

# Dysphemism Strategies in President Buhari's Arise TV Interview

Ephraim A. Chukwu, PhD.<sup>1,\*</sup>, Lucky Amarachukwu Onebunne<sup>1,2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Department of English Language and Literature, Faculty of Arts, Nnamdi Azikiwe University, Awka 420007, Nigeria

<sup>2</sup>Department of English Language and Literature, Faculty of Arts, Nnamdi Azikiwe University, Awka 420007, Nigeria

Received: 20.10.2023 • Accepted: 19.12.2023 • Published: 29.12.2023 • Final Version: 30.12.2023

**Abstract:** This paper is an attempt to check the use of dysphemism in Political Discourse. It featured the functions and aim of dysphemism, and the role it plays in enabling political actors to hide under utterance to attack face of others. It tries to give reasons for the use of dysphemism as an impoliteness strategy that tends to be direct in effect. For the purpose of answering the research questions, President Buhari's Arise TV interview of 10th July, 2021 was analyzed using Culpeper's impoliteness strategies to identifying the use of dysphemism, its types and functions. The outcome of the analyses showed that dysphemism as used in Political Discourse is geared towards damaging tendencies as politicians attack the face of their opponents, diminish the target while maintaining and sustaining their 'benefits', and lastly, justify their action and reinforce their influence in social interactions.

**Keywords:** dysphemism, taboo, impoliteness, political discourse, pragmatics.

## Introduction

Language, which connects interlocutors in an active interaction, is an inherent part of human life. Through its use, interlocutors express their thoughts, feelings and emotions (Olimat, 2018; 2019a; 2019b). So, as people communicate, they are expected to adhere to cultural norms which portray them to be competent speakers. Lakoff (1989:116) supported this by prescribing two fundamental rules of pragmatic competence: "be clear and be polite". This means it is ideally for speakers to fulfill both requirements; unfortunately, there seems to be a conflict in the rules. This is because we cannot separate politeness from the culture involved.

Another conflict could arise from the fact that in the utterance of a discourse, a person usually determines the choice of words he or she will use. Discourse itself being a set of sentences or harmonious utterances that connect proportions, one sentence to another, and refer to a specific goal (Bahri, 2009). It is what makes discourse to be closely connected to the term dysphemism (and euphemism as the case may be). Dysphemism (which is an upsetting expression about a thing or someone of both) according to Allan and Burridge, is a word or phrase with a painful or disturbing connotation for someone being spoken to and the person speaking and listening to the conversation

\* Corresponding Author: [ea.chukwu@unizik.edu.ng](mailto:ea.chukwu@unizik.edu.ng), [la.onebunne@unizik.edu.ng](mailto:la.onebunne@unizik.edu.ng)

(qtd. in Laili, 2012). They also added that it has a semantic connotation chosen by the speaker to show his negative judgment on a thing or someone so that negative subtlety appears (in Heryana, 2019). Probably, this accounts for why most uses of dysphemism are seen in propaganda and opposition discourses.

If we take a critical look at propaganda and opposition discourses (mostly found in Political Discourse), political texts and speeches are unparalleled stylistic category of human communication since the comprise of players and participators that use language for manipulation, compulsion and exerting power domination and control over others (Opeibi, 2005; Van Dijk, 1993). This is supported by Jones and Peccei (2004:36) who defined politics as “power; and to secure power, it makes sense to persuade everyone that what one wants is what they want”. So, political players usually enact their individual (or collective) ideological needs with the view to create and make the people accept what they say to be ‘common sense’ and thus, establish their prevalent ideologies (Ayoola, 2015). This is because language for political players is not only used to convey important information about the running of government, but is also used in the political process with specific discourse themes to achieve individual goals (Vedung, 1982; Bahri, 2009).

This paper seeks to investigate dysphemism expressions from President Buhari’s Arise TV interview in order to identify how he disguises himself behind utterances in order to cause the targets ‘face loss’ or what the target identifies to be so. It also seeks to identify the various types of dysphemistic strategies and their functions as used in the interview.

### **Statement of the Problem**

Studies have been dedicated in showing the use of euphemism expressions by politicians to indirectly call out things that are termed sensitive or unpleasant (Lakoff and Johnson, 1980; Neaman and Silver, 1983). But often times, there could be violation (probably because being euphemistic or ‘polite’ is culturally bound, and hence, what could be accepted in one social interaction could lead to degeneration and social disharmony in another. Yet, in political discourse, politicians employ words with intents and motives that are beneficial to them. These words could be abusive, threatening, bullying, and so on, but in a disguised manner (because it is prohibited). How are they able to hide or disguise themselves behind utterances in order to cause targets ‘face loss’ or what the targets thought to be so? This disguise does it has types and what do they aim to achieve?

### **Purpose of the Study**

The purpose of this study is to investigate dysphemistic expressions from President Buhari’s Arise TV interview in order to know the purposes behind the common use in Political Discourse, and how politicians resort to this strategy as a way of hiding behind utterances to in order to cause the addressee’s ‘face loss’ or what the addressees thought it to be. It seeks to investigate the possible types of this kind of disguise and their function.

### **Significance of the Study**

This study is significant because it shows the connection between figurative language and political discourse, and how politicians revert to the use of Dysphemism as ‘make up’ in order to set off the

targets 'face off' or what the target identifies to be so. This has a major effect as it will promote dysphemism as political strategy in a pragmatic light.

### **The Scope and Limitation of the Study**

This research work is limited to President Buhari's Arise TV Interview on 10th June, 2021. The rationale for choosing it was based on the President's infrequent communication to the people. His speeches were avoided because the researcher felt this interview would give a human face to his administration.

### **Research Questions**

1. To what degree do politicians disguise themselves behind utterances in order to cause targets 'face loss' or what the target thought to be so?
2. What are the frequent types of dysphemism strategies used by politicians?
3. What are the functions of these dysphemistic strategies in Political Discourse?

### **Defining Dysphemism**

Dysphemism (word coarsening) is a change in the visible structure of meaning in a language (Kafi, 2020), of which the change is to house socio-cultural and technological development among a social group (Meilasari, 2016).

Lexically, dysphemism hints on indicating disrespect, degrading, condemn, and even to demonize (Degaf, 2016). Therefore, it is not wrong, from the foregoing, to describe it as being alike to disparaging or even derogatory.

According to Allan and Burrige (2006), "dysphemism is an expression with connotations that are offensive either about the denotation or the audience.... It is used to talk about one's opponents, things one wishes to show disapproval of and things one wishes to downgrade" (qtd. in Maulana, Aziz & Daud, 2020:467). This clearly shows that dysphemism is used to show unpleasant impression about something. This was supported by Kurniawati (2011) Jayanti et al. (2019), and Heryana (2019) when they defined dysphemism as an expression that is offensive, hurtful, show taboo, biased and the use of words that are vulgar.

In Political Discourse, dysphemism is a common linguistic tool used by politicians for managing contentious issues or fustigate the opposition indirectly. This means that once the topic is disagreeable or sensitive, the politician will revert to repugnant or displeasing terms for confusing people or give a false or misleading account of the truth or reality. This clearly means that in dysphemistic cases, the undesirable, taboo and even invidious features of the target area of influence is highlighted or stressed, while positive, actual and even expedient characteristics are not expressed and ignored.

### **Interrelation of Dysphemism, Impoliteness and Face**

It is worthy to note that some pragmatic theories go hand in hand with dysphemism strategy as they help especially in conversational standards. This means that the help to account for the use of dysphemism (in spite of its derogatory nature). They include face and impoliteness principle (the later will form the basis of dysphemism strategy).

Watts (2003) observes that impolite behavior are mostly considered and talked about in conversation. This is probably to the fact that “it objects the acceptance and appropriate behavior” (Watts, 2003:18).

Allan and Burridge (2006) investigate impoliteness from an outlook of taboo language and see dysphemism as speaking offensively. For them being impolite or dysphemistic is being offensive.

Jonathan Culpeper (1995) developed an impoliteness structure that resembles that of Brown and Levinson’s (1987) Politeness Theory. Leech (1983) stressed that social harmony is preserved through politeness which explains for the cooperation of interlocutors in a conversation. But this is the opposite of impoliteness principle which is a communicative tool, an invention created to “attack other face and create conflict and disharmony in society” (Culpeper et al. 2003:1546).

In his earlier definition, Culpeper (to accommodate ‘intention’) defined impoliteness as “when the speaker communicates face attack intentionally, or the hearer perceives and/or constructs behavior as intentionally face-attacking (2005:38). This definition was later reviewed because not all behavior are intentional but can be regarded as impolite (offensive in social interaction). Another reason for the review is the dependence on the notion of face. Goffman (1967:5) sees face as “the positive social value a person effectively claims for himself [sic] by the line others assume he has taken during a particular contact”. It is worthy of note that most impoliteness events are undoubtedly face related. A good example is insult.

Culpeper’s revised definition is:

*Impoliteness is a negative attitude towards specific behaviours occurring in specific contexts. It is sustained by expectations, desires and/or beliefs about social organization, including, in particular, how one person’s or a group’s identities are mediated by others in interaction. Situated behaviours are viewed negatively – considered ‘impolite’- when they conflict with how one expects them to be, how one wants them to be and/or how one thinks they ought to be. Such behaviours always have or are presumed to have emotional consequences for at least one participant, that is, they cause or are presumed to cause offense (2011:254).*

From the foregoing, intentionality is employed by a speaker who hides under dysphemistic or impolite utterances to discourage a ‘specific’ behavior in a ‘specific’ context mostly to the fact the certain social belief, expectation and desires are being altered. When this happens, there is a ‘face attack’ or so the hearer perceives it.

In summary, impoliteness can be explained by the dysphemistic strategies used in a particular context, while ‘face’ is attacked as an individual tries to maintain expectation, desires and belief of a social organization while employing dysphemistic tools in interaction.

### **Political Discourse**

Discourse is a direction of language use and type of social transmission which allows for interactions in a specific social affair (Van Dijk, 1997). It is concerned with how social interaction and meaning

are created and retained in a social group and how people take advantage of language to exercise power and prevail influence (Takoua, 2015), of which a good instance is political discourse. Political Discourse (PD) becomes integral to achieving a functional social interaction as it portrays the socio-political face of society as the relate with development, administration and betterment of society. Rightly put, PD initiates ideas that are political that results to activities that are doable, controls the policies of social institutions and government of various countries, and enhance the rise of development of political goals in any community (Crespo-Fernandez, 2014).

Trying to define the concept, Shiffrin and Tannen (2001:398) gave us two different points: the first “a discourse which is itself political”, and the second, “an analysis. From the above, political discourse or PD is a form of discourse that is drawn from politics, controlled by political establishments that is linked to political services in different contexts.

Language is very critical when it comes to politics as political outcomes and activities are dominated with it. Angela Carter (1983:77) supports this when she stressed that language is “power, life and the instrument of culture, the instrument of domination and liberation”. This clearly means that language brings clarity when we talk about political reality in PD. This also goes on to reveal the real distinguish characteristics of political language or interaction to be dependent on appealing language that tends towards accusation, denunciation and criticism which proceeds to a supposed political actuality. Orwell (2012:10) explains it when he said that “political language –and with variation this is true of all political parties, from conservative to anarchists- is designed to make lie sound truthful and murder respectably, and give an appearance of solidity to pure wind”.

Dysphemism is a very effective tool in modern political discourse and planning of political rhetoric appearances that are employed by politicians to criticize opponents, talk about contentious matters and give their remarks on complicated and ambiguous issues (Ruiz, 2017; Herbert, 2016).

This also goes to show that dysphemism (and also euphemism) has pragmatic purpose in PD of positively (or negatively) reinforcing the image of the politicians, his political party, and determining of social and political actions.

In conclusion, Political Discourse is or serves as a seedbed or nest for the formation and advancement of Dysphemism.

### **Theoretical Framework**

The theory on which this research paper is based on is Jonathan Culpeper's (2011) Impoliteness strategies. He built this framework by asserting that impoliteness strategies are a means of attacking face instead of improving or supporting face. He proposed a model of five impoliteness strategies.

**1. Bald on Record Impoliteness:** this is used where there is so much face attack and where there is a ploy by the speaker to attack the face of the hearer. The Face Threatening Act (FTA) is done in a direct, clear and unambiguous manner in a situation where the face is unrelated and reduced (Culpeper, 2011).

**2. Positive Impoliteness:** the use of this strategy is deployed to neutralize the hearer's positive face who wants acceptance and admittance in society. By positive face, we mean the urge from a person to be needed and accepted by others. From his older output on this strategy, Culpeper (1996; 2005:41) listed some qualities of this strategy as: to snub or ignore others (by not recognizing their presence); to bar others from an activity; to separate from others (probably by refusing to sit with them); to be unconcerned, unsympathetic and having no interest in others; use of unsuitable identity markers (using formal title and surname in a situation where it is a close relationship and nicknames when it is a distant relationship); use of inconspicuous or secretive language (by using code or jargon that is known to other members of the group but not to the other); solicit disagreement (by selecting to talk on an upsetting topic); make the target feel some discomfort; use of taboo words, abusive or profane language; and lastly, name calling or use of disparaging nominations.

**3. Negative Impoliteness:** the use of this strategy is designed to damage the target's negative face want. What this means is the urge from a person who does not want to be disturbed. Negative face is the desire of every knowledgeable adult member that his/her effort or activity should not be obstructed by others. Like Culpeper (2011) puts it, there is the urge for unconstrained actions. Some output of this action includes: to scare (by showing injecting in others the belief that occurrences that are detrimental to them will happen); to disapprove or ridicule (by stressing on your pertinent power, expressing disdain and using words that connotes diminutives); to move into the other's space (literally or metaphorically); clearly associate the other with damaging undesirable aspects; lastly, to put the other's indebtedness or liabilities on record.

**4. Sarcasm or Mock Politeness (Off-Record Impoliteness):** bearing in mind that the opposite of banter (mock politeness for social agreement) is sarcasm, sarcasm is a face threatening act which is carried out by deploying politeness strategy in an insincere manner. With sarcasm, one can express opposite feeling which is not the real meaning he or she had in mind. This means that through sarcasm or mock politeness a lie is said by a person to injure someone. In conclusion, Culpeper (2005:44) summarizes that in off-record impoliteness, the FTA is deployed by a means of implicature in a sure way that one characteristic intention clearly exceeds any other.

**5. Withhold Politeness:** withhold politeness is the withdrawals of politeness work were it is considered obligatory. It could be in the form of failing to show gratitude or thank someone for a favour. This can be seen as deliberate impoliteness. In conclusion, the hearer is silent as he/she fails to respond to the speaker utterances.

### **Methodology**

This study is conducted by using descriptive qualitative design in order to describe the dysphemistic strategies employed by President Muhammadu Buhari in his interview on Arise TV on 10th July, 2021. The choice of interview instead of speech is based on the claim that "political interviews are confrontational, competitive encounters" (Mullany, 2002:6). This is based on the framework of politics which is full of smartness, wit, and aggressiveness of participants.

The data for this study are excerpt of responses of President Buhari from the interview. Accordingly, the context of the data was the dialogue and responses of President Buhari which contain impoliteness.

For the data collection techniques, the researchers adopted the in-depth open-ended interview because of the nature of the study which is interview based. To ensure the data is recorded accurately, the researchers watched the interview after downloading it on YouTube, and also downloaded a transcript of the interview while comparing it with the transcript. Lastly, they marked the impoliteness strategies that President Buhari used in the interview.

For the research instrument, since this study employed descriptive qualitative method, the primary instrument is the researchers themselves who had the responsibility of planning, collecting, analyzing and reporting the finding. The secondary instrument is the data sheet where the researchers noted the impoliteness strategies deployed through utterances by President Buhari from the interview.

The data analyses of this study will be conducted according to Culpeper Impoliteness Strategies (Bald on Record Impoliteness, Positive Impoliteness, Negative Impoliteness, Off-Record Impoliteness, and Withhold Politeness) that were discussed earlier. Each used strategy will be illustrated with explained extracts from the interview. This will assist in finding out the most used strategy by the President and help us know the functions and how he attacks 'face' of other while maintaining decorum in social interaction.

### **Analyses**

#### **1. Bald on Record Impoliteness:**

##### *Extract 1*

*Because people don't get that position until they declare their assets, they appear with their bank statements and assets, if they cannot explain their wealth; the balance is taken away from them. But what happened? I was arrested and detained and **they were given back what they had looted.***

President Buhari used looted which is a direct way of saying someone stole from what should be corporately owned by the people. He employed Bald on record impoliteness to attack others here.

##### *Extract 2*

*But the problem is that the local government has been virtually killed. And that is not good for this country because those that became **local chairman are being compromised.***

The president is direct again here that he used the word 'compromise' with local government chairmen to attack their face by putting them in the light as prejudicial. Accusation is one way of attacking face.

##### *Extract 3*

*If you do well you're brought in front of the class and praised. If you misbehave you are flogged right in front of the class. So you just have to behave yourself but that **standard has collapsed.***

Again, we can also see his choice of words for the standard of education. It sounds accusatory. Bald on record was deployed here.

*Extract 4*

*Take the North West for example; people with same language and culture are killing themselves, stealing each other's properties. **Imagine the madness.***

The use of the emphatic statement that is bolded shows the disgust of the president for the impropriety happening in the North-West is another form of the use of bald on record strategy to attack face.

*Extract 5*

*I would like you to check how much we earned from 1999 to 2014 with our production. If you check you'll find out that every production was 2.1 million barrels at the average cost of \$100. Multiply 2.1 million by \$100 and see the amount you have. Yet look at the state of infrastructure, our roads, rails and power. **Did you ask those other administrations what they did with all those monies?***

Here, the president is questioning the accountability of previous administrations. The last sentence though a question is an attack on face of others. So, questions can be used as a sub-set of the bald on record impoliteness.

*Extract 6*

***But what have they done with all the money they were getting?** Look at the power sector. **There has been a lot of waste.** The previous earn more with nothing on ground. **Did you ask them where they kept our money?** If I knew where, maybe I would not borrow. They sold oil at \$100; we sell at \$25 sometimes. **They wasted money on power, no light, no road, and no rail.***

Again, the president's utterances show his disgust and accusation of the previous government. He termed their effort as a 'waste'. This is direct and by that he attacked the face of others. This is a clear example of bald on record impoliteness.

*Extract 7*

*If we cut ourselves to pieces can we win the confidence of investors? Dividing Nigeria to piecemeal is not any solution. It's a wrong signal to all investors. So each Republic will become a paradise? How do we share what United us? What we have done together within such a record time? I'm surprised Nigerian elites watch these **uniformed lots to make criminal statements** every day. We are all better off as Nigerians. I don't like the way Nigerian elites allow **careless people** talking all over the place.*



Here, he referred to the various agitators as 'uninformed lots' and 'careless people' and their statements as 'criminal'. He does not want to soften his words since he is direct. He deployed these words badly with the purpose of damaging the various agitators' face.

## 2. Positive Impoliteness:

Extract 8

*I asked those governors to go back to the old system so that they would have intelligence and know what is happening in their states. **You can't just win elections and then sit tight and be thinking that somebody would do their jobs for them. When they come I send them back.***

Here, he deploys positive impoliteness by attacking the face of governors by referring to them idle men. The governors came to him for assistance on security. He fails to recognize their intention but instead damaged their face by informing them they need to improve on their own local security apparatus, and by implicitly sending them back to their various states which made the governors look like direct subordinates of the president while they actually have executive powers. The last sentence is very emphatic. Clearly emphatic statements can serve as means of attacking face as clearly seen by its use by the president.

Extract 9

***That IPOB is just like a dot in a circle.** Even if they want to exit, they will have no access to anywhere. And the way they are spread all over the country, having businesses and property, I don't think IPOB knows what they are talking about.*

IPOB is a Pro-Biafra group from the South-East. The Igbos is also from the South-East. But the president resorted to two of the outputs of positive politeness which are make the target feel some discomfort (when he referred to the whole of South-East as IPOB; when he referred to them as a **dot** which he used to refer to the spread of their properties all over the country and how it is impossible for them to exit the country) and name calling or use of disparaging nominations which could be seen in referring to the Igbos of South East as IPOB, a Pro-Biafra group that his government has labeled a terrorist group. He used this strategy to neutralize the hearer's positive face (the Igbos) who wants to be accepted by him and all Nigeria.

Extract 10

*Nobody would want to come and invest in an insecure environment. **So I told the youths that if they want jobs they should behave themselves and make sure that investors can come in.***

Again, he is seen calling the EndSARS protest by the youth as rascality and the reason why investors are not coming. Here, the bolded words is an example of positive impoliteness where he deployed an

output of this strategy which is to be unconcerned, unsympathetic and having no interest in others thereby neutralizing the youths' positive face who wants acceptance by his government by protesting the inhumane activities of SARS and the police.

### 3. Negative Impoliteness:

#### *Extract 11*

*But we are treating them as **criminals now** and they are getting a lot of casualties. **They would not say it because they don't want to demoralize their recruitment constituencies.** But they are suffering a lot of casualties and we know it.*

This is a clear case of Negative impoliteness where the president is direct in his assessment of insurgency in the North-West by attacking the negative face want of the insurgents by using word like 'criminals', 'suffering a lot of casualties' and 'we know it' hence damaging the face of the insurgent while stating his progress in the fight against insurgency. The outputs used here to drive his point are to scare, to ridicule and associating the other with damaging or undesirable aspects.

#### *Extract 12*

*There is security at each level from the state to the local government and even to the traditional level. We have the traditional rulers that **know all the crooks in the community.***

He deployed Negative politeness by using the word 'crook' (by using to disapprove or ridicule where he expressed disdain thieves in various communities). Second, he states the he is in touch with the various traditional rulers who know these 'crooks' in their various communities. Hence, he didn't just use that word alone to attack face but brought himself in opposition with thieves in various communities and revealing that he knows them and is ready to attack them through their various traditional rulers and security apparatus that are set up in various communities. This is a clear example of the output to scare which he used to inject in the 'crooks' that occurrences that are detrimental to them will happen.

#### *Extract 13*

*Well, I have now told the military and the Police to be **brutal**. From now, **we will speak the language they understand** and in the coming weeks, you'll get exactly what I am saying, there will be a difference.*

The use of the bolded words by the president is direct. By directing the armed forces to be 'brutal' is untypical of the code of armed forces. He also deployed one of the outputs of negative impoliteness which is to disapprove or ridicule by which he stressed on his pertinent power as the Commander-in-Chief of the Armed Forces. Also, he employed the word because according to him that is the language they understand. These words by the president sounds like threats and was deliberately used to attack face want of other. This is clearly the use of the output to scare which he deployed to inject on bandits the belief that occurrences that are detrimental to them will happen.

*Extract 14*

*The way the south easterners are spread all over the country, having businesses, properties, I don't think IPOB knows what they are talking about. In any case, we said we would talk to them in the language that they understand. We would organize the military and police to pursue them. That is what we can do and we can do it.*

Again, his tone here is filled with threat as he admonishes IPOB. He used the output to scare in order to instill the belief on IPOB that occurrences that are detrimental to them will happen. We also see the use of the output to disapprove or ridicule where he stressed on his pertinent power as the Commander-in-Chief of the Armed Forces. This here is a clear case of Negative Impoliteness.

**4. Off-Record Impoliteness:***Extract 15*

*But the important thing is the culture of the local security apparatus. We have police in every town. And I have been talking with the police trying to push them as hard as I can. **They don't wear uniforms and sling their rifles just to intimidate people.** But to make sure that if necessary they use it to bring security.*

Here, President Buhari performs an off-record impoliteness by indirectly attacking the face of the police. As the institution constitutionally entrusted with security in the state and locality, their uniforms and rifles are symbols of authority and a tool that should enable them secure properly the locality. But it seems they have failed in their role. The president's utterance is an indication that they are not doing their job properly thus disdaining them.

*Extract 16*

I will give a recent example. Two governors from Southwest came to tell me that the cattle rearers in some of the forests there have killed farmers while their cattle were eating their crops. **So I told them that you campaigned when you were elected they said yes and I told them to go back and sort themselves out.**

The President again performs an off-record impoliteness by indirectly attacking the face of the two governors from Southwest of the country. Governors are the chief security officers in their various states. And probably, during campaign, they stressed on the security of lives and properties. For the president to raise one of the issues of their campaign promise and asks them to go back and sort it out is clearly an indication that they are not doing their jobs well, and shows disdain by the way he dismissed them. This is a clear case of mockery.

*Extract 17*

*That is it! 'Yes, in the military, only those who are always with the troops lead the troops. **You can't just pick anybody from the Generals because of seniority.** You put somebody who has been in the mill, who has suffered and fought wars with the soldiers. **Soldiers would want to be led by someone they know that faces the war front with them.***

There is the use of off-record impoliteness by the president where he is justifying his choice of Chief of Army Staff who has over 30 Generals more senior than him. In his quest to defend his action, he also shows disdain for those senior generals as not having enough experience to lead because they have not 'suffered and fought wars with the soldiers' in the field and thus, won't have the full respect of the soldier. By doing this he is clearly deployed this strategy in a sure way that his characteristic intention clearly exceeds that of others.

*Extract 18*

*You're saying someone who had gone through military and police training all his life should not be appointed to lead the military or police department he works with just because we must balance appointments? What are you saying? The system didn't restrict anyone from joining the military or the police, and if you decided not to join, we will not force you but you too will not force us to bring someone who is not qualified in training and experience when it comes to leadership of these institutions just because we want to balance some appointments.*

Again, the utterance of the president is clearly an indication of indirect attack on the Southeast face. From his statement, the Southeast has low number of military personnel which he regarded as refusal to join the military. But the clamour is that he should show inclusiveness to all and sundry regardless to balance some appointments. This is a clear indication of mock politeness to the Southeast for not joining the military and want inclusiveness through getting 'juicy' appointments. The FTA is deployed by the President in a sure way that one Characteristic intention clearly exceeds the other.

**5. Withhold Politeness:**

This strategy was not seen or used by the President.

**FINDINGS**

Through this interview of President Buhari which is about current happening in the nation and how his administration is going about it, the analysis revealed the excessive use of dysphemism concerning Culpeper Impoliteness Strategies. It is clear that as politicians use dysphemistic expressions, they enjoy the social and pragmatic merits of the phenomenon. They hide under utterances to cause targets 'face loss' while maintaining their position in social interaction.

From the analyses, the use of dysphemistic expressions is large. Bald on record impoliteness strategy tends to take bulk of it (with seven extract). This is followed by Negative impoliteness and Off-Record impoliteness strategies (with four extracts each) while Positive impoliteness has three extracts. Noticeable, there was no use of the Withhold politeness strategy by the President.

Bald on record was frequent among the extracts. In extracts 1 and 2, we saw how direct the president was in name calling especially when he frowns at behavior he felt are dissidents. We also saw how this strategy was deployed to frown at a failed educational system, misappropriation of resources by past administration, and his rebuke of insurgency. The reason why the president uses this strategy to a great

extent is that he is a direct person. He does not try to hide his true feelings. He has no interest to please others as he uses this technique to attack their face.

Negative impoliteness is next in frequency where we were able to get four extracts from the interview. Out of the sub-strategies, President Buhari used three: to scare or frighten, to disapprove or ridicule and by associating the other with damaging or undesirable aspects. He employed the first two more especially to frighten in order to put fear on insurgents and criminals. Through the second output he always affirmed his pertinent power and his will do deal with insurgents and criminal and showed his disdain for them and their activities. This also proves the direct nature of the president. It also shows his position concerning dissident activities in the country and his will power to deal with matter. Lastly, it shows how he was able to deal with the targets negative face want.

Off-Record Impoliteness strategy also has the same frequency of use like the negative impoliteness. In extracts 15 and 16, he showed his disdain for the police and the two governors from Southwest who was looking for his intervention their various states concerning the security concerns. Using mock politeness, he frowned at their non-dedication to their constitutional duty as chief security personnel (both the police and the governors). For the remaining two extracts, the FTA is deployed by the president through mock politeness to defend his no inclusiveness of the Southeast in his administration by ridiculing their stance on not joining the 'mill' as he puts it but wants him to balance his appointment. Through mock politeness, a lie is said by someone to injure someone. The lie here is that the president is trying to say that the Southeast do not have competent people to head the military. So, through this strategy he didn't just show his disapproval for incompetence in the security sector but also, defended his action of neglecting the Southeast for the juicy post of Chief of Army Staff. Therefore, through this strategy, the FTA is deployed in a sure way that his characteristic intention clearly exceeds any other.

The least used impoliteness strategy is positive impoliteness (with three extracts). Three outputs out of almost ten were used by the president: to be unconcerned, unsympathetic and having no interest in others, to make the target feel some discomfort and lastly, name calling or use of disparaging nominations. The targets: the governors, Southeast and youths want acceptance and admittance in Nigerian society. But through this technique, he was able to neutralize their positive face want.

As mentioned in the analysis, the final impoliteness strategy, withhold politeness, was not used in the interview. Considering the direct nature of the president, it was assumed that this strategy would be used by him to a large extent. Therefore, it is surprising that we couldn't find instances of withhold politeness from his utterances.

Furthermore, concerning the function of these dysphemistic strategies in PD, Culpeper grouped functions of impoliteness strategies into three categories: affective, coercive and entertaining impoliteness (2011).

He defined affective impoliteness as show of extreme increased emotion like anger which connects the target to be responsible for the speaker's negative emotional action(s) (2011:223). This function was realized in extract 4, where he frowned at the banditry in Northwest; in extract 5 and 6, where he frown at the wasteful stance of the last administration; in extract 7, where he frown at the educated elites for allowing agitators who he termed 'uninformed lots' and 'criminals' speak for their region; and lastly, extract 13 and 14, where he threatened IPOB to speak to them 'in the language the will understand' which means sending the armed forces to handle them with brute force. From the above, President Buhari performed a bald on record impoliteness strategy and a negative impoliteness strategy with affective impoliteness function toward others. He displayed anger by making utterances that showed displeasure and threat to the other's behavior.

Culpeper defines coercive impoliteness as an impoliteness that "seeks a rearrangement of values between producer and the target in which the producer gets more benefit or gets their current benefits reinforced or protected" (2011:226). This impoliteness function was realized in extract 5 and 6, where he was putting the previous administration in a bad light as being wasteful despite earning more in oil sales (\$100 as against \$25) while he is doing more infrastructural with little. He is clearly protecting his legacy which is his benefit over the previous administration. This impoliteness function was also realized in extract 8, where the president admonishes some governors who after promises security of lives and properties during their campaign would sit idle only to come to him for assistance. His stance usually is to send them back. Through this action, he reinforced his benefits as he puts them in bad light while showing he is up and doing concerning the insecurity challenges in the country. Lastly, this impoliteness function was realized in extracts 17 and 18, where he defended his choice of Chief of Army Staff and his non inclusiveness of people from the Southeast in his administration. He later mocked them for refusing to join the armed forces but want juicy positions in his administration. With these, he reinforced and protected his benefits. From the above, President Buhari performed a bald on record impoliteness strategy, a positive impoliteness strategy and an off-record impoliteness strategy with coercive impoliteness function towards others as he seeks to strengthen his actions and protect his benefits.

Lastly, on entertaining impoliteness function, Culpeper (2011:252) sees it as an impoliteness that "exploits the target or potential target of impoliteness which includes entertainment at their cost". This was deployed in extract 8 and 16, where admonishes the governors of sitting tight and doing nothing but only coming to complain to him, and sending them back to their various states to go and fulfill their

campaign promises respectively. It was also deployed in extract 15, where he mocked the police of just wearing their uniforms and slinging rifle to intimidate the people instead of properly performing their constitutional duty which is to secure lives and properties. Through these utterances by the president, he performs entertaining impoliteness function.

To conclude, after discussing dysphemism in lieu of President Buhari's interview, we could clearly see why politicians disguise under utterances to attack face of others. Through the various types of impoliteness strategies and functions, we could see how and why politicians resort to dysphemism to attack targets face loss while promoting their agenda while maintain social decorum.

### **Conclusion**

From the study, we examined dysphemism in PD from a pragmatic point. It revealed the reason for the disguise of politicians behind utterances in order to cause the targets 'face loss' or what the target identifies to be so. It also reveals the types and purposes of the use of dysphemism as deployed by politicians as an impoliteness strategy and a tool to diminish the target while maintaining and sustaining their 'benefits'. Clearly, the use of dysphemism is a tool for damaging the target in a direct way while justifying your action and reinforcing your influence in social interactions.

### **References**

Arise News (2021). *Exclusive Interview with Nigeria's President Mohammadu Buhari*.  
[www.youtu.be/11KTSdpc0g0](http://www.youtu.be/11KTSdpc0g0) 10 July, 2021.

#### ***Other Sources***

Allan, K. and Burridge, K. (2006). *Forbidden Words. Taboo and the Censoring of Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Ayoola, M.O. (2015). "A Systemic Functional Analysis of Political Advertisements in Selected Nigerian Newspapers", *A Ph.D Dissertation Submitted to the Department of English, University of Ilorin, Nigeria*.

Bahri, Syamsul. (2009). *Eufemisme Dalam Wacana Politik*. Universitas Negeri Medan. (Online) accessed February 2, 2020.

Brown, P. and Levinson, S. C. (1987). *Politeness: Some Universals in Language Usage*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Culpeper, J. (1996). Towards an Anatomy of Impoliteness. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 25, 349-367.

Culpeper, J., Derek B., and Anne W. (2003). "Impoliteness Re-visited: With Special Reference to Dynamic and Prosodic Aspects". *Journal of Pragmatics* 35: 1545-1579.

Culpeper, J. (2005): "Impoliteness and Entertainment in the Television Quiz Show: the Weakest Link". *Journal of Politeness Research* 1/1: 35-72. doi.org/10.1515/jplr. 2005.1.1.35

- Culpeper, J. (2011). *Impoliteness: Using Language to Cause Offence*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Degaf, A. (2016). *The Functions of Derogation and Euphemism Found in Hollywood Movie*. Presented at The 3rd Forum on Linguistics and Literature, 27 Oktober 2016, Fakultas Humaniora UIN Maulana Malik Ibrahim Malang.
- Fernandez, E. C. (2014). "Euphemism and Political Discourse in the British Regional Press". *Brno Studies in English*: Volume 40, No. 1 (Online) retrieved on November 15, 2020. [https://www.researchgate.net/publication/287593086\\_Euphemism\\_and\\_political\\_discourse\\_in\\_the\\_British\\_regional\\_press](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/287593086_Euphemism_and_political_discourse_in_the_British_regional_press)
- Goffman, E. (1967). *Interaction Ritual; Essays on Face-to-face Behavior*. Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday.
- Herbert, A. (2016). *The Role of Euphemisms in Healthcare Communication*. *J Healthcare Communication*. 2016, 1:2. DOI: 10.4172/2472-1654.100014
- Heryana, Nanang. (2019). *Eufemisme dan Disfemisme Pada Media Berita Daring Republika : Perkembangan Kasus Setya Novanto Edisi Januari 2018*. Pendidikan Bahasa dan Sastra Indonesia. FKIP : Universitas Tanjungpura Pontianak. (Online) accessed February 2, 2020
- Jayanti, R. R., Maulida, N., & Musdolifah, A. (2019). Eufemisme Dan Disfemisme Pada Judul Berita Surat Kabar Harian Balikpapan Pos Periode April-Mei 2018. *Jurnal Basataka (JBT)*, 2(1), 77–86. <https://doi.org/10.36277/basataka.v2i1.61>
- Jones, J. and Peccei, J. S. (2004). 'Language and politics', in Thomas, L.(ed), *Language, Society, and Power*. New York: Routledge.
- Kafi, L. N. (2020). *Euphemism and Dysphemism on Donald Trump's Political Speech: State of the Union Address 2020*. Undergraduate thesis, Universitas Islam Negeri Maulana Malik Ibrahim.
- Kurniawati, H. (2011). Eufemisme dan Disfemisme dalam Spiegel Online. *Litera*, 10(1), 51–63. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.21831/ltr.v10i1.1172>
- Laili, E. N. (2012). *Eufemisme dan Disfemisme pada Wacana Lingkungan dalam Media Massa di Indonesia*. Tesis. Yogyakarta: Program Studi Pascasarjana Ilmu Linguistik, Fakultas Ilmu Budaya, Universitas Gadjah Mada
- Lakoff, G., and Johnson, M. (1980). *Metaphors we Live by*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Lakoff, R. T. (1989). "The Limits of Politeness: Therapeutic and Courtroom Discourse". *Multilingua Journal of Cross-Cultural and Interlanguage Communication*, 8, 101-130. <https://doi.org/10.1515/mult.1989.8.2-3.101>
- Leech, G. (1983). *Principles of Pragmatics*. London: Longman.
- Maulana, I., Aziz, Z. A., & Daud, B. (2020). *Dysphemism Used in Prohaba Newspaper*. *English Education Journal (EEJ)*, 11(4), 466-481, October 2020.
- Meilasari, P. (2016). Analisis Terjemahan Ungkapan Eufemisme dan Disfemisme pada Teks Berita Online BBC. Prasasti: Journal of Linguistic.



- Mullany, L. 2002, "I don't think you want me to get a word in Edgeways, Do you John?" Re-assessing (im) politeness, Language and Gender in political Broadcast Interviews." *Sheffield Hallam Working papers: Linguistic Politeness and Context* www.shu.ac.uk/wpw/politeness/mullany.htm, 1-20.
- Neaman, J., and Silver, C. (1995). *Book of Euphemism*. Wordsworth Editions Ltd.
- Olimat, S. N. (2018). "Developing a Model for Translating Euphemism in the Qur'an: an Intratextual and Contextual-based Approach". *Advances in Language and Literary Studies*. 9(6), 101-111.
- Olimat, S. N. (2019a). *Euphemism in the Qur'an: Corpus-based Linguistic Analysis and Intratextual and Contextual-based Translation*. Ph.D. Thesis, University of Leeds, UK.
- Olimat, S. N. (2019b). "Euphemism in the Qur'an: a Corpus-based Linguistic Approach". *International Journal of Computational Linguistics (IJCL)*. 10(2), 16-32.
- Opeibi, T. (2005). "Political Marketing or Politically 'Marketing?' A Study of Negative Campaigning in Nigerian Political Discourse". In *TRANS Internet Zeitschrift für Kulturwissenschaften*. No 16/2005.<http://www.inst.at/trans16Nr/014/opibi.16.m>.
- Orwell, G. "Politics and the English Language". (2012, June 26). *Daily News* (Colombo, Sri Lanka). Retrieved February 11, 2015, from [http://www.highbeam.com/doc/1G1-294393421.html?](http://www.highbeam.com/doc/1G1-294393421.html)
- Ruiz, R. S. (2017). "Euphemism and Dysphemism during the War of the Spanish Succession (1710-1713)": *Cuadernos de investigación filológica*, ISSN 0211-0547, Tomo 43, 2017, págs. 7-31
- Schiffrin, D., & Tannen, D. (2001). *The Handbook of Discourse Analysis*. Malden, Mass.: Blackwell, p. 872.
- Takoua, N. (2015). *English Euphemism in Political Discourse: A Politeness Strategy or Deception*. Unpublished thesis, Badji Mokhtar University-Annaba.
- Van Dijk, T. (1993). 'Discourse, Power and Access'. In C. R. Caldas (ed). *Studies in Critical Discourse Analysis*. London: Routledge
- Vedung, E. (1982). *Political Reasoning*. New Delhi: Sage Publications.
- Watts, R. (2003). *Politeness*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.