

# Linguistic Analysis as a Tool in the Deconstruction of Politically Biased Discourse during Elections: A Sociolinguistic Perspective

Datondji Cocou André

Département d'Anglais, Université d'Abomey-Calavi, République du Bénin

**\*Corresponding Author:** Datondji Cocou André, Département d'Anglais, Université d'Abomey-Calavi, République du Bénin

**Abstract:** *The current study examines the importance of language in preserving and enhancing the development levers in a country. It highlights the social reality, the meaning encoding power and sociocultural features of language. It sheds light as well on the critical role of language when a group of people passes through some particularly decisive events in their history that could result into social unease because of language misuse. Language is not a neutral instrument. It is a thousand ways biased, meaning oriented, tagged in a way as to serve a specific goal. The eclectic approach to this article paves the way to the use of linguistic analysis tools from semantics, pragmatics, systemic functional linguistics and discourse historical approach backgrounds. These theoretical frameworks set the gear to dig deep into the most often underestimated share that language definitely holds in nations' sustainable development process. The findings are forceful to disclose the very constituents at word, clause, and paragraph levels that embed the hate elements in the selected corpus of political hate discourse. The research also brings in a contribution in terms of recommendation to political leaders in particular and society in general for an increased awareness of the very sensitive aspect of biased language especially when uttered by political leaders. Undoubtedly then, language is not just as a means of communication, but rather a critical asset and invaluable input for an effective achievement of sustainable development.*

**Keywords:** *Linguistic analysis tools, sustainable development, political discourse, sociolinguistics*

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Social life in its various aspects has much to do with language, most importantly in the way it is used by speakers from all social strata to convey familiar information, to express power or resist it, to legislate, to recognize or deny precedence. Language thus appears so much graded above the commonly asserted function of a mere tool for communication. Undeniably, language serves a social purpose, which entails that any theory of linguistics must incorporate the functions of language in use (Halliday, 2004). Language thus matters more by what it is structured to mean than by its surface level form. In public affairs management, political discourse plays a tremendous role, with language as the major raw material, which may be particularly sensitive and hard to manage in times of political rendezvous such as elections. Chilton and Schaffner (1999) cited by Al-Faki (2014) identify political discourse as any discourse whose linguistic or other actions involve power or its inverse, resistance. Wilson (1990) provides more insight by identifying political discourse as language used in formal and informal political context with political actors, such as politicians, political institutions, government, political media and political supporters operating in political environments with political goals. Most political activities are carried out through language (Waya & Ogechukwu, 2013, p.17). Indeed, this is more conspicuous in modern times when elections are a condition for access to power. The basic and ultimate function of language is to convey meaning. Whenever a speaker takes the floor, there is always a choice to make in line with the intended goal to achieve and this is the turning point where the linguistic analyst's attention sets the gaze on the political discourses, much less for what is said than for how it is loaded and uttered. In actual fact, discourse is not a neutral representation of the world (Van Dijk 1988, 1992, 1995; Fairclough 1995a, 1995b; Fowler 1987 quoted in Al-Faki, 2014, p. 1). Al-Faki (2014) makes the point rather forthright as he posits that politicians make choices at different levels of discourse in order to

represent events in a way that fits with their ideology, thus siding with Butt et al. (2004) in their claim that the very use of language is ideological. Accordingly, the choice one makes among different alternatives matters. While remaining within the milestone frameworks of language as a social semiotics (Crystal, 1983) [the representation of abstract meaning in forms of legible signs], language as social construct (Dor, 2015) [language best viewed through a social lens], Halliday, M. A. K. & Matthiessen, C.I.M. (2004) shed forceful lights on the systemic aspect of language wherein choices are constantly made from what he calls 'deep paradigms', to best suit various meta functions as the social man undertakes to convey his/her message.

In addition to this and taking from Austin's speech act theory grounded on the analysis of the relationship between the utterance and the ensuing performance, one automatically calls in the necessity to question the subsequent felicity conditions. Among such conditions that must be fulfilled for a speech act to be satisfactorily performed or realized, the preparatory condition ranks high in this work as it covers the appropriateness of the speaker's authority and the circumstance of the speech act that determine its performance. In other words, the more the audience trust and accept the authority of a political leader, the more likely will they be to promptly act or react in line with his/her instructions. In a corroborative trend, Elliott et al. (2016) put the stress on both the status of the speaker and the prevailing circumstances as they indicate that more specifically, analysis of the political and socio-economic context in which the speech act occurs and consideration of the nature of the speaker and audience – including their impact and transmission should be allotted utmost importance specially in the case of hate speech. This saying from Elliott et al. (idem) is instrumental enough in this paper as politically biased discourse is specifically considered in the hate discourse aspect. Taking into account these various aspects of language use for political purpose, this work aims to bring some tentative answers to a general question such as this: How can linguistic analysis be instrumental in the deconstruction of politically biased discourse? For a methodical approach to this question, it has been broken into two sub-questions as follows: 1a) how can linguistic analysis best help unveil and examine instances of politically biased discourse? 1b) how can such analysis contribute in the deconstruction of politically biased discourse within a sociolinguistic framework?

The general objective of this study is to bring to the spotlight the critical importance of language in political discourse and most significantly on the influence political leaders' discourse can have on the population because of the way they use language. To reach this general goal, this research work undertakes to achieve the following specific goals:<sup>1</sup>Select some political discourse excerpts containing hate language, <sup>2</sup>identify and label the linguistic constituents embedding the hate elements, <sup>3</sup>use the selected linguistic tools to analyse those linguistic constituents so as to unveil the hate aspects, <sup>4</sup>undertake the subsequent linguistic discussion and interpretation aimed at their deconstruction. Specifying the theories that apply for the analytical purpose then deserves full attention.

## **2. THEORETICAL BACKGROUND**

This research work builds on a series of theoretical foundations that have been instrumental for various purposes. They corroborate its relevance, the inevitably context-based feature of language together with the linguistically swollen negative meaning some specific discourse can take in the mouth of political leaders during electoral periods. In addition, such theoretical backdrops show the role Discourse Historical Approach in deconstructing them. First, in the frame of his seminal work on Systemic Functional Linguistics (sfl), Halliday (1976) put a stress on the functional and choice patterns of language use in so far as people always speak to mean something specific and they do so by selecting from a bunch of possibilities. After all, as indicated by Halliday & Matthiessen, (2004) quoted by Fontaine (2013), language is primarily used for social communication. As a consequence, the internal organization of language is not arbitrary but embodies a positive reflection of the functions that language has evolved to serve in the life of the social man. Within the conceptual aspect of the sfl framework, the analysis of political discourse through the lenses of experiential and interpersonal metafunctions have been helpful in showing up some hate sequences in political speech. Secondly, the higher the authority vested in a political leader, the larger the impact [positive or negative] of the words he/she pronounces in the framing of public opinion and the ensuing reactions [constructive or destructive]. This aspect of language use falls in the frame of Austin's (1962) works

on speech act theory and most particularly on the illocutionary force indicating devices, the appropriateness of participants in the specific case of this work, within the felicity conditions. Thirdly, the very nature of the political matter and the propensity of political leaders to be versatile make it necessary to resort to Discourse Historical Approach (henceforth DHA) as a theoretical ground for an efficient grasp, scrutiny and interpretation of hate language embedded in political declarations. The perspective in which texts [written and oral] are viewed as sites of social and power struggle (Reisigl & Wodak, 2017), the focus that DHA lays on ideology in language and critical view about power, the problem solving perspective mandate together with the appeal that it makes to the linguist's personal viewpoint are some of the aspects that testify to its relevance in this work. More specifically, DHA operates through some typical questions such as these:<sup>1</sup>How are persons, objects, phenomena/events, processes and actions named and referred to linguistically?<sup>2</sup>What characteristics, qualities and features are attributed to social actors, objects, phenomena/events and processes?<sup>3</sup>What arguments are employed in the discourse in question?<sup>4</sup>From what perspective are these nominations, attributions and arguments expressed?<sup>5</sup>Are the respective utterances articulated overtly; are they intensified or mitigated? These theoretical frameworks have been applied to a selected linguistic material along a scientific method.

### **3. MATERIAL AND METHOD**

This research is a corpus linguistics work based on a collection of samples from real life linguistic productions. It views politically biased discourse in the specific sense of hate discourse as used by political leaders during electoral campaigns. Indeed, hate speech is defined as a bias-motivated, hostile, malicious speech aimed at a person or a group of people because of some of their actual or perceived characteristics. In the frame of this research work, such hate speeches have been selected from Ezeibe's (<https://www.inecnigeria.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/02/Conference-Paper-by-Christian-Ezeibe.pdf>) article entitled *Hate Speech and Electoral Violence in Nigeria*. The selected extracts of hate speeches that were published in the Nigerian media are referenced with their authors, and the publication specifications. The subsequent step has been the analysis of these portions of speech with linguistic tools such Semantics, Pragmatics, Discourse Historical Approach and Systemic Functional Linguistics. The ensuing discussion of the findings has been instrumental in the explanation of their meanings, their interpretation and the inference of the significance of this work. Taking into account the specific goal of this article, which is the contribution of linguistic analysis to peace construction for sustainable development, some recommendations have been made in this regard to society at large and to political leaders in particular. The following section is that of the linguistic analysis through the aforementioned theories.

### **4. ANALYTICAL APPROACH TO SOME SELECTED EXTRACTS OF POLITICAL HATE SPEECHES**

In this part of the work, some political speeches that were uttered during electoral campaigns in Nigeria have been critically examined and analyzed. The aim in so doing is to linguistically locate, unveil, and investigate why they should be labeled as instances of biased/hate speech. The linguistic analysis implemented here is an eclectic one. Actually, the said analysis takes from the abovementioned theoretical frameworks to unveil the specific parts of the selected corpus where the biased/hate aspects have been identified. This part of the work then successively flowsthrough the fourfold bunch made up of a<sup>1</sup>semantic scrutiny, a<sup>2</sup>pragmatic analysis, a<sup>3</sup>systemic functional investigation and a<sup>4</sup>discourse historical approach perspective.

On the semantic lens, political discourse during electoral periods displays a negatively discriminative use of the pronoun "We" that creates a "we-group" always featured under a bright day that is semantically, socially and politically opposed to "the others-group" featured under a bad light. The latterare subsequently viewed as unfitted to win any credit and trust from the "we-group" members for public governance. Beyond the semantic level, the intended meaning of words and the social status of those using them matter as of the subsequent outcomes. Disclosing such important aspects of language through pragmatic analysis thus becomes contributory.

The preparatory condition on the speech act strand links the appropriateness of the perlocutionary act to the validity of the speaker making the locutionary act and that of the context wherein the utterance is made. On the part of the context, the selected chunks of texts of the corpus are public declarations made during electoral campaigns in Nigeria. This allows saying that these are not meant for drama or joke plays.

**Table1.** Preparatory condition analysis in political discourse

<b>Authorities involved</b>	<b>pragmatic comments on the prospective impact of their utterances</b>
Wife of former President	Her words are much likely to be regarded as those of the former President and granted high credit.
Presidential Candidate	Supporters nationwide will receive his words as instructions
Governor	People under his governorship may give heed to his utterances
Minister	His words will likely be considered as the whole government’s official position
AnIslamiccleric	Religious followers are known from various records to act on their leaders’ words in an unquestionable way.
The leader of the Niger Delta Peoples	His voice may be heeded as that of an important socioeconomic and political pressure group that matters
Northern Elder	African societies still grant credit to their elders
U.S based Nigerian Doctor	His voice is likely to be heeded as that of the diaspora
National Coordinator of the Coalition of Northern Politicians	His voice may be heeded as that of an important sociopolitical pressure group that matters

The above table with the attempt of utterance impact appraisal shows that the preparatory condition is fully satisfied for the various audiences to have no doubt about the credibility of the messages and the intended overt or hidden perlocutionary act. The sociolinguistic backdrop of this work is still present here as the supporters of these authorities will all be likely to side with their leaders and probably step into actions or reactions that align with their sayings. The discourse historical approach (DHA) to this work offers an opportunity to bring about more insight.

From the DHA perspective, language is not powerful on its own – it is a means to gain and maintain power by the use powerful people make of it (Wodak, 2015). This explains why the DHA critically analyses the language use of those in power, who have the means and opportunities to improve conditions. Indeed, all the speakers who have been singled out in the corpus are in various religious, moral, social, political, socioeconomic positions, which means that their sayings matter much. In order to allow a methodical review and analysis of their discursive practices, discourse historical approach offers a five-process grid that has been implemented in the following table which is made up of the typical questions and the author’s analysis.

**Table2.** DHA analysis in political discourse

	<b>DHA Typical Analysis Questions</b>	<b>Selected Corpus Based Responses</b>
1	How are persons, objects, phenomena/events, processes and actions named and referred to linguistically?	The dog and the baboon, people that give birth to uncountable children, children that are dumped in streets, that short man, the enemies of the north
2	What characteristics, qualities and features are attributed to social actors, objects, phenomena/events and processes?	people that must meet at the battlefield, parasites and beggars people who are unlettered, uncouth, uncultured, unrestrained and crude, person with dead brain
3	What arguments are employed in the discourse in question?	Geographical locations membership arguments Social group membership arguments Religious membership arguments Political membership arguments
4	From what perspective are these nominations, attributions and arguments expressed?	Unfriendly and violence minded (people to be slaughtered, people to be stoned)
5	Are the respective utterances articulated overtly; are they intensified or mitigated?	Overtly and intensified (people that must meet at the battlefield, people to be slaughtered, people to be stoned)

The analysis of the selected corpus within the systemic functional lens is instrumental enough in the uncovering of the way hate aspects are inserted into political leaders’ speeches, especially during electoral campaigns. Indeed, through its three strands of meaning (ideational, interpersonal, textual)

sfl provides the lexico-grammatical means whereby situations around and inside us are depicted, represented as a casting of a flow of events in a unique way. This flow of events is chunked into quanta of change by the grammar of the clause: each quantum of change is modelled as a figure – a figure of happening, doing, sensing, saying, being or having (Halliday & Matthiessen, 1999). In the specific case of this work, the material and relational processes of the experiential strand of meaning have been more useful for linguistic analysis aimed at uncovering and deconstructing hate speech in political discourse.

As far as material processes are concerned, among other features that characterize this political speech, a close examination of the Doer-Participants in the first ranking material processes as presented in table n°3 allows a twofold inference. First, the extra linguistic reference use of the pronouns “what” and “something” takes ground on a shared past political events and context whereby the political leaders taking the floor during electoral campaigns operate rhetorical manipulation on their audience to win their support. The same extra linguistic reference to past electoral turmoil and conflict situations is construed through Circumstantials such as “in 2011”, “in 2015”, “in blood”, “a very disgraceful way”, “at the battlefield”, “in street”. Campaigning political leaders’ communicative method remains stigmatizing through the verbal creation of antagonistic groups through the use of Actors such as “they”, “the people”, “the dog and the baboon” while referring to political opponents and the use of doers such as “our people”, “our men”, “we” for their supporters.

**Table3.** *Material clauses analysis*

N	Actor	Process	Goal	circumstance
	GoodluckJonathan	wins	the PDP’s endorsement (tocontestthe 2011 presidentialelection)	-
	Something	will happen	-	
	What	Happened	-	in 2011
	-	Happened again	-	in 2015
	The dog and the baboon	Would all be soaked	-	in blood
	They	conduct	afreeand fairelection	
	They	go	-	a very disgraceful way
	What	Happened	-	1985
	What you	Did not do	-	in 1985
	old age	Has caught up	-	-
	You	Cannot change	-	-
	Our people	Do not give birth	To uncountable children	-
	Our men	Don’t give birth	To children	-
	That they	Dump	-	in streets
	We	Are going to meet	-	at the battlefield
	He who	Pays	The piper	-
	We	Are feeding	Them	-
	God	Takes	His life	-
	We	Gave	Him (power)	-
	The people	That killed	Igbo	-

‘Relational’ clauses serve to characterize and to identify participants (Halliday & Matthiessen, 1999). Relational processes relate two participating entities in a more abstract way (Fontaine, 2015). This makes them particularly important to scrutinize in this specific work that sets its core and major concern on how people view each other. A proofread of the identified relational process clauses provides insightful hints at this regard. The way political leaders relate to each other is discriminating, downgrading and stigmatizing, with absolutely no case of fair and friendly reciprocal appraisal.



**Table4.** *Relational clauses analysis*

<b>Identified</b>	<b>Process</b>	<b>Identifier</b>	<b>Process Connotation</b>
It	Must be	A Northern erorno Nigerian	discriminative
you	Will turn back to	a baby	downgrading
we	Are not	Like the people from that part of the country	discriminating
Your brain	is	Dead	downgrading
2015	Is	more than do-or-die	-
Money and the acquisition of wealth	Is	their sole objective and purpose in life	stigmatizing

**5. DISCUSSION OF THE FINDINGS**

This section of the paper essentially focuses on the interpretation of the above mentioned results and the description of their significance together with the explanation of the insights thereby generated. This research work started with the aim of examining the contribution of linguistic analysis in the deconstruction of politically biased discourse during election within a sociolinguistic framework. The eclectic approach implemented led into a successive use of theoretical backdrops such as semantics, pragmatics, systemic functional linguistics and discourse historical approach.

**Table5.** *Summary of findings.*

<b>Implemented theoretical framework</b>	<b>A gist of the findings</b>
Semantics	Rhetorical creation of a “we-group” made up of each political leader and their supporters with a discriminating discourse toward the “others-groups” composed of opposing leaders and their followers. Support is brought to each antagonistic side by leaders from religious and socioeconomic backgrounds.
Pragmatics	The preparatory condition is fully satisfied, which means that those whose portions of speech were selected are all in leadership positions and all meant what they said within actual contexts of political campaigns.
Discourse Historical Approach	The application of a five-step process questions revealed the presence of clear cut rhetorical strategies made of unfriendly metaphorical references to political opponents, conflict oriented references to some past clash events, reciprocal stigmatization of people from various geographical and social backgrounds.
Systemic functional linguistics	The identification of material and relational clauses confirmed the presence of hate discourse

These findings in themselves bring about an answer to question 1a on the unveiling and analysis of political hate speech during election periods. The four levels of analysis show the specific linguistic means whereby political discourse can mislead supporters on various sides into actions that are likely to jeopardize social peace and development. Important enough to mention in this section is the link between the levels of authority of the leaders and the proportions of peace threat that can be engendered locally or nationwide. At this point lies the very significance of this study which is to shed light on the peace and development threatening rhetorical practices of the very authorities who overtly declare their willingness and eagerness to promote better conditions for their citizens. The linguistic creation of the “we-group” and the “others-group” per se may be acceptable as a fair playground for political competition. However, this researcher deems the knob to have been hard pushed when speeches rank up to real speech violence with the use of some metaphors (the dog and the baboon), the negative reference to people belonging to some social and geographical backgrounds, the use of overt violence terms (to soak in blood, to meet at the battlefield). Once these aspects are pinpointed, their deconstruction, which is the core point of sub-question 1b, comes up with the disapproving of such hate speeches in order to raise awareness both from political leaders, and from society at large as well.

One other important aspect that was the least expected in this research work in the overtness of the hate declarations made by well-known upper rank leaders inside and outside the political arena, with reference to specific social classes, individual people and peculiar geographical parts of the country.

This came as an additional justification of the significance of this work in so far as it highlights the drawback such utterances may engender. This leads to wonder whether there is a real awareness of the possible impact of the hate speeches. A study aimed at investigating political leaders' on the possible consequences of their words may help scrutinize this aspect.

## **6. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

This paper started off with the aim of using linguistic analysis tools in the deconstruction of politically biased discourse during electoral periods for peace and development preservation. It thus assumed the critical importance of language and the necessity to rather view it not just as a means of communication but as an actual and active contributor in political discourse. Politically biased discourse has been semantically restricted in this work to the specific construct of hate speech. The eclectic approach adopted along this work permitted the use of a broadband linguistic collection of four theoretical grounds: semantics, pragmatics, discourse historical approach and systemic functional linguistics. The mapping of the analytical basics of these frameworks did good enough in uprooting some very outstanding instances of hate speech used by political, religious and other leaders in the form of rhetorical manipulative discourse. On the semantic level, the creation of a “we-group” and the “others-group” showed up as peace breaking and violence instigating. On the pragmatic ladder, the high rank of the authorities and real context of election campaigns provided the proof that everyone meant what they said. The discourse historical approach brought in a confirmation as of the use of downgrading and discriminating metaphors to designate people, events and areas. The conclusive analysis step within the sfl frame through transitivity examination depicted how the inner and outer worlds were represented in a negative and peace breaking ways. These results together with their explanation and interpretation make it worthy to bring in some recommendations. In order to achieve a real awareness on the importance and sensitive feature of language use in daily dealings in general and in political discourse in particular, it would be useful for language experts to be put to contribution to better show the link between language, peace and violence.

## **REFERENCES**

- Al-Faki, I. M. (2014).** Political Speeches of Some African Leaders from Linguistic Perspective (1981-2013) in International Journal of Humanities and Social Science Vol. 4 No. 3; February 2014:(pp.180 -198)
- Austin, J.L. (1962).** *How to do Things with Words*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Chilton, P. & Schaffner, C. (1999).** *Politics as Text and Talk, Analytic Approaches to political discourse*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company
- Crystal, D. (1985).** *A Dictionary of Linguistics and Phonetics*. Great Britain: T.J. Press. Ltd.
- Dor, D. (2015).** *The Instruction of Imagination: Language as a Social Communication Technology*. Oxford: Oxford University Press
- Elliott, C., Chuma, W., Gendi, Y.E., Marko, D., & A. Patel (2016).** Hate Speech: Key concept paper. WP Coordination: University of Leeds/Katrin Voltmer
- Fairclough, N. (1995a).** *Media Discourse*. London: Edward Arnold.
- Fowler, R. and Marshall, J. (1985).** Power . In T. van Dijk (ed.), *Handbook of Discourse Analysis* . London: Academic Press , 47 63.
- Fowler, R. (1987).** *A Dictionary of Modern Critical Terms*. London: Routledge
- Halliday, M. A. K., & Hasan, R. (1976).** *Cohesion in English*. London: Longman Group.
- Halliday, M. A. K., & Hasan, R. (1985/1989).** *Language, Context, and Text: Aspects of Language in a Social-semiotic Perspective*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Halliday, M. A. K., (2013)** Meaning as choice. In *Fontaine, L. & Bartlett, T. & O'Grady, G* (Eds.) *Systemic Functional Linguistics: Exploring Choice*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- Halliday, M. A. K. & Matthiessen, C.I.M. (2004).** *An Introduction to Functional Grammar*. London: Hodder Headline Group.
- Halliday, M.A.K. & Matthiessen, M.I.M. (2014).** *Halliday's Introduction to Functional Grammar*. Fourth Edition. USA and Canada :Routledge
- Hasan, R. (1985/1989).** *Linguistics, Language and Verbal Art*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Hasan, R. (1996).** *Ways of Saying, Ways of Meaning: Selected papers of Ruqaiya Hasan*. (eds. C. Cloran, D. Butt and G. Williams) London: Cassell. Halliday,

**Fontaine, L. (2013).** *Analysing English Grammar: A Systemic Functional Introduction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

**Reisigl, M. & Wodak, R (2017).** The Discourse-Historical Approach (DHA) The Discourse-Historical Approach (DHA). In R. Wodak & M. Meyer (eds.), *Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis Second Edition* (pp.87-121).India Pvt Ltd New Delhi: SAGE Publications.

**Van Dijk, T. A. (1988).***News as Discourse*. United States of America (Michigan): L. Erlbaum Associates

**Waye D.T, Ogechukwu M. (2013).** A Pragmatic Analysis of Victory and Inaugural Speeches of President Jonathan: a Measure for Transformation and Good Governance in Nigeria. *Innovare Journal of Social Sciences.*; 1(2)

**Wilson, J. (1990)** *Politically Speaking*. Oxford: Blackwell .

**Wodak, R. (2015a).** Critical Discourse Analysis, Discourse-Historical Approach. The International Encyclopedia of Language and Social Interaction, 1-14. <https://www.inecnigeria.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/02/Conference-Paper-by-Christian-Ezeibe.pdf>: *Hate Speech and Electoral Violence in Nigeria*. Retrieved March 2020

**APPENDIX: HATE SPEECHES IN NORTHERN NIGERIA, 2010-2015**

S/n	Year	Hate speaker	Hate speech	Sources
1	2010	National Coordinator of the Coalition of Northern Politicians, Dr. Junaidu Mohammed	It must be a Northern erorno Nigeria... If Good luck Jonathan wins the PDP's endorsement to contest the 2011 presidential election, there would be violence.	Interview with Guardian Newspaper, 2 <sup>nd</sup> November, 2010
2	2011	Presidential Candidate of Congress for Progressive Change, General Muhammadu Buhari	God willing, by2015, something will happen. They either conduct a free and fair election or they go a very disgraceful way. If what happened in 2011 should again happen in 2015, by the grace of God, the dog and the baboon would all be soaked in blood	Reported by Lika Binniyatin Vanguard Newspaper on May15 <sup>th</sup> , 2012
3	2015	Dr. Abraham Ariyo, U.S based Nigerian Doctor	You see how they (Igbos) are being slaughtered in South Africa. That is what is going to happen to them in Lagos... When are they (Igbos) going to be slaughtered in Abuja? We will continue to bus them to Onitsha	Facebook page of Dr. Ariyo, Reported in Quick News Africa, April20, 2015.
4	2015	The Governor of Ekiti State, Peter Ayodele Fayose	Buhari would likely die in office if elected, recall that Murtala Muhammed, Sani Abachaand UmaruYar "Adua, all former heads of state from the North West like Buhari, had died in office	January 19, 2015, This Day and other national dailies
5	2015	Wife of former President, Patience Jonathan	Any body that come and tell you changes, stone that person...What you did not do in 1985, isit now that old age has caught up with you that you want to come and change...You cannot change rather you will turn back to a baby	The Complete Works of Patience Jonathan, The Nation on Sunday, 15 <sup>th</sup> March
6		Wife of former President, Patience Jonathan	Our people do not give birth to uncountable children. Our men don't give birth to children that they dump in streets. We are not like people from that part of the country(apparently the northern Nigeria)	Presidential campaign in Calabar, The Nation, March 10, 2015



**Linguistic Analysis as a Tool in the Deconstruction of Politically Biased Discourse during Elections: A Sociolinguistic Perspective**

7	2015	Wife of former President, Patience Jonathan	<i>Wetin him deyfind again? Him dey drag with him pikin mate, oldman weyno get brain, him brain don die patapata-What is Buhari looking for? Old man that does not know his age. Your brain is dead.</i>	At a PDP rally in Kogi state, Reported by <i>The Express New</i> , 4 March, 2014
8	2014	Alhaji Mujahid Dokubo-Asari	2015 is more than do-or-die. You are a manandIamaman, we are going to meet at the battlefield	News Express 3 <sup>rd</sup> May, 2014
9	2014	Alhaji Mujahid Dokubo-Asari	If they contest (Northerners) they are wasting their time. He who pays the piper will dictate the tune. We own them. We are feeding them. They are parasites. A beggar has no choice...They are beggars and parasites	<a href="http://www.vanguardngr.com/2014/12/north-ungrateful-parasites-asari-dokubo">http://www.vanguardngr.com/2014/12/north-ungrateful-parasites-asari-dokubo</a> ).
10	2013	FemiFani-Kayode, aformer Aviation Minister	The Igbos are collectively unlettered, uncouth, uncultured, unrestrained and crude in all their ways...Money and the acquisition of wealth is their sole objective and purpose in life	Daily Post, August 8, 2013
11	2013	The leader of the Niger Delta Peoples Salvation Force (NDPSF), Alhaji MujahidDokubo-Asari	There will be no peace, not only in the Niger Delta, but every where if Good luck Jonathan is not president by 2015,except God takes his life, which we do not pray for	Vanguard Newspapers, May 5, 2013
12	2013	Chief Arthur Eze PDP Chieftain	That short man called Ngige, we gave him power and he joined the Awolowo people; the people that killed Igbos	Premium Times, November13, 2013
13	2014	An Islamic cleric, Ima Sadiq	Muslims,vote for Buhari. It is as into support anon-Muslim	Twitter handle, Saturday, 27 <sup>th</sup> December, 2014
14	2014	Northern Elder Forum	Those who vote for JonathanandthePDPin2015willbe considered an enemy of the north	<i>Vanguard</i> , 15 October 2014.
15	2014	Governor Shema Ibrahim of Kastina State	You should not be bordered with cockroaches of politics. Cockroaches are only found in the toilet even at homes, If you see cockroach in your house, Crush them	Reported byPremium Timeson19 <sup>th</sup> November,2014

**Citation:** Datondji Cocou André. "Linguistic Analysis as a Tool in the Deconstruction of Politically Biased Discourse during Elections: A Sociolinguistic Perspective " *International Journal of Humanities Social Sciences and Education (IJHSSE)*, vol 10, no. 1, 2023, pp. 113-121. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.20431/2349-0381.1001015>.

**Copyright:** © 2023 Authors. This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License, which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original author and source are credited.