of four A, the speaker portrayed President Jonathan as a weak president, while in four D, the speaker seems presumptive in her statement on the capability of the opponent. In four E, the speaker explicitly presented Trump as someone without a stable psychological state and rightful knowledge expected of a President. The macro semantic implication is that, Jonathan and Trump might be good in other aspects, but certainly not as commander in chiefs /presidents.

In four a, b, c, e and f the speakers were very much direct in mentioning names of the targeted persons. The underpinning ideological strategy of the speaker in four d was designed to present her opponent as one who lacks the strong will and independence to be a president without mentioning the name of the target person. Both speeches emphasized on the bad aspects of their out -groups but de-emphasized *their* good sides. In both hate speeches, we also noticed discourse structure of polarization.

Based on the analysis in this domain, the study observed that the hate speeches in Nigeria centred more on incompetence and lack of focus. While in America, the focus is about exposure, experience, temperament, independence and truthfulness. The analysis also showed that hate speech patterns in the Nigeria and USA have some degree of similarities, since both speakers attacked their opponents by calling individual names except in four D.

Five: Hate speeches based on educational status

(Five A) Kani Kayode:“.....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.... pay for a translator so that they could

understand the proceedings”.(Conduct the debate in the vernacular www.dailypost.ng 12/3/2015).

(Five B). Adeniyi Sulaim: Buhari lacks educational requirement to be Nigeria President

(certificate-saga www.dailypost.ng/2016/05/29/).

(Five C) Trump: “Does anyone know that crooked Hillary who tried so hard, was unable to pass Bar exams in Washington D.C., she was forced to go elsewhere”

(twitter@realDonaldTrump 27/8/2016).

In five a, the speaker deployed a vague expression that requires sound understanding of the context, tone, target of the speech. Based on the theoretical foundation of the Dijk model of CDA, the used of the plural pronoun “they” is ironical, since the speaker target was Buhari not the entire APC members. In the context of the speech, it is clear that the speaker’s strategy is to show the educational deficiency in Buhari. In five B, the speaker sounded blunt in his accusation and violated the maxim of ‘tact’ which borders on the ability of a speaker to be diplomatic rather than being rude in an utterance. This statement suggests a hard fact claim that Buhari is not the right man for the job.

In the case of USA as shown in five C, the speaker pictured his political opponent as one who is not academically sound and deceitful in her conducts. Also, the derivation of the verb ‘Crooked’ from personal name ‘Clinton’ is a clear manifestation of hate act. Indeed, the target of the hate speeches in Nigeria under this domain revealed the candidates’ level of educational attainment thereby possibly manipulating the voters’ sense of judgment. While in America, the speech eludes claim that Clinton is not academically sound/trustworthy and should not be trusted by the electorates. We noticed discourse structure of *Polarization* in (five a-b). Meanwhile in five c, there is an overall ideological strategy for negative other-representation through the lexicalisation of the word ‘crooked’.

Six: Hate speeches based on health status

(six A) Fayose Ayo: “APC presidential candidate was likely to die in office if elected, like the late President, Yar Adua”....?(*enough of state burials* www.punchonline.com 19/1/2015)

(six B) Fayose: “the banana peel being thrown in their path by former President Olusegun Obasanjo.....”. (buhari’s health-status-www.dailytrust.com.ng/daily/news/4/4/2015).

(six C) Fayose: “Buhari, ...has health problems and may soon return Nigeria to the Yar’Adua scenario, if he becomes president.”(Obasanjo-said-without-jonathan-no-nigeriattps://www.thecable.ng).

(six D) Patience Jonathan: “*Old man wey no get brain, him brain don die patapata.*”(PDP women rally in Kogi state accessed

<https://politics.naij.com/395589-dame-jonathan-says-buhari-has-a-brain-dead.html>13/1/2015).

(Six E) Trump: “Crooked Hillary and myself, should release detailed of medical records. I have no problem in doing so! (twitter@realDonaldTrump Aug 28 2016).

In six a and b, the speaker avoided mentioning the personal name of the presidential candidate but APC which invariably described his target. The phrases that made the aforementioned statements in six a-c hate speeches are:

“*the presidential candidate was likely to die*”, “*the banana peel*” and “*Buhari...may soon return Nigeria to the Yar’Adua scenario*”

The statements are hard fact expressions intended to remind Nigerians of Yar Adua’s death as a sitting president to further support the speaker’s claim. Meanwhile, in six C, he mentioned his name and categorically described him as someone that is sick. The pejorative slur “banana peel” is an attack on the dignity of the victim of the hate speech. In six e, the speaker demonstrated that the opponent is not physically fit. The call for medical reports and the lexicalization of her name presents the statement with clear features of hate speech.

Under this domain, it is observed that Nigeria hate speeches were more from party followers while in America they were uttered by individual candidates.

Seven: Hate speeches based on Gender/ Sexual orientation

(seven a) Trump: “Women.....feminine and needy, but inside they are real killers.....”(wild-

donald-trump-quotes.1/1/2016 www.cbsnews.com).

(seven b) Trump: “I think that putting a wife to work is a very dangerous thing,

(www.theguardian.com/world/2016)

(seven c) Kim Campell: “Trump is a sexual predator”(trump-sexual-predator

www.theguardian.com/world/2016/oct/12/)

The speaker described feminine as ‘real killers’. It is arguable that the intention of the speech might be targeted at demeaning his opponent personality or the speaker has no respect for women. This shows the speaker’s different line of thoughts or ideas about women being classified as the weaker sex. The statement in seven b further revealed the speaker’s negative representation of women. Meanwhile, in seven c, the speaker projected Trumps’ negative sexual habit and lewd comments against women as an insult. The description of Trump as a predator presents the speech as a hate act. The focus of the speeches in ‘a’ and ‘b’ were basically on gender discrimination. While in seven c, the focus was on the sexual orientation.

Since Nigeria election was contested by people of the same sex; there was no clear focus on gender or sexual orientation. However, the USA hate speeches dominated this

particular domain because of the fact that the contestants were of opposing sex.

Table 1: Number of selected hate speeches between Political groups in Nigeria and USA

Sub grouping of Hate Speeches	Number of hate speeches in Nigeria		Number of hate speeches in USA		Number hate speech by domain
	APC	PDP	DEMOCRAT	REPUBLICAN	
Party affiliation	2	1	1	NIL	4
Religion	NIL	1	-	3	4
Racism/ Ethnicity	Nil	1	-	2	3
Personality/ Trust	2	1	2	1	6
Education	NIL	2	NIL	1	3
Health	NIL	4	NIL	1	5
Gender/sexual o.	NIL	NIL	2	1	3
Total	4	11	5	9	28

In table 1, APC scored the highest hate speeches under political affiliations and personality/trust. The total number of four hate speeches was recorded by the APC. Meanwhile, PDP scored (11) hate speeches with a marginal lead under religion, ethnicity, education and health. It therefore means that the members of the APC focused more on party differences and personality of their opponents while the pattern of hate speeches by the PDP were more on the

health, religious, ethnic and educational background of their opponents.

In the case of the USA, the Republican Party recorded the highest scores in four sub categorizations of the hate speeches. The Republican obtained a total of nine hate speeches. Meanwhile, the Democratic Party recorded a total of five hate speeches with a focused on personality/trust, gender/sexual orientation and part affiliation.

Table.2: Quantitative Comparison of the selected hate speeches in Nigeria and USA

Sub grouping of Hate speeches	Number of hate speeches in Nigeria		Number of hate speeches in USA	Percentage of the overall number of hate speeches per country	
				NIG	USA
Party/Ideology	3		1	10.8%	3.5%
Religion	1		3	3.5%	10.8%
Racism/ Ethnicity	1		2	3.5%	7.1%
Personality/ Trust	3		3	10.8%	10.8%
Education	2		1	7.1%	3.5%
Health	4		1	14.2%	3.5%
Gender/ sex orient.	NIL		3	0%	10.8%
Total	14		14	50%	50%

The hate speeches in Nigeria recorded 14.2 per cent based on health domain and 10.8% on political affiliation and personality/trust. Meanwhile, there is no record of hate act in the selected speeches that focused on gender/ sexual orientation in Nigeria as shown in table 2.1. In the case of USA, religion, personality/trust and gender/sexual orientations domains scored 10.8 per cent respectively. Comparatively, Nigeria and USA recorded a cumulative total of 50 per cent respectively. This means that an overall relative frequency of the selected campaigns hate speeches showed that both

countries recorded approximately equal hate speeches during their presidential campaigns.

VI. SUMMARY

The results of the analysis showed that what constituted hate speeches in Nigeria and USA. In Nigeria, the narratives of ethnicity formed bases for hate speech while in USA, the focal point of hate discourse was on racism rather than ethnicity. The study ascertained that hate speeches in Nigeria featured more violence than the ones in the United

States of America. Also in America, the hate speeches were found more among the candidates, while in Nigeria, the party leaders or associates of both opposing groups recorded more hate speeches than the candidates.

On the patterns of hate speeches, the study observed that the American hate speeches recorded more on religion, personality and gender/sexual orientation. In Nigeria, the hate speeches centred more health ground, party affiliation and personality/trust.

The study equally observed that hate speeches in the USA differ with the Nigerian patterns based on the social construction and choice of language used. In the USA, despite their political differences, some aspects of the speeches sustained the spirit of national glorification.

The study identified features of hate speeches in USA based were on the use of hate terms/phrases like: 'untrustworthy', 'crooked', 'liar', 'dishonest', 'they are rapist', 'they are drug addicts' and 'confused', 'inexperience' 'sexual predator', 'puppet', 'arrogance', 'unfit', 'unprepared', 'temperament', 'racist', 'rapist', 'untrustworthy' e.tc. In the case of Nigeria, the predominant hate terms uttered were 'Janjaweed ideology', 'PDpigs', 'cockroaches', 'incompetence', 'confused', 'crush', 'kill', 'gambler', 'roast' et.c. Another clear difference is in the choice and variety of language used. Unlike Nigeria, none of the speakers in the USA used Pidgin English to express thought. The major similarity between the pattern of hate speeches in Nigeria and USA is that both campaigns centred more on personal attacks and character assassination rather than critical issues.

VII. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The study compared the patterns of hate speeches uttered in the 2015 and 2016 presidential electioneering campaigns in Nigeria and United States of America. What constitute major focus of such speeches are evaluated in relation with the tenets of CDA. The pattern of hate speeches in Nigeria are more on health, ethnic background, personality/trust and party affiliations. In USA, hate speeches centred more on religion, gender and personality traits. It has been justified in the study that some politicians believed in the power of hate speech to influence the public thoughts, while others deployed it to further showcase their negative perceptions at a set or group of people. The study also observed that, some persons used hate language as an intended instrument for political relevance.

Considering the possible destructive tendencies of hate speech, the study is recommending that politicians should avoid deliberate use of hate speeches and concentrate more on critical issues that can bring about peaceful elections and good governance. Despite regulations or laws against hate speech, freedom of expression should be considered as a vital tool for strong democratic systems.

REFERENCES

- [1]. Anderson, B. (1991). *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*, London, UK: Verso Publishing.
- [2]. Adisa, R, Udende P, Abubakar I and La'aro O, (2017). "Media, Politics, and Hate Speech: A Critical Discourse Analysis". e Academia Journal .6 (1): 23-38.
- [3]. Brown, P and Levinson, S. (1978). "Politeness: some Universals in Language. Cambridge Press.
- [4]. Barbara et al (2009). "Cyber hate: the Globalization of Hate .Information and International Law".180 (2): 14-18.
- [5]. Butler, J.(1997). *Excitable Speech: A Politics of the Performative*, New York: Routledge.
- [6]. Carter R. and Simpson G. (1986). *Language, Discourse and Literature*. Oxford: Oxford Press.
- [7]. Calvert G. (1997). Hate Speech and its Harm: a communication theory perspective. Journal of Communication . 47, (1).
- [8]. Erik B. (2011). *The Rise of Hate Speech and Hate Crime Laws in Liberal Democracies*. Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies.37, (6): 917-934.
- [9]. Ezeibe C. (2015). "Hate speech and Electoral Violence in Nigeria". A paper submitted to the Department of Political Science, University of Nigeria Nsukka.
- [10]. Fairclough, N. & Wodak, R.1997.*Critical discourse analysis*. In: Van Dijk. *Discourse as Social Interaction*. London: Sage.
- [11]. Grice, N. (1975). "*Logic and Conversation*," *Syntax and Semantics*, Vol.3 edited by P. Cole and J. Morgan, London: Academic Press.
- [12]. Gordon P. (1992). *Racist Violence: The Expression of Hate in Europe" in Striking a Balance Hate Speech, Freedom of Expression and Non-Discrimination*, University of Essex. U.K.
- [13]. Hall, S. (1992). "*The West and The Rest: Discourse and Power" in Formations of Modernity* Edited by Stuart Hall, Bram Gieben, 275-333 Oxford, UK: Polite Press and Blackwell.
- [14]. Kayambazinthu, E. and Moyo, F. (2002). *.Hate speech in the new Malawi*, in H. Englund (ed.) *Democracy of Chameleons: Politics and Culture in the New Malawi*. Stockholm:Gotab.
- [15]. Laura, L. (2010). "*Responses to Internet Hate Sites: Is Speech Too Free in Cyberspace?*"www.dx.doi.org(accessed August 20, 2017).
- [16]. Matsuda, J.M., Lawrence, C.R., Delgado R., Crenshaw, K.W. (1993). *Words That Wound: Critical Race Theory, Assaultive Speech, And The FirstAmendment*, Harvard: Westview.
- [17]. Mackinnon A. C. (1996). *Only Words*. Harvard; Harvard University Press.
- [18]. Neisser, E. (1994). "Hate Speech in the New South Africa: Constitutional consideration for a land recovering from decades of rational repression and violence", *South African Journal of Human Rights* (10): 33-356.
- [19]. Nicole A. (2005). *Race Riots on the Beach Criminalising Hate Speech? A Case for*, University of Tasmania. www.britisocrim.org (a accessed December, 2, 2017).
- [20]. Nicle A. (2008). *Race Riots on the Beach A case for Criminalising Hate Speech*. The British Society of Criminology, (8): 50-64.
- [21]. Pêcheux, M. (1982). *Language, Semantics and Ideology*.London: Macmillan.
- [22]. Purdy, J. (2009). *Languages of Politics in America*. In Law and democracy in the Empire of Force (ed.) H. Jefferson Powell and B. White. Michigan. The University of Michigan Press.
- [23]. Rapheal C.A. (2015). *Hate and Racist Speech in the United States: A Critique Philosophy and Public Issues* 5,(3): 77-123.
- [24]. Searle, J. R. (1970). *Speech Acts: An Essay in the Philosophy of Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- [25]. Stephen R. (2017). *A Study of Hate Speech as a Threat on Nigerian Democracy*. Anyangba. Communication Series. Kogi State University.
- [26]. Utych, S.M. (2012). "Negative Affective Language in Politics". Paper presented at the 35th Annual meeting of the International Society of Political Psychology, July 6-9.

- [27]. United Nations (2016). *General Assembly Resolution*. www.un.org (accessed March, 1, 2017).
- [28]. Van Dijk, T.A.(2004). Politics, Ideology and Discourse www.discourse-in-society.org (accessed March, 11, 2017).
- [29]. Wodak, R. and Meyer, M. (2001). *Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis*. London: Sage.
- [30]. William, B.F. (2002). *Hate speech in the Constitutional Law of the United State*. University of Missouri School of Law Scholarship Repository www.scholarship.law.missouri.edu.(accessed June 27, 2016).
- [31]. Zeynep O. (2014). *Introducing Two New Terms into the Literature of Hate Speech: “Hate Discourse” and “Hate Speech Act”*. Speech Studies in the era of Web 2.0. 4 (2): 56-67.
- [32]. Online blog; Vote out PDP. www.issuu.com (accessed December 28 2017) Nigeria editorial; APC campaigns in Osogbo. www.dailytrust.com.ng. (Accessed December 18, 2016).
- [33]. Nigeria Daily Trust editorial; NBC keeps Mum as Hate Campaigns Rule the Airwaves. www.dailytrust.com.ng(accessed March, 11, 2016).
- [34]. Nigeria Premium Editorial. .Kwankwaso Says Jonathan is incompetent.www.premiumtimesng.com(accessed February 2 ,2017).
- [35]. Nigeria Premium Editorial. Jonathan Replies- Kwankwaso Says Governor Low understanding. www.premiumtimesng.com(accessed February 2, 2017).
- [36]. Nigeria Premium Editorial Nigerians are Dying. www.premium.com(accessed February, 2, 2017).
- [37]. Nigeria Daily Post Editorial. Conduct the debate in the vernacular.www.dailypost.ng (accessed February 1, 2016).
- [38]. Naijblog . Jonathan is Confused :Tinubu. www.naij.com. (accessed 4, March 2,1,2017).
- [39]. Trine E. Trump Muslims Islamophobia Hate Crime. www.theatlantic.com.(accessed October 2, 2017).
- [40]. Caire N. Donald Trump Quotes. .www.marieclaire.co.uk (accessed March, 31 2017).
- [41]. Nigeria Punch Editorial. Enough of State Burials.www.punchonline.com (accessed, January, 19, 2017).
- [42]. Claire N.Hillary Clinton/Donald Trump Temperament.www.time.com(accessed February, 3 2017).
- [43]. Nigeria daily Trust Editorial. Nigerians Deserve to Know Buhari’s Health- Status. www.dailytrust.com.ng(accessed Febrauary 2 2017).
- [44]. USA Guardian Editorial. Trump Sexual Life. www.theguardian.com (accessed December, 12 2016).
- [45].

Online editorial sources