A PRAGMA-DISCOURSE STUDY OF FACE-SAVING AND FACE-THREATENING ACTS ON THE BBC'S HARDTALK INTERVIEW

BY

OKORO SIMEON ESIMCHI

P13AREN8047

SEPTEMBER, 2018

A PRAGMA-DISCOURSE STUDY OF FACE-SAVING AND FACE-THREATENING ACTS ON THE BBC'S HARDTALK INTERVIEW

BY

OKORO SIMEON ESIMCHI

P13AREN8047

A DISSERTATION SUBMITTED TOTHE DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH AND LITERARY STUDIES, FACULTY OF ARTS, AHMADU BELLO UNIVERSITY ZARIA, IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE AWARD OF MASTER OF ARTS DEGREE IN ENGLISH LANGUAGE

SEPTEMBER, 2018

DECLARATION

I declare that the work in this dissertation entitled **A Pragma-Discourse Study of Face-Saving and Face-Threatening Acts on the BBC'S Hardtalk Interview** has been carried out by me in the Department of English and Literary Studies, Ahmadu Bello University, Zaria. The information derived fromthe literature has been duly acknowledged in the text and a list of references provided. No part of this dissertationwas previously presented for another degree at this or any other institution.

OKORO, Simeon Esimchi ---------- ----------

Signature **Date**

CERTIFICATION

This dissertation entitled **A Pragma-Discourse Study of Face-Saving and Face-Threatening Acts on the BBC'S Hardtalk Interview** by Okoro Simeon Esimchi meets the regulation governing the award of the degree of Master of Arts in English Language of Ahmadu Bello University, and is approved for its contribution to knowledge and literary presentation.

---------- ----------

Dr J.E. Amodu **Date**

Chairman, Supervisory Committee

---------- ----------

Dr Auwal Muhammad **Date**

Member, Supervisory Committee

---------- ----------

Prof. T.Y. Surakat **Date**

Head of Department

---------- ----------

Prof. S.Z. Abubakar **Date**

Dean, School of Postgraduate Studies

DEDICATION

To my Lord and Saviour, Jesus Christ.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I thank God Almighty for His mercies all through my studies so far. My sincere thanks go to my supervisors: Dr Jonah Amodu and Dr Auwal Muhammad for their patience and learned insight without which this work would have been defective. I am particularly indebted to Dr Jonah Amodu for granting me unfettered access to some useful materials in his library.

I thank all my lecturers in the Department of English and Literary Studies among whom are Prof. T.O.Gani-Ikilama, Prof. G.Y. Sadiq, Prof. Shade Frank-AkaleDr S.A. Abaya, Dr I. Saminu, Dr Ahmed Abdullahi Dr Joyce Agofure the PG Coordinator, and the Head of Department, Prof. T.Y. Surakat.

Dr Thomas Nkoro deserves special mention for giving me 'the first kick' into the M.A. programme and urging me not to give up. I sincerely thank my Pastor on campus, Pharm. John Omale for his invaluable support. Dr Mohammed Jibril, is worthy of mention for his counsel and support. Many thanks go to Pastor John Apeabu for his encouragements.

I thank my loved ones: Christian, Okwudiri, Charity, Uruchi, Amarachi and my mum MadamJanet Okoro, for their support and prayers. Thanks go to my landlord Pastor Aaron Bangiwa and his family for their support.

My thanks also go to my friends and course mates among whom are Raphael IkechukwuOkoye, Raphael Sylvester, Grace Olayinka, Mary Amedu, BisolaOlatunji, KemiAyigun, Mustapha Abdullahi, YunusaHussaini, AmbiSarikinkwambo, Shameer Mohammed, Audu Daniel, Umar Muhammad,NdambaboYahaya,Emmanuel Usoh and AnyamPilah.

Abstract

The media is a powerful tool of influence in societies. Media interviews provide a special platform that showcases how language is used. This study focuses on the Pragmatic concepts of Face-Saving and Face-Threatening Acts on the BBC'S HardTalk interview. It attempts to find out what kind of acts interlocutors on interviews perform; how face threats affect interlocutors and how they respond to them. The Speech Act theory and the Stimulus-Response theory are deployed in analysing the data. In all, three interviews are studied. A total of 25 tables containing about 50 utterances are extracted and studied. The findings show that, by their utterances, interviewers and interviewees perform a variety of acts. Some of these acts include questioning, accusing, alleging, asserting, debunking, denying, concurring, reprimanding, cautioning, announcing, affirming, requesting, informing, clarifying, obscuring, defending, reporting, denigrating, admitting, rejecting, approving, attacking, bragging and naming, among others. The findings also show that both the interviewer and the interviewee encounter face-threats as they engage in dialogue. Face threats can arise from the implicatures invoked by/embedded in the utterances of the interviewers and the interviewees. Face-threats are countered with face-threats, more or less. In conclusion, the interviewer's attitude, more than that of the interviewee, determines the politeness tone of the whole interview process. FTAs undermine politeness. The more an interlocutor feels his face threatened, the less polite (and perhaps, cooperative) he/she will be at every given time. But when FTAs are mitigated by careful phrasing and couching, the threat level becomes very minimal.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Title page---------- ii

DECLARATION---------- iii

CERTIFICATION---------- iv

DEDICATION---------- v

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS---------- vi

ABSTRACT---------- vii

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background to the Study - - - - - - - 1

1.2 Statement of the Research Problem - - - - - - - 5

1.3 Research Questions - - - - - - - - - 6

1.4 Aim and Objectives - - - - - - - - - 6

1.5 Significance of the Study - - - - - - - - 7

1.6 Scope and Delimitation - - - - - - - - 8

CHAPTER TWO

LITERATURE REVIEW

2.0 Preamble - - - - - - - - - - 9

2.1.0 Conceptual Review - - - - - - - - - 9

2.1.1 Language and Interview - - - - - - - - 9

2.1.2 Speech - - - - - - - - - - 13

2.1.3 Communicative Competence - - - - - - - 14

2.1.4 Pragmatics - - - - - - - - - 19

2.1.5 Speech Acts - - - - - - - - - 21

2.1.6 Politeness - - - - - - - - - 25

2.1.7 Positive and Negative Faces - - - - - - - 27

2.1.8 Face-Threatening and Face-Saving Acts - - - - - 29

2.1.9 Politeness Principle versus the Cooperative Principle - - - 31

2.1.9.0 Politeness and Context - - - - - - - 33

2.1.9.1 Politeness and Culture - - - - - - - 36

2.1.9.2 Selectional and Presentational Politeness - - - - - 37

2.1.9.3 Politeness Maxims - - - - - - - - 38

2.1.9.4 Utterance Meaning versus Sentence Meaning - - - - 41

2.1.9.5 Implicature - - - - - - - - - 43

2.1.9.6 Discourse, Discourse Analysis, Turn- Taking, Act, Move, Exchange - 46

2.1.9.7 Transition Relevance Places - - - - - - - 47

2.1.9.8 Overlapping - - - - - - - - - 48

2.1.9.9 Interruption - - - - - - - - - 48

2.1.9.9 The Media/ BBC HARDtalk Interview - - - - - 48

2.2 Authorial Review - - - - - - - - 52

2.3 Theoretical Framework - - - - - - - 54

2.4 Summary - - - - - - - - - 56

CHAPTER THREE

METHODOLOGY

3.0 Preamble - - - - - - - - - 57

3.1 Sources of Data - - - - - - - - - 57

3.2 Method of Data Collection - - - - - - - - - 57

3.3 Data Transcription - - - - - - - - - 57

3.4 Symbols used in Transcription - - - - - - - - 59

3.4.1 Analytical Procedure - - - - - - - - - 59

CHAPTER FOUR

PRESENTATION OF DATA AND ANALYSIS

4.0 Preamble - - - - - - - - - 61

4.1 Relationship between Interviewer's FTA and Interviewee's Response - 61

4.3 Relationship between Interviewer's FSA and Interviewee's Response - 70

4.5 FTAs from Implicatures/ Implicated Meaning - - - - 80

4.6 Summary ofFindings - - - - - - - - - 84

CHAPTER FIVE

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

5.1 Preamble - - - - - - - - - 88

5.2 Summary - - - - - - - - - 88

5.3 Conclusion - - - - - - - - - 89

5.4 Limitations - - - - - - - - - 91

5.5 Contribution to Knowledge - - - - - - - - 91

5.5 Areas for Further Studies - - - - - - - 92

REFERENCES - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - 93

APPENDICES - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - 97

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background to the Study

It appears emphases are laid on the description of how language is communicatively used in different contexts rather than on grammatical rules. In justification of this view, Honey(1997:118) avers that ‘‘ The task of linguist is never to prescribe how words should be used, only to describe how they can be seen to be used in actual practice’’. The business of the linguist is essentially descriptive and it should be based on observed language behaviour.Functional Linguistics, that is the aspect of Linguistics concerned with language in use, has therefore continued to gain more prominence than prescriptivism or traditional grammar.

The essence of using language is to communicate meaning, and since meaning itself is fluid and context-dependent, any attempt at meaning explication that is limited to linguistic, grammatical imports of utterances without adequate recourse to the context of utterance may not be complete. Words take on extra nuances of meaning when they go out to work. Language itself is constantly changing. Widdowson (1996:70) buttresses this fact thus:

> Language...is not essentially a static and well-defined cognitive construct but a mode of communication which is intrinsically dynamic and unstable. Its forms are significant only insofar as we can associate them with their communicative functions.

No doubt, Pragmatics is one aspect of Linguistics that addresses the place of context in meaning realisation. Leech (1983:1) highlights the place of Pragmatics in language use when he asserts that ‘‘... we cannot really understand the nature of language itself unless we understand Pragmatics; how language is used in communication.’’ For adequate realisation of meaning, therefore, context of utterance is crucial. It is this context of utterance and the

influence this bears on meaning that Pragmatics is concerned with, essentially. Adding his voice to the indispensability of context in accounting for the meaning of utterances, Mey (2001:42) maintains that:

> No matter how naturalour language facilities or how convention bound their use, as language users, we always operate in contexts. Therefore, the context looms large, and has to be taken into account whenever we formulate our thoughts about language.

This shows that even conventions in language bend to context in meaning realisation. Conventions are not explicated in isolation. The context in which they operate have to be accounted for.The media is one platform on which language plays a predominant role. Ahmadvand (2008:35) observes that ''the undeniable power of the media has inspired many critical studies in many disciplines...''. Unarguably, this power of the media is not unconnected with language.

It is very interesting how discussants, especially on international media interview platforms such as the British Broadcasting Corporation (BBC)HARDtalk interview programme exploit the pliability and indeed, the malleability of language to achieve their aims. The intricacy of interrogating or defending controversial political issues on far-reaching, broadcasting organisations, require discreetness. Such platforms are one instance that showcases how things are done with words (Austin, 1962). In an attempt to assert, defend, deny, debunk or condemn an idea, media interlocutors display their mastery (or otherwise) of language. Such demanding communicative encounters sometimes elicit a lot of covert information regarding the attitude and personal biases of the discussants towards the issue being discussed and other underlying ones. Individual and group ideologies and biases can slip off the lips of the interlocutors as they engage in heated arguments over serious political or other issues of consequence.

Virtually every turn made by the interviewee, is either concurring with or refuting certain notions or perceptions. The success of this is largely determined by the skilful use of language. This battle of asserting and refuting views and ideas is even fiercer when the discussion is political and the topic is a controversial or highly sensitive one, as the main one being studied. Although it has been observed that what a speaker intends to communicate is characteristically far richer than what he directly expresses, pragmatically (Amodu, 2011:92), it is also tenable to say that from the little that is uttered, many valid deductions can be made using pragmatic principles. When utterances are subjected to pragmatic scrutiny, they yield a lot of interesting results.

Ibileye (2007:78) observes, that'...language is an instrument or weapon with which territorial barriers can be broken down....' Yet, it must be stated that language is not only used to break barriers, but also to erect them, wittingly or unwittingly. As a weapon, therefore, language can be wielded in communicative 'combats' to assert, counter or alter opinions and views. Needless to say that radio and television interviews are instances where language is employed as a weapon and indeed used to build or break down different forms of barriers.

It has been observed that it is not language on its own that is powerful, but the way it is used. Needless to say that utterances can have far-reaching consequences. ''For by thy words thou shalt be justified and by thy words thou shalt be condemned'' as the Christian Holy Writ declares (Matt. 12: 37, KJV) hints at the possible consequences of one's utterances, especially in certain circumstances. Political office holders can lose face or popularity, be queried or even dismissed from service by their bosses for making unwarranted or tactless utterances in the media. When therefore a political adviser is being interviewed on an international media station over some knotty political issues in his government, you can understand how dicey the situation is. There is a lot at stake.

Also, a politician for instance, can lose support and/or incur heavy criticism just for what he/she says on air. (One such case is the political statement attributed to the immediate past President of Nigeria, Dr Jonathan, that ‘‘stealing is not corruption’’ which went viral in the Nigerian society recently and also echoed beyond the shores of the country.) Political interviews are therefore, a serious business to political office holders in particular. One interview can make or mar a politician or portray the administration he/she represents in bad light.

The BBC World Service is one of the most widely-recognised international broadcasters, currently broadcasting in 32 languages to many parts of the world via analogue and digital shortwave, internet streaming and podcasting, satellite, Frequency Modulation (FM) and Medium Wave (MW) relays. It is politically independent, non-profit and commercial-free. It broadcasts radio and television programmes. The English language service broadcasts 24 hours a day. In May 2007, the BBC reported that the World Service’s average weekly audience had reached 183 million people, beating the previous record of 163 million listeners set the year before. HARDtalk is BBC World News’ flagship current affairs interview, usually presented by Stephen Sackur(http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Bbc-world-service).

Stephen Sackur, the presenter of HARDtalk, BBC World News' flagship current affairs interview programme, has been a journalist with BBC News since 1986. Broadcasting across BBC World News, BBC News Channel and BBC World Service, Stephen has interviewed many high-profile guests. With a keen interest in politics, he has interviewed President George W. Bush, covered the 2000 US Presidential Elections, the Clinton scandal and impeachment trial, and the ways and means of lawmaking, including campaign finance reform. In November 2010, Stephen was awarded the "International TV Personality of the

Year Award" by the Association of International Broadcasters. Born in Lincolnshire, England, Stephen was educated at both Cambridge and Harvard University.(http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Bbc-world-service)

1.2 Statement of the Research Problem

The media is one of the most influential institutions of a society. Media interviews provide useful instances of how people manipulate language. Harris (1986) in Frank (1989:53), observes that ‘‘... broadcast interviews (especially political news interviews) have developed into an important means of journalistic enquiry not only as a way of conveying information to the public but also as a way of raising and discussing controversial issues.’’ As the interviewer and the interviewee interact using language, face threats can occur. How face-threatening and face-saving acts occur in interviews and how they are managed is part of the interest of this study.

One’s political utterances, whether one supports or opposes the government of the day, can have far- reaching consequences both on oneself and on others. This is particularly the case in most African fledgling democracies where freedom of speech can be expensive in terms of threat to one’s life. Anyone who goes on air to air his/her views must do so circumspectly. When the media go out in search of opinions on heated issues of the day, people think twice before they display their faces on television cameras or speak to reporters about such thorny issues. Normally, most ‘ordinary’ citizens will prefer to present sealed lips. Even politicians who dare to speak on controversial matters of the state do so cautiously. They may employ taciturnity, vagueness, circumlocution or prevarication as a means of hedging themselves from possible indictment.

Shrewd media interviewers, however, have skilful strategies they deploy to enmesh their respondents, if they desire to do so. How they use words to do this is intriguing. They may

not always succeed though, since the respondents themselves are not at all naive. It appears certain people, especially politicians, have trained themselves adequately to match the dexterity of media practitioners at putting words into people's mouths as well as 'catching' people by their words. It is like the hunters-birds situation: since hunters have learnt to shoot without missing, the birds too have learnt to fly without perching (Achebe, 1958)! Politicians have, therefore, devised ways of wriggling their way out of 'media interview traps' by their clever use of words. This study, therefore, examines the discourse strategies employed by interactants on media interviews to entangle and/or wriggle out of serious political issues.This study looks at how interlocutors on radio interview programmes use language to accomplish their aims. How the Politeness Principle comes into play in the interviews is also part of the concerns of the study.

1.3 Research Questions

This research seeks answers to the questions itemised below.

(i) What acts do interlocutors on radio interviews perform and how do they perform them?

(ii) How do Face-saving/Face-threatening Acts affect interlocutors and their responses?

(iii) How are Face-threatening Acts managed in interviews?

(iv) Do Face-threatening Acts arise from implicatures?

1.4 Aim and Objectives

This research is set to explore how the pragmatic principle of politeness operates in selected editions of the BBC HARDtalk interview. The objectives of the study include to:

(i) identify what acts have been performed and how they are performed by the interlocutors;

(ii) outline the likelyeffects of Face-Threatening and Face-Saving Acts(FTAs/FSAs) on the interlocutors and their responses;

(iii) explore how Face-Threatening Acts are managed in interviews

(iv) identifyhow implicatures may harbour face threats.

1.5 Significance of the Study

Media interviews provide instances of functional use of language. They show how interlocutors employ language as a tool to perform actions. It has been observed that language use in the media is amenable to linguistic investigations (Ahmadvand 2008; Frank 1989).This work is a pragma-discourse study: As a discourse, it focuses on the conversational exchange of participants in an interview. It is pragmatic as it examines what the participants have done by means of their utterances.

Interest in Functional Linguistics is on the ascendant. Pragmatics is one of the linguistic fields that study language as a functional phenomenon. How language is used based on contexts is the business of Pragmatics. When pragmatic lights are beamed on utterances, an amazing array of deductions, interpretations and semantic imports are realised.This study looks at how interlocutors on radio interview programmes use language to accomplish their aims. How the Politeness Principle comes into play in the interviews is also part of the concerns of the study.

This study is a modest contribution to the literature on pragmatic and discourse studies of (international) media interviews. Furthermore, it is hoped that this study shall trigger additional investigations in the Pragmatics of international media interviews as it may arouse the interest of prospective researchers. In addition, it is anticipated that the findings of this

study will be of benefit to media personalities, linguists, politicians and the general public on, for instance, the need to be discreet in the use of language, especially in media interviews on sensitive political issues.The BBC is widely regarded as a good model in the use of the English language. The corporation is also regarded as being politically neutral and unbiased in its reportage and analysis (http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Bbc-world-service. The HARDtalk interview is among the most popular socio-political current affairs programmes across the globe. Interviews on international media organisations such as the BBC are usually regarded as objective. These are some of the factors that influenced the researcher's choice.

1.6 Scope and Delimitation

This study is a pragma-discourse analysis of selected editions of the BBC HARDtalkinterview. The selected editions are interviews of prominent Nigerians on current critical socio-political issues in the country. The interviews are downloaded as podcasts from the website of the BBC. The study examines the face-saving and face-threatening strategies of the interviewer and the interviewee. The interviews are as follows:

DoyinOkupe: He is a politician. He was a Senior Adviser on political affairs to the former President, Goodluck Jonathan. He also served as Special Assistant to former President OlusegunObasanjo, on media and publicity. He is a member of the People's Democratic Party, PDP.

Professor Wole Soyinka is a renowned writer. He is a neutral political watcher.

ShehuSani is a Senator of the Federal Republic of Nigeria. He is a Civil Rights Activist and Freedom fighter. He is a politician and a member of the ruling party (All Progressive Congress, APC).

CHAPTER TWO

LITERATURE REVIEW

2.0 Preamble

Thischapter reviews related literature from the conceptual framework to the review of previous studies. This is followed by a theoretical framework and a summary of the chapter.

2.1. Conceptual Review

This is a discussion on linguistic concepts and theories. It focuses on language, Pragmatics, Discourse, the Media and Communication generally, among other pertinent concepts.

2.1.1 Language and Interview

Rodman, Fromkin and Hyams (2003:3) associate language with our humanness. They see language and humanity as being inextricably woven together. Thus they argue that,

> The possession of language, perhaps more than any other attribute, distinguishes humans from other animals. To understand our humanity, one must understand the nature of language that makes us human. According to the philosophy expressed in the myths and religions of many peoples, language is the source of human life and power.

To Finegan (2012:5), the fundamental function of language, like a coin with two sides, is to link meaning and expression; to provide verbal expressions for thought and feeling. But he further notes that language is more than a two sided coin:

> ...it has a third face, so important in producing and interpreting utterances that it can override almost all else. That face is context, and only in context can an expression convey a speaker's intended meaning and be correctly interpreted by a hearer.

His view of language draws attention to the essence of language: to communicate meaning, and this is largely dependent on the all- important factor of context.

Halliday (1985:xiii) is of the view that ‘‘ Language has evolved to satisfy human needs; and the way it is organised is functional with respect to these needs...’’. This conception of language as a tool for meeting the crucial human need of expressing and transmitting ideas, is in consonance with that of Edward Sapir (1844-1939) as cited by Abubakar (2008) which states that language is ‘‘a purely human and non instinctive method of communicating ideas emotions and desires by means of a system of voluntarily produced symbols’’.

Hartley (1982:11) makes bold to say that ‘‘Society as we know it could not exist without language, and indeed, for some, it is a defining characteristic of the human race itself, far exceeding in sophistication any animal communication system’’. This presupposes that language is what keeps societies together. This assertion becomes incontrovertible in the light of the biblical Tower of Babel incident, if it might here be alluded to. Okoro (2011:1) further observes that language links peoples of the world together ‘‘... like the network of blood vessels that connects all parts of the body together’’.

All these views of language show how powerful and indispensable language is in human affairs. It is important to the individual as well as to society. Hartley (1982:83), citing Open University (1073), observes that ‘‘language unifies and divides. It symbolises a common bond. It ties people together and it marks them off as distinct from others. At all levels and in all communities, language is a symbol of group and individual identity’’.

Broadly speaking there are twelve different types of interview: Hard news interview, Informational interview, Investigative interview, Adversarial interview, Interpretative interview, Emotional interview, Entertainment interview, Actuality interview, Remote/Telephone interview, Vox pop interview and Grabbed interview.(www.photographytraining.tpub.com/14129).

The Hard news interview is normally short, to the point, and to illustrate a bulletin or news item. It deals only with important facts, or comments and reactions to those facts. The Informational interview is similar to the Hard news interview but not restricted to main stories. Informational interview can be about an event, something that is happening or about to happen. It can also provide a background. Informational interview goes beyond the main points to seek an explanation of the HOWs and WHYs of the story. It is a bit more detailed than short bulletin. The Investigative interview aims at getting behind the facts to discover what actually caused the happening of the events and sometimes what could be done to prevent a repeat of that incident. It tries to get behind the facts, to dig out the actual reasonsof the incident. The Adversarial interview is one in which the interviewer gets into a war of words with the interviewee to get his question answered. Although the interviewer is speaking on behalf of the audience or public opinion, he need not to be impoliteor rude while asking questions. A verbal assault on an interviewee might result in allegations of victimisation and bias. Adversarial interviews may expose the interviewer to the libel suit and the interviewee may drag him to the corridors of the court.

The Interpretative interview is of two types: A Reaction story, which is a response either for or against what has happened and, An Explanatory story, which provides the details of a story. So the interview conducted to get the details of an event or incident is called an interpretative interview. The Personal interview is an interview with an important figure of society. It could be a detailed interview exposing personality profile. The Entertainment interview is one in which light things are asked from the interviewee. The only purpose is to entertain listeners. Emotional interview is an attempt to lay bare someone's feelings. It lets the person who was a victim of an incident share the personal tragedy with the listeners. Actuality interview is one in which the reporter's voice is not included in the final production and only the interviewee's voice is made to be heard by the listeners. This kind of interview

is made a part of a documentary or feature. Remote interviews (interviews on the telephone): Here the personality to be interviewed is not in the city or country and is interviewed on the telephone. Vox Pop interview: Vox pop is an abbreviation of the Latin expression ‘ Voice of the people’. It is conducted to obtain diversified public opinion on certain issue. Grabbed interview: This means to interview a person who does not intend to give an interview but the reporter is determined to take. Normally, it is a very short interview and the potential interviewer comes up with ‘ no comments’.

As can be seen, the line of demarcation between these types of interviews is very thin. For example, the hard news, the informational and the interpretative interviews are very similar. In addition, telephone interview is not only conducted to interview a person that is not in the city or the country, but in urgent situations, telephone interviews can be carried out with people in the same city or country as the interviewer. This study is on the first five types of interview presented here.

There are eight body recommendations for broadcast interviews (www.prnewsonline.com/8-media-traini): 1.If seated, sit erect but do not ramrod-straight, and slightly forward or toward the interviewer. 2.If you are standing, do so with arms at the side or one hand in a pocket. Planting one foot slightly in front of the other will help you avoid swaying. 3. Should you gesture, do so naturally, not expansively. Keep gestures small and in front of you, and avoid sudden body movement. 4. Make your expressions match your words. Smile if it is appropriate. Practice in a mirror. 5. Lean forward slightly and modulate your voice to bring attention to key points. 6. Avoid obvious signs of discomfort or nervousness such as foot tapping, clenched fists, shifting back and forth. 7. Do not nod your head to indicate that you understand or are ready to answer the question. Inadvertently, this may convey agreement with the questioner’s premise when you don’t mean to do so. Remain neutral and become animated only when you begin to speak. 8. Test yourself on the above points by reviewing

your training video.It is obvious that these recommendations apply more in video interviews rather than the radio version of interviews as the one being studied.

2.1.2 Speech

Speech is a form of symbolism; a composite of thought, language, voice and action; and a product of the integrated personality. It is used almost constantly to satisfy our needs, wants, and desires. It is essential to our adaptation to other individuals and to all of society about us. It is an integral part of our personality. Speech, as a skill, develops from basic understanding, careful training, and guided practice.

Speech is a process of social adaptation. For this reason, it is a futile aim to seek to become a good speaker as an end in itself. It is not an end in itself, but a means by which our social purposes may be accomplished. It is a way of imparting and gathering information, of persuading and being persuaded, of creating and changing opinions, of entertaining and being entertained, of inspiring and being inspired (Oliver and Cortright, 1951).

Speech processes, the means by which any act of speaking is accomplished, include knowing, thinking, believing, and analysing speech content; using oral language; using voice and articulation; using visible symbols; and integration of attitudes and adjustments. Many psychologists point out that speaking and thinking are only different manifestations of the same process. Thinking is the counterpart of speaking; it is restrained speaking or subvocal talking.

In oral interviews, as in the ones being studied, there is a need for the interviewee to think before responding. But the thinking has to be done virtually at the same time the talking is going on. The task is really an enormous one as there is usually limited time for the interviewee to adequately address the issues raised by the interviewer. When the interviewer brings up too many matters at the same time and does not give the respondent reasonable length of time to react to them, the whole process may not go smoothly.

In mastering the means of oral communication, one must not overlook what may be called the mechanics of language: enunciation, articulation, pronunciation, and grammar. Careless enunciation, muffled articulation, mispronunciation, and poor grammar are often serious obstacles to communication. They hinder intelligibility. Although all of them add up to only part of the total process of oral communication, each alone is sufficient seriously to impede the process.

Oliver and Cortright(1951), further enumerate three theories of speech. They are the needs that motivate the development of speech: they include the needs for expression, for communication, and for social control.

2.1.3 Communicative Competence

DeSaussure(1967:9/13) asserts that language is ‘‘a collection of necessary conventions that have been adopted by a social body...’’. This body of conventions governing the use of language is termed langue. He further adds that language also has an ‘executive side’ i.e. the performance aspect. This, he calls parole or speaking. While langue is socially determined, he observes that parole is not collective but basically individual and personal. Every language user has a unique way of using language even if the person is a subset of a community or group of users. In other words, idiolect is present even in sociolect. Although legal practitioners, for instance, have a describable way of using language as a group, each member of the group still has an idiosyncratic way of using language: manner of pronunciation, stress, choice of lexical items and mannerisms are some of the ways that individuals may differ in their manner of using language.

Competence refers to speakers’ knowledge of their language and mastery of its system of rules by means of which they can produce and comprehend an infinite number of sentences and identify mistakes and ambiguities. It is seen as idealistic and opposed to the notion of

performance (Crystal, 2008). Communicative competence refers to a speaker's ability to produce and understand appropriate sentences within a given context of communication.

Linguistic competence refers to the unconscious knowledge of grammar that allows a speaker to use and understand a language. It defines the system of rules that governs an individual's tacit understanding of what is acceptable and what is not the language. It is an innate knowledge of rules rather than knowledge of items or relations. Furthermore, Abdulrasheed(2011:8) stresses that 'grammatical competence is a very crucial component of communicative competence.' Consequently, a speaker who is deficient in the grammar of a language is very likely to experience hitches in communicating in that language. Such a speaker may find it hard to express him/her self and also to understand what another speaker says.

Meyer (2009:49) underscores the need for language users/learners to go beyond grammatical knowledge and acquire communicative competence. Knowing the grammar of a language does not automatically translate to knowing how to use the language appropriately as dictated by context. Thus:

> ...human communication involves not just knowledge of how to form linguistic structures but knowledge of how to use these structures in specific communicative contexts. To appreciate this perspective, an individual need only have the experience of studying a foreign language in a classroom and then travelling to a country in which the language is spoken and discovering how little he or she truly knows about the language: that its use among speakers in differing social contexts involves more than simply "knowing the rules."

Meyer is not alone in the view expressed above. Finegan (2012) shares the same view, noting that because the patterns that govern the appropriate use of language differ from one speech community to another, even a shared grammatical competence in a language such as English may not be sufficient to make one a fluent speaker across other English-speaking

communities. This is evident in this study where the interviewer is a native speaker while the interviewee is not.

The difference between the competence and the performance of a speaker-hearer is the difference between what the person knows and what he/she does. King (1969:2) further summarises the concepts thus ‘‘Competence is the intrinsic, largely unconscious knowledge underlying our ability to speak and to understand what is spoken. Performance is the way this intrinsic knowledge is applied in a given case’’. Competence and performance are not only about productive language skills; they also play a part in receptive language skills. A listener who is not competent may not be able to process speech and arrive at the accurate meaning intended by the speaker. Such an incompetent listener may, for instance, understand the locution but fail to grasp or come to terms with the illocutionary import of an utterance.

In an interview, if the illocutionary force of an utterance is not identified, the respondent is likely to respond differently from how he/she would have responded if the actual message had been understood. In the main interview in this study, for instance, the interviewer as a way of expressing doubt or curiosity says ‘interesting’ to what the respondent has said and the respondent in turn says ‘ yes, very interesting,’ meaning exciting.It is obvious that the illocutionary force of the interviewer’s utterance was not understood. This fact further throws light on the possibility of ambiguity arising in conversations as a result of polysemy, the fact of a linguistic item having two or more meanings.

As de Saussure notes, competence or langue is collectively determined whereas performance or parole depends on and varies with an individual user. In a radio interview or, any other interview for that matter, both the interviewer and the interviewee using the same language have basically the same linguistic rules and conventions. However, the way each party employs and deploys these rules in using the language differs. This is hinged on several

factors including geographical region, level of exposure, level of mastery, and whether or not it is one's native or second language. In this study, the interviewer in each case is a native speaker of the English language while the interviewee is a second language user. There is little wonder then when the interviewer has to correct the stress and pronunciation of some of the interviewees. In other words, both the interviewer and interviewee know the language, but differ in their ability to apply the rules in practical communicative situations.

Communicative competence is a concept introduced by Dell Hymes(1980) (see: www.slaencyclopedia-10.wikispaces.com) and discussed and refined by many other authors. Hymes' original idea was that speakers of a language have to have more than grammatical competence in order to be able to commmuincateeffectively in a language; they also need to know how language is used by members of a speech community to accomplish their purposes. According to the widely accepted theory of Canale and Swain(1980) (in:www.slaencyclopedia-10.wikispaces.com), communicative competence as a whole can be explained in terms of three component competences: grammatical competence, sociolinguistic competence and strategic competence.

Grammatical or linguistic competence involeves knowledge of the language code (grammar rules, vocabulary, pronunciation, spelling, etc.) It has been observed that language teaching has traditionally been aimed at developing this competence above all others. But as already stated, this is not enough to produce a communicatively competent language user.

Sociolinguistic competence is the ability to interpret the social meaning of the choice of linguistic varieties and to use language with the appropriate social meaning for the communication situation. It is the recognition and use of appropriate varieties of language in various social contexts. It takes cognisance of the target culture, the status of participants, the purpose of interaction, register, the topic area, function or purpose for communicating

(greeting, inviting, offering, apologising, rejecting an invitation, complaining, etc.), and so on. Appropriacy in language is culture-driven and varies according to societies. In the same language, what is appropriate in one culture may be completely different in another. Therefore, learners have to be aware of these differences in order to develop communicative competence.

Sociolinguistic competence is made up of two sets of rules: socio-cultural rules and rules of discourse. Socio-cultural rules specify ways of using language appropriately in a given situation. They are concerned with style, register, degree of politeness, and so on. Rules of discourse concern the combining of language structures to produce unified texts in different modes or situations. The focus here is on certain cohesion devices (grammatical links) and coherence rules (appropriate combination of communicative functions) to organise the forms and meanings.

Strategic competence refers to a person's ability to keep communication going when there is a communication breakdown or to enhance the effectiveness of the communication. It is the ''verbal and non-verbal communication strategies that may be called into action to compensate for breakdowns in communication due to performance variables or to insufficient competence'' (Canale and Swain,1980:30)(www.slaencyclopedia-10.wikispaces.com). They further observe that a lack of strategic competence may account for situations when students with a firm knowledge and a wide range of vocabulary get stuck and are unable to carry out their communicative intent.

It is being able to get one's message across through the use of a number of devices such as repetition, paraphrase, circumlocution, transfer, mime, topical avoidance, asking for help and pause fillers, among others (www. elearning.la.psu.edu/aplng/2/less). It involves strategies to be used when communication is difficult. It said to be the component of the communicative

competence that is most neglected by language course books and teachers. In the interviews being considered in this study, there is a preponderant use of pause fillers, especially by the non-native party, i.e. the interviewee.

Discourse competence refers to the way ideas are linked across sentences (in written discourse) or utterances(in spoken discourse). Two main aspects are relevant to discourse competence: First, Cohesion, which refers to how ideas are linked linguistically. For example, pronouns are used to refer to what or who has been mentioned previously. Another example is the use of an auxiliary verb as a substitute for the main verb, e.g. 'Do you work here?' 'Yes I do'. Second, Coherence: this refers to how the meanings of sentences or utterances are linked in written or spoken discourse. For example:

A: It's hot in here.

B: I'll open a window.

There is no grammatical or lexical link between the utterances, but the exchange has coherence because B understands that A is expressing discomfort and reacts accordingly. (www. elearning.la.psu.edu/aplng/2/less)

In the data used in this study, there are instances of both coherence and cohesion at work as the interlocutors converse.

2.1.4 Pragmatics

Pragmatics is essentially about the functioning of language in context, i.e. context of utterance. When a sentence is uttered, it is invariably uttered in a particular context, by a particular speaker for a particular purpose (Lycan, 1999). Many times, linguistic meaning does differ from speaker meaning. This fact, and the factors that bring it about, is what Pragmatics investigates.

The origin of Pragmatics has been traced to Charles Morris (1938) a philosopher and semiotician (semiotics is the study of signs and symbols). Pragmatics to him is the ‘‘relation of signs to their interpreters’’. According to Morris, Semiotics consists of Three (3) broad branches namely: **Syntax** being the formal relation of signs to one another; **Semantics** being the formal relations of signs to objects to which they refer and, **Pragmatics** being the formal relations of signs to interpreter (the language user).

Pragmatics, according to Crystal (2008:379), is ‘‘the study of language from the point of view of the users, especially of the choices they make, the constraints they encounter in using language in social interaction, and the effects their use of language has on the other participants in an act of communication.’’ This definition draws attention to what Pragmatics harps on i.e. the possibility of speaker meaning differing from sentence meaning.

To Spencer-Oates and Zegarac (2010:72), Pragmatics ‘‘is concerned with the study of the meaning that linguistic expressions receive in use.’’ This view of Pragmatics underscores the fact that expressions can take on new or extra meanings based on the particular contexts in which they are used. This is further highlighted by Meyer (2009:48) as follows: ‘‘interpretation of a sentence goes beyond understanding its meaning at the level of grammar. We need to understand the entire social context in which a sentence was uttered...the role that context plays in the interpretation of what people say.’’

Malmkjaer’s (1992:476) comprehensive definition juxtaposes Pragmatics with formal Linguistics.

> Pragmatics may be defined as the study of the rules and principles which govern language in use, as opposed to the abstract, idealized rules of, for instance, grammar and of the relationship between the abstract systems of language on the one hand, and language in use on the other.

Here Pragmatics is seen as practical, functional and realistic aspect of linguistics.Crystal (2008:379-380) identifies a number of derivative terms that reflect the wide-range of the subject matter involved in Pragmatics:

Pragmalinguisticshas been used by some to refer to the more linguistic 'end' of Pragmatics, wherein one studies these matters from the viewpoint of the structural resources available in a language. **SocioPragmatics**, by contrast, studies the way conditions on language use derive from the social situation. **General Pragmatics** is the study of the principles governing the communicative use of language, especially as encountered in conversations –principles which may be studied as putative universals, or restricted to the study of specific languages. **Literary Pragmatics** applies pragmatic notions (especially to do with narratives) to the production and reception of literary texts. **Applied Pragmatics** focuses on problems of interaction that arise in contexts wheresuccessful communication is critical, such as medical interviews, judicial settings,counselling and foreign-language teaching.

This is a broad view of Pragmatics. It is more or less the various ways of looking at Pragmatics depending on the area it is applied. Pragmatic principles are adapted and applied to areas of need. The present study, it appears, touches on all of these sub-categorisations of the subject matter, Pragmatics.

2.1.5 Speech Acts

The fact that actions are accomplished by means of speech is the crux of the Speech Act theory propounded by the British Philosopher, J.L. Austin (1962). Words are used to do things. That is why many times, attention is not on what is said, but what is done by means of what is said. Utterances are used as a means of achieving a particular aim. Speech Acts are actions accomplished through language (Finegan, 2012). Speech Acts consist of three parts, viz., locution, illocution and perlocution. An utterance with meaning is the locution. The

intended (and unintended) meaning of the utterance is the illocution. Examples of illocution include: promising, naming, threatening, warning, sentencing, inviting, congratulating, requesting and denying. The perlocution is the result, feeling, or thought arising from what the addressee understands the utterance to mean. It is pertinent to stress here that the perlocution is a function of the addressee's understanding of the illocution. Indeed, the reaction a speaker expects from his listener may not be obtained if the listener does not grasp the intention or illocution of the speaker, or if the listener wishes to ignore the locution.

Although, it is widely assumed that illocutions are the main component of the Speech Act theory, it is pertinent to state here that the three aspects are so fused that none can stand on its own. And if this is the case, then it is skew to say one is more important than the other. If at all there should be rating, then the locution should be ascribed more prominence. Without the locution, the illocution and the perlocution are inexistent. In the analysis of an interview, as in this study, for instance, you cannot begin to talk about the meaning and impact of what is said if nothing is said. It is after something has been uttered that its semantic and psychological significance can be appreciated.

Meyer (2009:51-54) further discusses Speech Acts and their types as follows:

Although speech act theorists have proposed three general types of Speech Acts (locution, illocution and perlocution), they are primarily interested in speaker intentions: the illocutionary force of utterances. To study this facet of human communication, various types of speech acts have been proposed. Below are five described in Searle's (1979) seminal book on Speech Acts:

> **Assertives**/**Representatives**: Utterances reporting statements of fact verifiable as true or false (e.g. I am old enough to vote; Columbus discovered Americain 1492; Water freezes at zero degrees centigrade).**Directives**: Utterances intended to get someone to do something (e.g. Stop shouting; Take out the garbage).**Commissives**: Utterances committing one to doing something (e.g. I promise to call you later; I'll write your letter of recommendation tomorrow). **Declarations**: Utterances bringing about a change in the state of affairs (e.g. I

now pronounce you husband and wife; I hereby sentence you to ten years in jail) **Expressives**: Utterances expressing speaker attitudes (e.g. That's a beautifuldress; I'm sorry for being so late)

A Speech Act, as Meyer further notes, can be **explicit** or **implicit**, **direct** or **indirect**, and **literal** or **non-literal**. If a speech act is explicit, it will contain a **performative verb**, a verb that names the speech act and has a very specific structure. For instance, even though both of the examples below are apologies (a type of expressive), only the first example contains a performative verb:

I was ill-mannered, and I apologize.

I'm sorry that I was late.

Apologize is a performative verb because it literally names the Speech Act that the sentence represents. In addition, it is in the present tense and occurs with a first person pronoun. If the subject and verb tense are changed, a very different sentence results, one in which no real apology is being made by the speaker but instead an apology given by somebody else at some other time is described:

He apologized for all the harm he'd done.

While I'm sorry that I was late is also an apology, here the apology is implicit because the verb am (contracted in I'm) does not fit the structural definition of a performative verb: the naming of the speech act is conveyed by the adjective sorry, not the verb am.

Speech acts can also be either direct or indirect. A speech act is direct if its intent is clearly conveyed by the words and structure of the utterance. For instance, each of the three examples below is a directive.

That's enough go away.

Will you go away.

I'm really uncomfortable with your being here now.

However, only the first example is a direct speech act because the directive, go away, is in the form of an imperativesentence, a form conventionally associated with a directive. The other two examples are indirect.

The second sentence is a yes/no question. Typically, such structures elicit a yes or no response. But in this context, the speaker is asking an individual to leave but in a less direct manner. The third example is even more indirect. It is in the form of a declarative sentence, a form most closely associated with, for instance, a representative. But in the appropriate context, this example too could have the intent of asking someone to leave, though its high level of indirectness would certainly leave room for ambiguity and potential misinterpretation. In English, indirectness is very common with directives and is typically associated with yes/no questions, particularly those of the form could you or would you:

Would you mind just moving the screen back

Could you grab me a box of tea

Indirectness in English is very closely associated with politeness, since issuing a directive requires various strategies for mitigating the act of trying to get someone to do something, an act that can be considered impolite if inappropriately stated.These excerpts from the data is one instance where the interviewer is very direct, and this directness is face threatening:

The Nigerian security forces have appeared impotent and the case exposed deep failings at the heart of the state....**(see appendix A, page 96)**

You have soldiers who are not paid. Who have said it themselves that they go hungry. They are not delivered the right kind of food. One told Reuters news agency in Borno recently. He said ' BH are much better equipped than we are....(see appendix A, page 100)

Speech Acts can be literal or non-literal. Many figures of speech in English are non-literal in the sense that the speaker does not really mean what he/she says. It is quite common in English for individuals to postpone saying or doing something by uttering an expression like

I'll explain why in a minute.

However, the person uttering this example does notliterally mean that his/her explanation will be forthcoming in preciselysixty seconds. Likewise, in

Yes, I know it's taken me forever to write you,

the speaker uses forever as a means of acknowledging that his/her letter has been long forthcoming. In other cases, literalness can be more ambiguous. For instance, it's quite common to open a conversation with an expression such as

So, howare you or How's everything

However, the person uttering these examples does not necessarily want to know how the addressee is feeling. And embarrassment can result if the addressee does indeed respond by telling the speaker how badly, for instance, he/she is feeling.

2.1.6 Politeness

Politeness as used in linguistic circle, concerns how interlocutors show regards for each other in their use of language. A speaker minds his utterances to ensure that feelings are not hurt or dignities ruffled. The matter of politeness is a give-and-take one. Mutual, reciprocal show of deference as required by the circumstances surrounding the speech situation is paramount for a successful communicative interchange. The concept of face in Pragmatics refers to someone's self image. Face is, therefore, one's emotional and social sense of self worth that one expects someone else to recognise (Yule, 2010). Leech (183:131) expatiates further:

> ...politeness concerns a relationship between two participants whom we may call self and other. In conversation, self will normally be identified with s (speaker) and other will typically be identified with h (hearer); but speakers also show politeness to third parties, who may or may not be present in the speech situation. The label other may therefore apply not only to addressees, but to people designated by third-person pronouns. The importance of showing politeness to third parties varies; a key factor is whether or not the third party is present as a bystander; another is whether the third party is felt to belong to s's or h' s sphere of influence.

This points out the fact that a show of politeness is not limited to the immediate interactants in a conversation; even third parties who may not be present during the exchange are also included. As a matter of fact, failure of a participant to show politeness to a third party, who may not even be present at the time of the talk, can hamper the present conversation. Impolite reference to third parties who are in some way positively connected to the person one is conversing with can affect the discourse adversely. Cautions such as ‘‘don’t say such a thing about him again’’, ‘‘please mind the way you talk about my...’’ point to the fact that politeness in conversations extend to third parties. This partly explains why a political adviser on an interview makes sure the government he represents is not unnecessarily denigrated in the interview, but rather accorded due respect and recognition. This is illustrated in this extract where the interviwee vehemently defends his government and country:

but it is a Nigerian problem and we will get a Nigerian solution to it. It may not conform to what the world thinks, but it’s a Nigerian solution and we’re Nigerians, we always get it right. We have always gotten it right....(see appendix A, page 103)

The concept of politeness may be discussed in conjunction with the concept of face, just as the Cooperative Principle goes hand in hand with the maxims. Consequently, Wardhaugh (2006:276) traces the origin of the concept of politeness in linguistic domains, noting that ‘‘the concept of politeness owes a great deal to Goffman’s original work...on face’’. Scollon and Scollon (2001:48) as cited by Wardhaugh (2006:276) assert that ‘‘There is no faceless communication’’. In other words, in every conversation, there is a conscious or subconscious regard for face. Otherwise, there will likely be a breakdown in communication. They further note that

> any communication is a risk to face; it is a risk to one’s own face, at the same time it is a risk to the other person’s. We have to carefully project a face for ourselves and to respect the face rights and claims of other participants....

This draws attention to the fact that as people converse, they do not pay attention to just their interlocutors' faces but they also respect their own faces. This way, they try not to say what can make them lose face. To protect personal face, an interviewer, for instance, will try not to ask a silly question while an interviewee will also try not to give a silly answer. Neither will try to do anything that will portray him/her in bad light. As it is in science, to every action there is an equal and opposite reaction, sometimes when an interviewee perceives the interviewer as trying to put him/her off balance by the manner of posing a question or type of question, he/she may also answer in such away as to portray the interviewer as unreasonable. Instances of this abound in the data being analysed in this study.

Wardhaugh (p.276) concurs with the view that speakers should respect their own faces and not just those of their listeners. He therefore observes that ''in social interaction, we present a face to others and to others' faces. We are obliged to protect both OUR OWN FACE (emphasis added) and the faces of others to the extent that each time we interact with others we play out a kind of mini-drama, a kind of ritual in which each party is required to recognise the identity that the other claims for himself or herself. As shown by the data used in this study, both the interviewer and the interviewee exhibit instances in which self regard is shown by each party. For example, instances where either the interviewer or the interviewee defends himself are cases of regard to self.

2.1.7 Positive and Negative Faces

Scholars such as Wardhaugh (2006), Mey (2001), Leech (1981) and Yule (2010), among others, identify two types of face: positive face and negative face. Simply put, positive face is the desire to win the approval of others; while negative face is the desire to be unimpeded by others in one's actions. Wardhaugh (2006:277) elaborates further saying

> When we interact with others we must be aware of both kinds of face and therefore have a choice of two kinds of politeness. Positive politeness leads

> to moves to achieve solidarity through offers of friendship, the use of compliments, and informal language use: we treat others as friends and allies, do not impose on them, and never threaten their face. On the other hand, negative politeness leads to deference, apologising, indirectness, and formality in language: we adopt a variety of strategies so as to avoid any threats to the face others are presenting to us.

In the following extract, for instance, the interviewer appeals to the positive face of the interviewee:

My guest today is Wole Soyinka. Nigerians know him as a writer who defied persecution and imprisonment to champion the cause of independence against colonisers of democracy, against dictatorship.(see appendix B, page 107)

Finegan (2012) notes that there are two basic aspects of expressing politeness. The first is hinged on the fact that human beings respect each other's privacy, independence, and physical space. Intrusion on other people's lives is avoided, trying not to be overly inquisitive about their activities and taking care not to impose one's presence on others. Their independence must be respected. This is generally referred to as negative politeness, but Finegan appears to prefer the term independence politeness. On the other hand, he further notes that, expressions that let people know that one enjoys their company, feels comfortable with them, likes something about their personality, or are interested in their well-being, show involvement. This aspect is known as positive politeness but he terms it involvement politeness.

Finegan's terms independence politeness and involvement politeness are, to me, more apt than the terms negative and positive politeness. He notes that everyone expects both involvement and independence. The first requires one to leave people alone while the second requires one to do the opposite. Respecting other people's needs for privacy, demonstrates independence politeness; showing sympathy and interest expresses involvement politeness. When one prefers to be alone, one expects others to respect one's independence. But when one attends a party or is involved in a form of group activity, one expresses and expects involvement and recognition.

Leornardi (2010) observes that the politeness principle is considered an offshoot of the Cooperative Principle and is widely credited to Brown and Levinson (1978/1987) who hypothesise a Model Person endowed with rationality and face. In order to theorise a set of universal principles shared by all languages in communication, Brown and Levinson hypothesise a Model Person endowed with rationality and face. They distinguish between negative face, which refers to interlocutors' need of not being impeded in whatever they want to do; and positive face, that is, the need for social approval. They note that Face Threatening Acts (FTAs) can target both the positive and the negative faces. Those against the positive face criticise, ridicule, or show irreverence towards the hearer; while requests and orders may threaten the hearer's negative face.

The theory has not escaped criticisms. Christie (2000) in Leornardi(2010)claims that the problem with Brown and Levinson's (politeness) theory is its abstraction from a socio-cultural context of a Model Person assumed to be sharing the same rationality and face with all human beings, irrespective of their class, gender, and culture. In addition, variables such as race, class, and age, influence both the production and interpretation of politeness.

2.1.8 Face-Threatening and Face-Saving Acts

The need to save face is recognised by languages and is an important pragmatic concept in human interaction deriving from Far-Eastern notions of deference and politeness (Mey, 2001). Linguistic interaction, however, threatens interlocutors' face, and this is whyspeakers use linguistic strategies that express solidarity and minimise potential threats both for themselves and the hearers (Leonardi, 2010).

A threat to your self esteem constitutes face threatening act. A face-saving act that recognises another person's negative face will be concerned about his need not to be imposed, harassed or insulted. Thus, the need to use such expressions as "I'm sorry to bother you…" "I just couldn't help asking if…." "I know you're busy but…" etc. A face-saving act that

emphasises a person's positive face will show solidarity and be mindful of a common goal, tendency or a common weakness.

In this study, for instance, the interviewer asks the politician 'Why has your government failed to tackle the problem of insurgency?' This may constitute a face threatening act since there is already an assumption that the government in question has failed. The interviewee in turn answers in such a way as to save his face as he will not admit his government has failed.

Face-threatening acts occur in diverse ways in an interview. Tilney (2015:181) cites Fairclough (1985) as enumerating five forms of face-threatening acts in interviews. He notes that since interviews are unequal interactions, the interviewer has the power to open and close the interview and initiate turns. The interviewee, on the other hand, is expected to cooperate by answering the interviewer's questions. The smoothness of this interaction and the adherence to the interview format, achieved by the participants' fulfilment of their assigned roles, is what Fairclough calls orderliness.

Fairclough refers to the five face-threatening acts as instances of disorderliness. They include instances where: 1. the interviewee interrupts the interviewer; 2. the interviewee challenges the interviewer's questions rather than answering them; 3. the interviewee questions the interviewer; 4. the interviewee questions the interviewer's sincerity; 5. the interviewee maintains a different orientation by using the lexis of a different peer group.

One glaring problem with Faclough's classification of instances of interruptions or what he calls disorderliness in interviews is that it is tilted towards the interviewee. Disorders in interviews do not only emanate from the interviewee's moves. The interviewer's interruptions are also sources of disorderliness in interviews. Also, items three and four can be subsumed under item two as they are also instances of challenging the interviewer. Another fact is that it is not all interruptions that can be described as disorders. Some forms of interruptions do not challenge but concur with the speaker's views. An example of this is

in cases of simultaneous speech where the listener anticipates, agrees with and helps to complete the speaker's utterance.

2.1.9Cooperative Principle versus Politeness Principle

The Cooperative Principle is the unspoken pact that language users adhere to and expect others to adhere to in most, normal conversational exchanges. It is associated with Paul Grice, a Philosopher. It consists of four maxims: quantity, quality, relevance and manner (Finegan, 2012).

> **Quantity**: Make your contribution as informative as is required for the current purpose of the exchange: Do not make your contribution more informative than is required. **Quality**: Do not say what you believe to be false; do not say that for which you lack evidence. **Relation**: Be relevant. **Manner**: Avoid obscurity of expression. Avoid ambiguity; be brief; be orderly.

There appears to be some points of convergence between the Politeness Principle and the Cooperative Principle. It is when interlocutors cooperate that politeness becomes part of the conversation. It is doubtful whether there can be politeness without cooperation. The Cooperative principle is, therefore, necessary for the occurrence of the Politeness principle. By adhering to the Cooperative Principle, interlocutors try to build up each other's positive faces and try not to threaten their negative faces (Mey, 2001). The following exchange taken from the data shows cooperation between interviewer and interviewee:

S: Do you agree with your most successful businessman in all Nigeria, in all Africa, Mr Dangote said the other day that ' If we don't tackle the roots of this insurgency, it threatens the very integrity, the very future of Nigeria,' do you agree?

D: I agree. We've got to get over this. This is the greatest challenge of this generation of Nigerians. But I tell you, it's a Nigerian problem we're going to find a Nigerian solution. We're gonna get over it. We've always gotten over everything that has plagued us. And we will get over this.(see appendix A, page107)

Juxtaposing the maxim of quantity with the politeness phenomena, Grundy (2000:146) remarks that ‘‘... it is very often the case that politeness phenomena depart from the principle of maximal economy of utterance – if by maximal economy we mean uttering only the proposition to be conveyed.’’ In other words, Grundy is saying that in order to be polite, speakers are usually explicit and elaborate. This may therefore not always conform to some of the Gricean maxims, for example that of manner which urges brevity.

Interestingly, it appears that the Cooperative Principle and its maxims are in conflict with the concept of face as associated with the Politeness Principle. When an interlocutor is confronted with a face-threatening act, he/she may be forced to disregard any of the maxims to avoid losing face. Again, maids, servants or subordinates may not be able to tell their boss to his/her face that he/she is lying even when the boss in question is actually doing so. The need to save face can, therefore, impinge on the maxim of quality, for instance.

It is usual for politicians to, even in interviews, employ vague, indirect and ambiguous expressions when confronted with certain issues. This act clearly violates the maxim of manner. The maxims, therefore, are not rules cast in stone: they are forced to bend under certain conditions. Just like a mother who tells an ailing child going to have some injections that they are going to buy some biscuits, a politician may understandably not be explicit or blunt about certain issues especially those having to do with national security. This is expedient. In the case of the mother and her child, even if some biscuits are bought for the child before or after the injection, the maxim of quantity and quality remain flouted. The need for tact can, therefore, negate adherence to the Cooperative maxims. And Leech identifies tact as a type of politeness, though one that has become trite. In the following exchange taken from the data, there is tact in the interviewee’s response:

ER: Let me put you... about corruption, what the President Jonathan said. He said this a few days ago. He said, ‘over 70% of what called corruption is not corruption but common

stealing. Corruption is perception not reality.' Do you think that is correct or is it just semantics?

EE: Em, you know, er, English is a foreign language and one has to make allowances for how individuals and groups use a language, er, especially when the language being foreign is convenient for the evading realities and responsibilities of governance. For Heaven's sake, I ask you, when we talk of corruption, material corruption, and somebody says it's not corruption we have to deal with but stealing, now what does that tell you? Either a total lack of understanding of the society you live in or an attempt to confuse your listener.(see appendix B, page 108)

2.1.9.0 Politeness and Context

Context can be conceived as the situation, within which language functions. It could be physical/environmental, social context or institutional situation, including events, time, culture or social conventions that can influence language use. Since Pragmatics is concerned with context-based meaning, it will be impossible to talk about Pragmatics without reference to the context in which utterances are made.

Leech (1983) views context as any background knowledge that is assumed to be shared by interlocutors and which contributes to the hearer's interpretation of what the speaker means by a given utterance. Leech's mention of ''background knowledge'' is said to cater for all kinds of context one can talk about. Some scholars also view context as the link between linguistic items and the social and situational factors of communication (Ogunsiji and Farinde, 2012)

Politeness is very sensitive to context. Context influences the nature or degree of politeness exhibited by interactants. This is predicated upon the fact that the level of politeness shown may be reflective of the relationship existing between the speaker and the addressee, among

other factors. The dependency of politeness on context is highlighted in the following example by Grundy (2000:147)

> ...we would expect one person, perhaps someone who happened to be sitting next to us in a lecture and whom we didn't know all that well to say Could I just borrow a tiny bit of paper. And we would expect a different person, perhaps an older brother, to put the request in the more direct way: Give me a sheet of paper. If we do not see the relationship between ourselves and the person who addresses us as they do, we will be upset by the strategies they employ, since these strategies imply the nature of our relationship as they see it.

This might explain why informal, direct language is usually used with people who are close to each other whereas formal and more elaborate language is employed with people between whom there is more distance. Different kinds and degrees of politeness are called for in different situations (Leech, 1983).

Context influences what people say, how they say it and how others interpret what they say (Ogunsiji and Farinde, 2012). To add to this, context can also explain why people say what they say. For instance, a woman being interviewed live on the radio who is asked whether she is happy with the man she married may answer in the affirmative, but to the same question, she can say no when asked in private by, for example, her mother. Lycan (1999) observes that truth can be relativised to contexts and that the number of context variables that can affect truth-value may be indeterminable. The truth of a sentence does vary with context. 'I am sick now' is only true at a particular time and with regard to a particular speaker, for example.

As a matter of fact, certain expressions that are said to be 'meaningless', when properly situated within particular contexts may yield some reasonable level of semantic significance. Taking Chomsky's popular example Colourless green ideas sleep furiously, the following ratiocination may not be totally inconsequential:

Two friends are chatting. One tells the other that he is ruminating on some very incredible ideas but which are still green (not fully developed). He adds that, though the ideas may be described as sleeping, they are actually disturbing or bugging his mind. And the friend asks what the ideas are really like. And he replies saying they are still colourless (have no clear description yet). Then the friend jokingly, but cleverly, says 'so one might say you are disturbed by colourless green ideas that sleep furiously!' and they laugh.

The example above is just to highlight the 'powers' of context in extracting meaning from what formal linguistics may adjudge meaningless or nonsensical. Context can imbue meaning to seemingly nonsensical utterances. If a child utters 'food me eat' a reasonable adult would not dismiss it as ungrammatical and meaningless, but will rather employ the provisions of context and understand that the child is either requesting food or reporting that he/she ate or has eaten food. The context makes the utterance meaningful albeit ungrammatical. This is why some Pragmaticians deemphasise grammar and focus on speaker meaning, i.e. what the speaker is trying to communicate. Discarding utterances because they flout the 'sacred' rules of grammar may just be like throwing out the baby with the bathwater.

Now, this is not to say that Pragmatics undermines or discourages Grammar. Rather, in a situation where Grammar, for one reason or the other, is lacking, it advocates for speaker meaning; what he/she intends to communicate. Must we become slaves of Grammar or fail to communicate when there is imperfection in grammar? Surely, communication can take place with or without Grammar and its hallowed 'thou shalt not's! This fact may explain why the interviewer in this study, being a native speaker of the English language, does not correct any of the grammatical slips of the interviewee, a second language user. The message being communicated is understood, not being impinged by minor grammatical flaws. It is pertinent to state that under normal circumstances, most of such flaws can be avoided or corrected by

the interviewee. The grammatical blunder in the following extract, for instance, does not undermine the meaning of the utterance:

I can't take some of these informations (sic) as credible. It was Reuters that broke the news that the President was going to go to Chibok and it was not true.(see appendix A, page 100)

In every communicative encounter, there is always, in one way or the other, an asymmetry in language proficiency among the interlocutors. This is what Nzeakor and Akano (2013:223) try to elucidate thus:

> Though, every man born in (a) human environment possesses language, but (sic) language is not used with the same expertise and dexterity by (all) human beings. There is always variation in the use of language which may emanate from idiolectal, dialectal, occupational, regional, sociolectal, attitudinal and so on reasons.

This is very true. There are factors that account for variations in individuals' use of language. In this study, one glaring factor of difference between the interviewer and the interviewee is regional. The interviewer is a European while the interviewee is an Africa.

2.1.9.1 Politeness and Culture

As Finnegan (2012) rightly observes, culture-specific norms determine when and where independence politeness and involvement politeness behaviours are appropriate. This is because the organisation and realisation of politeness behaviour in conversations differs from one culture to another. This is why miscommunication of intent across cultures is common.

Maintaining eye contact, for instance, is a form of conversational etiquette required in some cultures, such as the English, whereas the same practice is adjudged impolite in another culture, such as what obtains in most African cultures. There are, however, other factors that affect this norm. Age is one. Another is social distance or status. In some cultures, the young should not look atthe elderly in the eyes when they are conversing. The culture that demands

eye contact in conversation may consider it a sign of attentiveness, involvement and interest while the culture that disallows it, especially between interlocutors of socially asymmetric relation, considers it impolite and an affront. It appears that languages have their peculiar ways of expressing politeness as part of their linguistic behaviour.

2.1.9.2 Selectional and Presentational Politeness

It has been observed that the occurrence of politeness is not limited to spoken discourse. Politeness principles operate in written texts, as well. Sell (2000) in Leonardi (2010) identifies two modes of politeness in written texts: Selectional politeness and Presentational politeness. Selectional politeness is concerned with the writer's diction i.e. choice of appropriate words and expressions that convey politeness. Presentational politeness is evaluated in the light of the Gricean Cooperative Principle based on the maxims. Presentational politeness is concerned with how cooperative the writer is with the reader in the light of the Gricean maxims. Both forms of politeness are said to be historical and culture-sensitive since what is considered impolite in one period may not appear so to readers in some other social and cultural milieu.

It does appear, however, that politeness in written texts is one-sided, originating from and hinging only on the writer. But then, the reader can also express politeness or otherwise to the writer albeit indirectly. If, for instance, the reader judges the writer to be impolite, he/she may respond to this by, say, throwing away the text or criticising the manner in which it is presented. So then it really does appear there is politeness at work even in written texts. The major difference may be that it is not immediate and direct as in spoken conversations. In this study, the transcription of spoken text is used examined.

2.1.9.3 Politeness Maxims

Leech (1983:132) itemises several maxims which he calls the maxims of the Politeness Principle and considers them to go in pairs. He juxtaposes them with Searle's classification of illocutions. Assertives are utterances that commit the speaker to the truth of the propositions. They include: stating, boasting, suggesting, complaining, claiming and reporting. All these are observed in the data used in this study. Assertives are said to be politeness neutral, except for boasting. Leech further groups assertives into what he calls collaborative, i.e. utterances whose illocutions are indifferent to social goals of establishing and maintaining comity. Directives are intended to effect some action in the hearer. Examples are: requesting, ordering, commanding, advising, asking, demanding and recommending. He also gives this group of illocutions a term – competitives, i.e. those whose illocutionary goals conflict with the social goal. Apart from invitations, directives/competitives require negative politeness as they are 'impositives'. Commissives commit the speaker to some future actions. They include: promising, vowing, offering. Since they are performed in the interest of the hearer rather than the speaker, leech sees them as being more of 'convivials' than competitives. Convivials include offers, greetings, invitations, thanks and congratulations whose illocutionary goals coincide with the social goals.

Expressives reveal the speaker's psychological attitude towards a state of affairs expressed by the propositions. Examples are condoling, congratulating, praising, pardoning, blaming and thanking. Except for blaming and accusing, expressives are convivial and intrinsically polite, just like commissives. Declaratives, when successfully performed, are illocutions that bring about the correspondence between the propositional content and reality. They are institutional rather than personal acts and can scarcely involve politeness. Christening, sentencing, excommunicating, naming, dismissing, resigning, baptising and appointing are examples. He

further notes that in general, directives call for negative politeness while commissives and expressives basically contain positive politeness.

From the data for this study, it appears that many of the utterances of both the interviewer and the interviewee are assertives. Allegations are made, usually by the interviewer and then countered or admitted by the interviewee. For example, when the interviewee says:

> ***but it is a Nigerian problem and we will get a Nigerian solution to it. It may not comform to what the world thinks, but it's a Nigerian solution and we're Nigerians, we always get it right. We have always gotten it right...even when people gave up on us, we always got it right {he is clapping}, that is what makes us Nigerians*...(see appendix A, page 103),**

he (DoyinOkupe) has made some bold assertion about his country and its people.

Directives are also common in radio interviews, as the data for this study further shows. However, they occur as requests, questions, etc., rather than orders. Orders as a class of directives are face- threatening, especially when they are direct. In the following extract from the data (see appendix), the interviewer challenges the interviewee's preceding assertion and by so doing directs him to expatiate:

> ***So when Amnesty International, Human Rights Watch, the US government and Nigerian media as well, all report that in recent months your security forces have been responsible for not just dozens but hundreds of extra-judicial killings; that they routinely detain and beat suspects—people they believe to be from BH—across the north-east of your country. That is part of getting it right, is it?(see appendix A, page 103)***

Directives do not only come from the interviewer. As observed in this study, the interviewee sometimes makes demands on the interviewer, albeit rhetorically. The lines with emphasis in the following excerpt show how an interviewee can issue a form of directive i.e. questioning the interviewer:

> ***Yeah, but then, but then, but then you have to win this war first. You cannot rebuild, you cannot rehabilitate, you cannot bring money,***

youcannot do anything unless there is peace. I MEAN IF I ASK YOU AS AN EXPATRIATE, 'COME TO BORNO STATE, COME AND HELP ME ESTABLISH A SCHOOL,' WOULD YOU GO?(see appendix A, page 105)

Thus, Leech's paired tact maxims include: **Tactmaxim**: minimise cost to other/ maximise benefit to other. This maxim is said to be relevant in impositives and commissives. **Generositymaxim**: (for impositives and commissives) minimise benefit to self/ maximise cost to self. **Approbationmaxim**: minimise the dispraise of other/ maximise praise of other. This maxim is appropriate in expressives and assertives. **Modestymaxim**: minimise praise of self / maximise dispraise of self. This is suitable in expressives and assertives. **Agreementmaxim**: minimise disagreement between self and other/ maximise agreement between self and other. This is particularly for assertives. **Sympathymaxim**: minimise antipathy between self and other/ maximise sympathy between self and other.

In sum, the maxims reveal that politeness is basically geared towards others more than to self. However, a speaker does not have to downgrade himself so as to be polite to others. It does appear that the Golden Rule should here apply: treat others as you would like to be treated. But in interviews, as in the present study, a typical politician is not likely to minimise self praise or praise of the government he/she represents. This runs contrary to the modesty maxim. In addition, a critical interviewer is not likely to 'maximise' praise of a politician being interviewed or the government he/she represents. Indeed political interviews are a classical instance where Leech's politeness tact maxims are, more often than not, flagrantly flouted.

Yet, just like the maxims of the Cooperative Principle, Leech's maxims of the Politeness Principle are not cast in stone. They are largely affected by context. This is why Mey (2008:177) hints that language rules are not always considered sacrosanct. He therefore contends that ''As users, we can, within limits, make and break the rules of language: for

instance, we can choose not to be polite, and 'flout' the Politeness Principle, if our circumstances are such that we think our aims and goals are better realised by not being polite''. It is pertinent to note that Mey recognises that this breaking of rules can only be done ''within limits''. There is therefore no licence for anyone to purposelessly and arbitrarily undermine grammatical rules or linguistic principles of communication.

2.1.9.4 Utterance Meaning versus Sentence Meaning

In Pragmatics, emphasis is more on utterance meaning rather than sentence meaning. An utterance, though, can be a sentence. An utterance need not be syntactically perfect the same way we expect a sentence to be. A sentence usually satisfies some basic grammatical rules, such as subject/verb/complement structural pattern. An utterance on the other hand, need not always be a sentence. It could also be a word, a phrase, an exclamation. Their functions or the intention of the speaker in uttering them is what is important. While sentence meaning is a function of the words in the sentence together with the overall sense of the sentence, utterance meaning relies much more on the intention of the utterance in relation to the context. Pragmatics stresses utterances rather than sentences; utterance functions and goals rather than grammaticalness, and the kind of cultures/conventions which influence how language users encode and interpret meaning. This study focuses on utterance meaning, basically.

Many people mistakenly think that complete sentences are the norm in both speech and writing. However, Meyer (2009:50) cites Carter and Cornbleet (2001: 3) as having correctly observed that "We do not set out to speak in sentences – in fact, in informal speech we rarely do that – rather, we set out to achieve a purpose which may or may not require full, accurate sentences." Therefore, when discussing Pragmatics, linguists tend to avoid labels such as

sentence, instead preferring to describe the constructions under discussion as utterances, a category that includes not just sentences but any construction that is meaningful in the context in which it occurs.

Radford, Atkinson, Britain, Clahsen, & Spencer, (2009:389) distinguish between sentence utterance and proposition thus: A sentence is a (grammatical) string of words. When a sentence is spoken or written on an occasion, we have an utterance (of that sentence). Sentences are abstract objects which exist outside of time and place. Utterances are concrete manifestations of sentences and each utterance is unique. A proposition is the meaning expressed by (some utterance of) the sentence. To get a complete specification of the proposition expressed by an utterance of a sentence containing a pronoun, we need to take into account an aspect of the context, namely, the identity of the person making the utterance. In the following example, from the data, the antecedents of the pronouns occurring in the utterance may not be easily identified when the utterance is considered in isolation:

> ***D: I agree. We've got to get over this. This is the greatest challenge of this generation of Nigerians. But I tell you, it's a Nigerian problem we're going to find a Nigerian solution. We're gonna get over it. We've always gotten over everything that has plagued us. And we will get over this.(see appendix A, page 107)***

But when the interviewer's turn which necessitated the response is brought into the picture, (as done below) it provides an immediate context which goes a long way in situating and identifying the pronouns. This way, the whole utterance and its proposition become meaningful.

> ***S: [interrupting] Here's what might be a joke to some Nigerians: the fact that the Governor of the Central Bank alleges corruption in the state petroleum company and lo and behold within weeks he is detained; he is suspended from his...(see appendix A, page 106)***

2.1.9.5 Implicature

Speakers usually mean more than they say. This is a pragmatic fact. Interlocutors usually draw from a number of inferential tools to arrive at what is actually meant, by what is uttered. Shared background knowledge, assumption that the Cooperative Principle is at work, linguistic and paralinguistic features that accompany speech, tone (and other supra-segmental features of speech),and common sense, are all incorporated in processing speech to arrive at meaning. The fact that interactants do not need to say everything they mean, but rather try to mean everything they intend, by being as brief as possible, is the wisdom expressed by William Shakespeare thus: ‘‘brevity is the soul of wit’’. How implicatures impact on politeness vis-a-vis face, is part of what this study is out to investigate.

The concept of implicature is associated with Grice (1975). Implicatures are covert, beneath-the-surface meaning of utterances. They may be described as the meant that is not obvious from the said. Implicatures are an integral part of conversations. They are the implied meaning of expressions. More often than not, implicatures seem to arise from failure to ‘cooperate’ and a break of the Gricean Maxims.

There are two types of implicature: conversational implicature and conventional implicature.Conversational implicatureis a message that is not found in the plain sense of what is uttered. The speaker impliesit. The hearer is able to infer this message in the utterance by appealing to the rules governing successful conversational interaction.Implicature is a component of speakermeaning that constitutes an aspect of what is meant without necessarilybeing part of what is said. It refers to how hearers manage to work out the complete message when speakers mean more than they say.

In conversational implicature, utterances acquire additional meaning from the usual meaning of the words used. Consider the short exchange below:

X: Your mother is here again.

Y: To hell with her! I don't want to set my eyes on her.

To grasp the meaning of the conversation, context is indispensable. Ordinarily, one will understand 'mother' to mean one's female parent, in this use, however, it has been imbued with meaning beyond convention. It actually refers to the speaker's girlfriend with whom he has fallen out. This shows that without the actual context in which they occur, utterances can be misconstrued. Again, it is because of shared background knowledge that the interlocutors understand the coded meaning of their utterances.

Conventional Implicature: Conventional implicature is largely independent of the cooperative principle and its four maxims. A statement always carries its conventional implicature. It is derived largely from the linguistic form and content of the expression. No recourse to the maxims is necessary. For example,

Elisah is rich **but** begs.

This implies that being rich and begging are not compatible. The conventional interpretation of the word "but" creates the implicature of a sense of contrast. Therefore, Elisah is rich but still begs necessarily implies "Surprisingly Elisah begs in spite of being rich".

Points of Divergence: conversational and conventional implicatures are different in certain ways. Some lines of demarcation may be drawn between the two as follows.

- Conventional implicature is derived from the conventional meanings of words in conversation. The use of such words like 'some', 'much' and 'many', for example, naturally carry some conventional implicatures. Consider the following: The labourer did **muchof** the work. This implies, "The labourer did not do **all** the work." But

conversational implicature is more an issue of speaker meaning rather than conventional meaning.

- Again, conventional implicature is largely semantic (intra-linguistic) in nature whereas conversational implicature is basically pragmatic (consideration of the extra-linguistic context is paramount).
- Furthermore, conventional impicature can be understood by persons other than the interlocutors, but conversational implicature is best interpreted by the interlocutors themselves or perhaps and to some extent, those who share the same background knowledge with them.
- In addition, conventional implicature can operate independently of the Cooperative Principle/ the Maxims, but there must be cooperation among interactants for successful interpretation of conversational implicatures embedded in utterances.
- All things being equal, meaning is explicit in conventional implicatures but covert and implicit in conversational implicatures.

Points of Convergence: though different in some ways, conversational and conventional implicatures have certain common features. These are itemised below.

- Both make use of linguistic signs and symbols.
- Both are concerned with meaning explication,
- there are interlocutors in both, i.e. speaker(s) and listener(s);
- both are situated within contexts, albeit differently;
- both are different forms of the same concept(i.e. implicature)

So far, it is clear that conversational implicature arises when a speaker deliberately flouts a conversational maxim and/ or uses words outside their conventional domain. Such

usageconveys an additional meaning to what is expressed literally. The meaning can only be recovered when the original context in which the expression was made is brought to bear. Conventional implicature, on the other hand, are the implied conventional meanings of words and expressions. Such meanings are basically linguistic/ semantic rather than pragmatic.

In radio interviews, both the utterances of the interviewer and those of the interviewee usually carry some implicatures. If an interviewer, for instance, asks a government official of a country, ***'where is the leadership capable of rescuing Africa's most populous nation?'*** (see appendix A, page 97) there is an implicature that the present government is incapable, otherwise there would be no need asking or looking for a capable leader or government. Exploring how face threats arise from the implied meanings of what is uttered is part of the interest of this work.

2.1.9.6 Discourse, Discourse Analysis, Turn- Taking, Act, Move, Exchange

Discourse refers to language in use (Osisanwo, 2003). It is situated language use. It includes spoken and written conversations. Discourse analysis is the analysis of situational language use. It is an aspect of text analysis. Speaking on the importace of text analysis, Abdulrasheed (2011:23) notes that 'Text analysis reveals the link between grammar and linguists'. Linguists analyse grammar to extract meaning. Grammar is part of the raw material for linguistic analysis.

''A turn is each occasion that a speaker speaks'' (Sencer-Oates and Zegarac, 2010). Turns are taken based on nomination or selection usually by the current speaker or when another participant selects himself or herself. In a situation where a participant is not selected by the current speaker and he/she does not select himself or herself, the current speaker may simply continue. There are specific linguistic devices for getting the turn when one is not selected

but wants to come in. These strategies vary based on the level of formality and appropriateness to situations. There are also conventionally-based methods of taking the turn of the current speaker by using expressions such as 'I wonder if I might say something', 'Can I just come in here', 'Hang on a minute', etc (McCarthy, 1991). Back-channel responses are linguistic means of not taking the turn when one has the opportunity, or simply of making it clear that the message is being attended to. They are mainly subvocalisations such as mm, ah-ah and short phrases like yeah, no, right, sure. Back-channel realisations may vary according to culture and the particular language being used. McCarthy (1991:127) further notes that ''Natural conversational data can often seem chaotic because of back-channel, utterance completion and overlaps...''.

Transactions are composed of exchanges, moves and acts. A typical example is the eliciting exchange which has three moves: an initiating move, a responding move and a follow-up or feedback move (IRF). An exchange contains acts and moves. Moves contain acts. An act is a local micro-action such as nominating, acknowledging, etc. (McCarthy, Mattliessen& Slade, 2010)

2.1.9.7 Transition Relevance Places

Radford, Atkinson, Britain, Clahsen, & Spencer, (2009:401) add that to manage the progress of talk, there is the need to manage who takes a turn at various stages; in other words, we need to understand the mechanics of turn-taking. Talkers don't take up their turn at random places. Rather, there are transition relevance places (TRPs), that is, places where a second person can take up the talk. One obvious TRP is when there is a noticeable silence, but this is not the only type. Whenever such a place occurs in the talk, the current speaker has the option of selecting the next talker. If the speaker doesn't make a specific selection, then anyone can take over. If no one takes over, the speaker has the option of continuing.

2.1.9.8 Overlapping

Overlapping talk is simultaneous talk where someone starts talking while another person is still talking. It usually occurs when a participant predicts the present speaker's utterance and tries to complete it for him/her. It appears that while overlapping/simultaneous talk is complimentary and concurring interruption is particularly obtrusive and attacking. In other words, while overlapping talk may show that the listener is flowing with the speaker's line of thought, an interruption appears to have negative connotations and interpretation.

2.1.9.9 Interruption

Although Spencer-Oates and Zegarac (2010) assert that ''Neither back- channels nor completions or overlaps are normally perceived as interruptions or as rude... they represent cooperative activity by participants to facilitate communication,'' most speakers do not really like to be interrupted. This is why, more often than not, there is an apology before an interruption. Interruptions may be construed as devious means of preventing a speaker from saying something the interrupter may not want him/her to say.

2.1.9.9 The Media/ BBC HARDtalk Interview

The media are organisations that mainly deal with matters of information dissemination in society. 'Media' refers to the various methods that enable humans to communicate. When media such as television, radio newspapers, etc., are used to communicate to a very large

number of people at the same time, they are known as ‘mass media’. ‘‘Some of these... have become sophisticated tools, capable of persuading and influencing large numbers of people’’ (Clifford, 1999:8). The media wield a great influence on the populace. They may also be manipulated by powerful persons or groups to suit their interests. This fact further underscores the need for a study as this.

As van Dijk (2000) in Tilney (2015:180) points out, ‘‘media discourse is the main source of people’s knowledge, attitudes and ideologies, and despite freedom of the press, media elites control these sources of information’’. This draws attention to the power of the media. People’s minds and perceptions are affected by what is presented in the media. Their views and thoughts about issues are partly shaped by the media.

Schiffrin (1994:160) in Urbanova (1998) states that the function of interviews is ‘‘information gaining’’ and reflect ‘‘a desire to resolve an asymmetrical distribution of information’’ based on an asymmetrical power distribution. The basic pattern used in interviews is thus the typical question-answer schema. This implies that interviews are one means by which information flows from those that have (more of) it to those who have less of it (or none at all) but need it. The fact that it is based on an asymmetrical power distribution also implies that the amount of such information delivered depends on the number of questions the interviewer asks and the time the interviewee is allowed to respond, among other factors.

Radio interviews are used to obtain the views or opinions of people who may be considered as experts or having knowledge in a particular matter or area of human endeavour. Radio interviews are usually face-to-face or one-on-one verbal interactions aimed at eliciting information from those who should give it. A radio interview is dyadic; there is the interviewer and there is the interviewee.

Montgomery (2008) as cited by Tilney (2015) observes that overhearing audience and pre-allocation of roles are two prominent features of the media interviews including those on the radio. The overhearing audience are the people listening who do not usually take any direct part in the interview except when it is a phone-in. Although the audience may appear passive, they are actually the 'consumers' of the programme.

In the case of this study, the BBC's radio interviews selected feature Africans and African affairs, and the audience are mixed. Africans and non-Africans can have access to the information provided. So what is discussed on such a platform informs and educates both Africans and non-Africans about Africa in general, and the affected region or country in particular. This partly explains why the (African) interviewees are very careful not to portray their countries or Africa in bad light, even if the interviewer appears to do this.

The pre-allocation of roles refers to the fact of the interviewer asking the questions and largely controlling the turns, while the interviewee answers the questions. But things do not always go in this conventional direction. Sometimes the interviewee can and does influence the whole interview process, as observed in this study.

Cotter (2003:424) in Schiffrin, Tannen and Hamilton (2003) observes that the ubiquity of media language and its easy accessibility make it a natural data source for linguists interested in the component of language and discourse and for other researchers interested in accessing the effects of language on culture. The media context produces unique manifestations of language and discourse, the study of which enriches our understanding of the media as well as of discourse behaviour. The media sets a standard for language use, be it to enhance social position or to bond with others.BBC English in Britain, network English in the US, and news English in the Philippines are considered targets for prestigious usage. To study media discourse, then is to work to make sense of a great deal of what makes up our world.

According to Adler R.B. and Rodman, G (1988:7) Communication plays a central role in human existence. They identify the following as functions of communication:

Physical needs: Poor communication can contribute to coronary disease. Communication is so important that it is necessary for physical health. In fact, evidence suggests than an absence of satisfying communication can even jeopardize life itself. Communication enables us to survive; socially isolated people are said to be two to three times more likely to die prematurely than those with strong social ties. The type of relationship does not seem to matter: marriages, friendship , religious and community ties all seem to increase longevity. The important point here is that personal communication is essential for our well- being.

Ego needs: Communication is one way we learn who we are. Our sense of identify comes from the way we interact with other people. Deprived of communication with others, we would have no sense of identity. We decide who we are based on how others react to us: each of us enters the world with little or no sense of identity. We gain an idea of who we are from the way others define us.

Social Needs: By communicating, we strive to fulfil three types of social needs: **Inclusion**: The need to feel a sense of belonging to some personal relationship from both formal and informal relationships. **Desire for Control**: the desire to influence others, to feel some sense of power over our world. **The Need for Affection**: a desire to care for others and be cared for.

Practical Needs: this encompasses every use of language:learning, interacting,relating,etc.

HARDtalk is BBC World News' flagship current affairs interview. It is a platform on which socio-political issues are discussed with people who are in the know. It features high-ranking politicians (including presidents) and human rights activists, among others. Its aim is to try to clarify issues and provide information on matters of socio-political significance.

In the UK, HARDtalk is broadcast on the BBC News Channel on Mondays, Tuesdays, Wednesdays and Fridays at 00.30 and 04.30am.The programme can also be seen on BBC Two at 10.35am on Tuesdays and Thursdays. One can also catch up on recent editions of the programme in the UK on BBC iPlayer. Outside the UK, HARDtalk is broadcast Monday to Thursday on BBC World News. Stephen Sackur, the presenter of HARDtalk, BBC World News' flagship current affairs interview programme, has been a journalist with BBC News since 1986. (http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Bbc-world-service)

2.2 Review of Previous Studies

Although formal political interviews hold much for linguistic investigations, not much research has been carried out in this regard, from the pragmatic point of view. It has been noted that ‘‘most researchers have concentrated on classroom interaction, doctor-patient talk, etc with little or no mention of interview and although many have pointed out the importance and possibility of analysing interviews, not much has been done especially in Nigeria’’(Frank,1989).

Some scholars have carried out research on different aspects of the media but with a heavy concentration on the print media. There have also been studies on the Pragmatics of language in the domains of religion and political speeches, and discourse analysis. Some of such works include Frank (1989),Bahago (1999) andGusau (2009),among others. Frank (1989) is a discourse analysis of feature radio interviews.Bahagocarries out a pragmatic analysis of the language of religion with focus on how language is used in Christian sermons. Gusau (2009) investigates the pragmatics of sensational newspaper headlines in Nigeria.

Urbanova (1998) is a semantic analysis of impersonal forms in media conversations. Mullany (1999) compares the degree of politeness in conversations between male and female participants. Ajibola (2001) is a study of the discourses structure of the ‘Eye Witness News’

on Nigeria Television Authority, using H.P.Grice's maxims.Anifowoshe (2006) is a pragmatic study of political reportage in the Guardian and New Nigeria newspapers. Abaya (2008) is a pragmatic study of military coup announcements in Nigeria. Garba (2008) is a pragmatic analysis of the language of news reporting in selected Nigerian dailies. Okpehen (2011) is a discourse analysis of the language of prophecy with the aim of showing that prophecy is dialogic rather than monologic.Amodu (2011) is an analysis of presuppositions and overstatements in newspaper advertisements. Ndace (2011) is a pragmatic analysis of the language of diplomacy, and shows that language is a weapon and a vital tool in diplomacy. Saminu (2014) looks at transitivity in the language of newspaper reporting in Nigeria. Adanu(2014) is an analysis of Nigeria Television Authority Kaduna editorial boards use of language.Mamdam(2015) carries out a discourse analysis of parliamentary debates which concludes that context plays a vital role in discourse analysis and the use of language in particular situations. Doke(2015) does a pragmatic analysis of visual message contexts as used in new media advertisements and finds that nonverbal communication plays several pragmatic roles in the language of advertisements and communicates more than their verbal counterparts. Bello(2015) looks at a pragmatic study of the interface between informativeness and conciseness in the language of advertisement of the Nigerian print media. The finding include that most advertising slogans are not informative in themselves. Also that an advertisement that seeks to be informative is not concise and one that seeks to be concise is not informative.

All these works, except Mullany and Frank that are on interviews, are on totally different aspects of Pragmatics and the media. Corroborating this fact, Harris (1986) in Frank (1989) observes that 'broadcast interviews have been neglected...''. And although this observation was made over two decades ago, it is still relevant today as the situation has not changed

much. The present study which looks at Face-Saving and Face-Threatening Acts of the Politeness Principle is on an international broadcast station. This study, therefore, is a modest contribution towards this area of broadcast interview that appears to have received little scholarly attention.

2.3 Theoretical Framework

The Speech Act Theory, propounded by J.L. Austin (1962), is the main theoretical framework adopted for this study. This choice is predicated upon the fact that when interviewers and the interviewees engage in a conversation, they perform acts by means of what they say. According to Finegan (2012:302), ‘‘much of what is reported in newspapers, blogs, and radio and television news broadcasts are speech acts: arrests, predictions, denials, promises, accusations, announcements, warnings, threats, exhortations, and so forth’’. Frank (2001:34) adds that

> The emphasis, by the functional school of linguistics, today has given rise to theories and models for the analysis of different situations of language interaction, some of such situations include the home, classroom, law court, media and so on’’.

Although Austin identifies three categories of speech acts (locutions, illocutions and perlocutions), it is generally agreed that illocutions form the kernel of the theory. What is done by what is said is the focus of the Speech Act Theory. This study therefore, deploys this theory in investigating what acts the media interactants perform and how they do it.

In addition, one of Thorndike’s Law of Connectionism, particularly the Law of Effect which is regarded as ‘‘the most important of his laws’’ (Mukherjee, 1972:41), shall be employed as a subsidiary theory for the study. It states that behaviours that lead to satisfying outcomes are more likely to be repeated than behaviours that lead to unwanted outcomes. It is to be applied

on certain aspects of the discourse. Mukherjee (1972:41) further notes that the essence of the law of effect is that ‘‘To every stimulus there was (is) a response...’’. The Stimulus-Response Theory (from the Law of Effect) proposes that all learning consists primarily of the strengthening of the relationship between the stimulus and the response. A stimulus is any object or event that elicits a sensory or behavioural response from an organism. An eliciting stimulus is a stimulus that precedes acertain behaviour and thus causes a response. A discriminative stimulus in contrast increases the probability of a response to occur but does not necessarily elicit the response. A reinforcing stimulus usually denotes a stimulus that is delivered after the response has already occurred; in psychological experiments it is often delivered on purpose to reinforce the behaviour (https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/S). The theory essentially holds that certain acts/ actions necessitate and encourage or discourage particular (re)actions, other things being equal. Bloomfield (1933:33) in Abubakar (2008:19), asserts that ‘‘human actions...are part of cause and effect sequence exactly like those we observe, say in a study of physics or chemistry’’. Speaking, no doubt, is an important human action. Furthermore, Abubakar (2008:18) notes that ‘‘meaning consist (sic) in the observable stimulus reaction features in utterance’’.

Okon and Ansa (2002:481) further note that the behaviourist theory was first propounded by Thorndike but later developed by Skinner. ‘‘... the behaviourist theory asserts that human behaviour is dominated by the stimulus-response relationship,’’ they observe.

In terms of application of these theories, the illocutionary and perlocutionary forces of the interviewer’s and interviewee’s utterances (i.e. of their locutions) are identified. This is done by deploying the Speech Acts Theory. In addition, the Law of Stimulus-Response is employed to see how one form of utterance triggers a particular form of response from the interviewee. In this case, the first/source utterance is the stimulus and the reaction such an utterance provokes or necessitates constitutes the response. More often than not, the way an

interviewee responds, is perhaps largely a function of the manner and content of the interviewer's question or proposition. By subjecting the interviewer's utterance to the tenets of the Speech Acts theory, the illocutionary force of the utterance can be deduced then, the response of the interviewee is in turn scrutinised by the same principles, this way, the correlation between the question type and the form of response it elicits becomes clear. A face-threatening act, for instance, may in turn generate a face-threatening response.

2.4 Summary

This chapter has discussed some relevant linguistic concepts as well as examined research works related to the study. Some the concepts discussed include: language, interview, discourse, communicative competence, politeness, face, the media, utterance meaning and implicature.It further presents the theoretical framework. The Speech Act Theory is applied to cater for the Pragmatic dimension of the work. The law of Stimulus-Response is particularly suitable for the Discourse aspect of the study. Some of the acts performed by the participants by means of what they say have been indentified using the Speech Act Theory. The anticipatory effect of each move is also stated. The likely effects of the interlocutors' utterances have also been outlined by applying the law of Stimulus-Response.

The relevance of studies on functional linguistics has been highlighted. The need for more research on radio interviews has also been pointed out. And in this regard, the present study is apposite. The impact of the audience on the utterances of the interlocutors, for instance, is one area where further work can be done.

CHAPTER THREE

METHODOLOGY

3.0 Preamble

Thischapter explains how the data for this research was sourced and adapted for use in the study.

3.1 Sources of Data

The data was sourced from the internet. The audio record of the interview was obtained online and then transcribed. The transcripts are provided as appendix.

3.2 Method of Data Collection

The data for this study was downloaded as postcards from the website of the British Broadcasting Corporation (http://www.bbc.co.uk/radio/podcasts). Three interviews on socio-political issues in Nigeria were selected. The interviewees are prominent Nigerians. At the section on appendices, brief profiles of the interviewees are provided.

3.3 Data Transcription

According to Davidson (2009) much of the literature that has examined transcription draws from a seminal work by Ochs (1979) which proposes, and demonstrates, that transcription is theoretical in nature. She illustrates how notation of talk and interaction need to vary to meet specific goals of individual studies. Her central claim is that "transcription is a selective process reflecting theoretical goals and definitions".

Languages usually have a standard orthography, an established convention for representing the words of a language and this standard orthography represents one way of writing the words spoken in the transcription. Using the standard orthography has the advantage of being

easily understood by many speakers of the language including non-specialist readers of the language. There is tension between standard orthography, which promotes readability of transcript and the actual words which are spoken in a particular way in a particular conversation. The transcriber has to face the issue of finding a balance between ‘‘representing speech accurately, representing it readably...’’ (Liddicoat, 2007:18).

Liddicoat (2007:14) draws attention to the fact that in transcribing conversations, two important considerations are made with a view to striking a balance between: ‘‘ (1)the high level of detail found in the talk itself and (2) the accessibility of the transcript to a range of potential audiences’’. The latter consideration implies that there should not be too many symbols unfamiliar to speakers of the language that may require specialised knowledge.

A number of researchers have sought to develop conceptual frameworks to address the range of approaches to transcription. Bucholtz (2000) in Davidson (2009) considers transcription using a continuum that presents two extremes in the range of transcription practices. She terms these naturalized and denaturalized transcription. Naturalized transcription occurs when written features of discourse have primacy over the oral, so written down talk exhibits many features of written language that do not actually occur in spoken talk. For example, commas, full stops (periods), and paragraphing are incorporated. Bucholtz refers to naturalized transcription practices as literacized. Denaturalized transcription preserves the features of oral language such as “ums” and “ers.”

Bucholtz highlights that the more a transcript retains the features of spoken language, “the less transparent it becomes for readers unaccustomed to encountering oral features in written texts” (p.1461). Readers unused to denaturalized transcription practices might find the transcripts odd looking and difficult to read.

The method of transcription adopted for this study is tilted towards denaturalism. This is because the data transcribed this way is clearer and more easily accessible. This helps to

reduce reconditeness. Also, the aim of the study does not necessitate much use of symbolic notations and technical oddities. But where necessary, appropriate symbols with explanations are used. Features such as *erms*and *y' know* are also preserved.

3.4 Symbols used in Transcription

Some of the specialised symbols used in this study are presented here. These symbols appear at the appendix (pages 96 - 113).

Curly brackets contain explanatory entry: {}

Used to enclose instances of interruption: [ ]

Contains unclear or doubtful element: (?)

Upper case letters: indicate strongly stressed syllable or word.

Shows emotion-laden entry: (!)

Interviewer: ER (for the last two interviews)

Interviewee: EE (for the last two interviews)

Stephen Sackur: S (for the first/main interview)

DoyinOkupe: D (for the first/main interview)

3.4.1 Analytical Procedure

The Speech Act theory propounded by J.L. Austin (1962) is the main model of analysis for this study. The theory holds that by making an utterance in a particular situation, a language user performs one or more acts. The social and cultural settings necessary for an utterance to produce the desired effect are referred to as 'felicity conditions'. A speech act consists of three components: 1.**TheLocutionary act**, that is, the actual words spoken, the sounds uttered. It is the act of saying, uttering or expressing something. **The Illocutionary act** – the intention of the speaker, the meaning or interpretation of the utterance. **The Perlocutionary act**, which is the effect of the utterance on the receiver(s). In a nutshell, the **locution** is the act of saying; the **illocution** is the act of doing (by saying), while the **perlocution** is the

feeling/thought induced or invoked by what has been said or done. The focus of this study is mainly on the illocutionary and perlocutionary imports of utterances of the interviewer and the interviewee.

Thorndike's Law of Connectionism, particularly the Law of Effect which is regarded as ''the most important of his laws'' (Mukherjee, 1972:41), shall be employed as a subsidiary theory for the study. It is to be applied on certain aspects of the discourse. Mukherjee(1972:41) further notes that the essence of the law of effect is that '' To every stimulus there was (is) a response....'' The theory essentially holds that certain acts/ actions necessitate and encourage or discourage particular (re)actions, other things being equal. Bloomfield (1933:33) in Abubakar (2008:19), asserts that ''human actions...are part of cause and effect sequence exactly like those we observe, say in a study of Physics or Chemistry''. Speaking, no doubt, is an important human action. Furthermore, Abubakar (2008:18) notes that ''meaning consist (sic) in the observable stimulus reaction features in utterance''.

Okon and Ansa (2002:481) further note that the behaviourist theory was first propounded by Thorndike but later developed by Skinner. ''... the behaviourist theory asserts that human behaviour is dominated by the stimulus-response relationship,'' they observe. Language is an integral part of human behaviour.

CHAPTER FOUR

PRESENTATION OF DATA AND ANALYSIS

4.0 Preamble

This section contains the details of data analysis and discussions. Each segment of the analyses ispresented in a tabular form. Each table is introduced, presented and then discussed.The data is presented and analysed based on the application of the theoretical frameworks adopted. Within each table of analysis is a presentation of what is said, what is done by what is said and the (likely) effect of what is said and done by the addressor on the addressee. In addition, each table is followed by a brief discussion.

Table 4.1 shows the relationship between interviewer'sFTA and the response it elicits or provokes from the respondent.

4.1 Relationship Between Interviewer's FTA and Interviewee's Response

⇨ **STIMULUS (QUESTION)** ⇦ **ERLOCUTION** ⇨ **RESPONSE** ⇦

LOCUTION	**ILLOCUTION**		**LOCUTION**	**ILLOCUTION**
1. it is clear BH made the most brazen challenge to the authority... and it is a challenge your government is failing to meet.	1.Castigation: your government is failing to tackle the affront.	1. face threat felt.	**1.Stephen, that is wrong! That, you know, the act itself is dastardly enough, I agree, but it is not a reflection of the seriousness of the challenge.**	1.Interviewer cautioned; Allegation refuted.

This move of the interviewer is not interrogatory: it is not directly seeking information. It is rather an accusatory assertion and sounds conclusive. This sends a negative stimulus to the interviewer thereby posing a face threat. It poses a face threat because it castigates the interviewee and the government he represents. This is so because castigations and reprimands, unlike approvals and praises, are face-threatening. Expectedly, the response is equally harsh and cautionary, and, in turn, this further poses a threat to the interviewer's own face. This is because when the interviewer concurs with the interviewer's comments or assertions, it appeals the positive face of the latter, but when the interviewer's assertions are rejected and described as inaccurate, the interviewer's face is threatened. This is particularly so when the assertion appears to be that of the interviewer himself, as in the example above, rather than those of a third party, for example when the interviewer is reporting or quoting someone else.

STIMULUS (QUESTION) **PERLOCUTION** **RESPONSE**

LOCUTION	**ILLOCUTION**		**LOCUTION**	**ILLOCUTION**
2.Sure, it is the most basic challenge to the capability of the state to protect its most innocent civilian population.	2. assertion, insistence that the government's capability was challenged	2.feeling of face threat is sustained	**2.Stephen, that is also wrong!... I must tell you from here...**	2.refutation sustained, possession of superior knowledge/ information asserted

In this move, the interviewer further berates the interviewee's government. This is face-threatening. It therefore, provokes an equally face-threatening reaction. The interviewee rejects the accusation, and asserts it is he himself that has accurate information regarding the matter under discussion, implying that the interviewer's source of information is questionable. As this reaction also threatens the interviewer's face, he, the interviewer, has to

do something to save his face so as not to be seen as someone making false claims or wrong accusations. Consequently, the next move:

STIMULUS (QUESTION) **PERLOCUTION** **RESPONSE**

LOCUTION	**ILLOCUTION**		**LOCUTION**	**ILLOCUTION**
3.Hang on! four hours before the abduction operation began, military headquarters in Maiduguri was informed this attack was going to take place and the military did nothing about it.	3. assertion substantiated; allegation of incompetence and incapability of institutions maintained.	3.face threat continues: the government I represent is failing.	**3.That's another dys-information or misinformation. you know, the military in Borno, the military in these areas generally on a regular basis, almost hourly basis, receive information of possible attacks all over the states...**	3.allegation faulted/refutation affirmed.

This locution seems to have been necessitated by the face threat posed by the interviewee's preceding turn, which questions the veracity of the interviewer's claims. The interviewer attempts to ameliorate this face threat by appealing to circumstantial evidence surrounding the incident under question. But then his move is equally face-threatening, especially as it ends with the bold assertion '... and the military did nothing about it'. This then provokes a rather strong reaction from the interviewee as he faults his interlocutor's source of information and then presents and substantiates his own claims. It appears that one art of saving face threat arising from a comment or assertion is to substantiate it with circumstantial evidence.

⇨ **STIMULUS (QUESTION) PERLOCUTION ⟹ RESPONSE⇦**

⇩

LOCUTION **4.And they routinely ignore them.**	ILLOCUTION 4.insinuation and accusation of irresponsibility/laxity	4.face threat persists: your military personnel are incapable	**LOCUTION** **4.No! they don't ignore them. you know, most of them are hoax, alright, that's the truth.**	ILLOCUTION 4.accusation denied; capability of the military affirmed and substantiated

This move continues the face threat as it insinuates incompetence and irresponsibility on the part of the military. The response counters this assertion and affirms the capability of the military. It is pertinent to note here that the way a statement is structured says a lot about its politeness level. ''And they did nothing about it'' is definitely not the same in form and function as 'And what did they do about it?' Their threat levels are definitely not the same. The former is conclusive while the latter is an attempt to find out what follows.

⇨ **STIMULUS (QUESTION) PERLOCUTION ⟹ RESPONSE⇦**

⇩

LOCUTION **5.Your government doesn't appear to even now to have one steady, specific number for how many girls are still missing. And it took more than two weeks for your boss, the President, to make any public statement about these situations...**	ILLOCUTION 5. government accused of lacking/ not supplying accurate, reliable information; your president is failing to act promptly	5. face threatened: boss and government denigrated.	**LOCUTION** **5. No, no, no. Ok, that is not what happened. You know, when this event happened, I just told you , there was no official of the Borno state government, neither the principal nor the vice principal or any of the boarding house mistresses or masters were on ground(sic)**	ILLOCUTION 5. Allegation vehemently denied; reason for apparent numerical discrepancy adduced.

In the move above, the interviewer accuses the interviewee's government of not possessing, or refusing to offer, accurate and reliable information. The face threat increases as the interviewee's boss, the president, is accused of tardiness. In reaction, the interviewee vehemently denies the allegation. There is a reprimanding implicature in the interviewee's assertion '... I just told you there was no official on the ground...' This implies that the comment is unnecessary as the interviewee's previous move has taken care of it.

⇨ **STIMULUS (QUESTION)** **PERLOCUTION** ⇨ **RESPONSE** ⇦

LOCUTION	ILLOCUTION		**LOCUTION**	ILLOCUTION
6.O, come on, some officials know and won't tell the Nigerian public...	6. Government officials accused of deliberately withholding useful information from citizens/starving the people of much needed information.	6. Face threatened: my government is unfair and inconsiderate.	**6. This is the real issue. You know, you cannot sit here in England and understand the problem that we have in Nigeria...**	6. Assertion faulted; interlocutor's perception of the situation, skewed.

This locution poses a serious face threat as it asserts with veracity that the government is insensitive and economical with much needed information. This face threat provokes an equally face- threatening reaction: '... you cannot sit here in London and understand the problem that we have in Nigeria...'. By this utterance, the interviewer's perception of the situation is presented as skewed and inaccurate. Perhaps, if the interviewer had 'packaged' his utterance as a question rather than a conclusive assertion, it would have been less threatening to the interviewer's face and would not have, therefore, provoked an equally face-threatening reaction from the interviewer.

⇨ **STIMULUS (QUESTION) PERLOCUTION** ⇩ ⟹ **RESPONSE** ⇦

LOCUTION	ILLOCUTION		**LOCUTION**	ILLOCUTION
7.Well, I'll tell you what. Gross dereliction of duty... your president does not even know... Stop for a second. Why did it take your President more than 2 weeks to address the Nigerian people on this matter?	7. President castigated as negligent and uninformed	7. Face threatened: my boss failing to act promptly and appropriately.	**7. the issue isn't addressing the Nigerian people but taking, you know, immediate actions that will assist in rescuing the girls. I mean, I am DoyinOkupe. I work with this President. I'm with the President almost 24 hours a day. I know the night that this news broke(sic) and I know immediately the news –er—er—er—er— security agents, I mean military officials in the country were summoned the very next day, you know, the—the—the—council meeting was held, instructions were given... actions were taken...**	7. Premise for conclusion faulted; corrective assertions made; interlocutor educated with facts.

The next move castigates and denigrates the interviewee's boss. The face threat in this move is scathing. This appears to have been induced by the interviewee's preceding response ('... you cannot sit here in London and understand the problem...') which is a bit strong. But then the interviewee counter-balances this threat by faulting the interviewer's accusation and educating him appropriately.

STIMULUS (QUESTION) PERLOCUTION ⇒ **RESPONSE**

LOCUTION	ILLOCUTION		**LOCUTION**	ILLOCUTION
8.wh—wh— why do you think that all of these actions that you talked about have failed so completely?	8. conclusion reached: government's actions are futile	8.Negative face threatened: government efforts not yielding expected results.	**8. For the same reason that, you know...you know, I mean kidnapping all over the world is not a soap opera!**	8. the fact of little or no progress admitted; interlocutor cautioned: in certain issues results should not be expected too soon; interlocutor reminded that slow progress in such matters is not peculiar, but usual and widely experienced.

This locution sounds conclusive: all government's actions have proved futile. This face threat is met with a 'schooling' response which is in itself equally face-threatening. The threat is not in the ''why do you think...'' part of the statement but in the concluding assertion ''have failed completely...''. This is the kernel of the statement and the interviewee recognises this and tackles it squarely.

⇨ **STIMULUS (QUESTION) PERLOCUTION** ⟹ **RESPONSE** ⇦

LOCUTION	ILLOCUTION		**LOCUTION**	ILLOCUTION
9.So what a terrible indictment of your security forces! They know exactly where the girls are but it appears they are completely impotent to actually deliver their rescue.	9. conclusion reached: slow or lack of progress implies weakness of the armed forces to tackle the situation.	9. face threatened: government's forces inept to handle the matter.	**9. Stephen, I'm surprised that you are saying that. You know, the Americans were held hostage, 54 of them where held hostage in Tehran in 1979 or something like that. It took the American government, I mean 444 days to free them. I mean, why are you talking like this? 444 days—one and half years. They know the venue, it is their embassy. They could not get those hostages released for 444 days!**	9. interlocutor's conclusion faulted; speaker's prior assertion maintained and substantiated with facts and figures.

This utterance is a follow-up to the interviewee's threatening response to the previous comment. It further threatens the interviewee's face as it portrays the armed forces as inept and incapable of handling the challenge. The reaction expresses disappointment at the interviewer's comment which, in the light of the elucidations made by the interviewee, appears uninformed.

⇨ **STIMULUS (QUESTION) PERLOCUTION** ⟹ **RESPONSE** ⇦

LOCUTION	**ILLOCUTION**		**LOCUTION**	**ILLOCUTION**
10. You have soldiers who are not paid. Who have said it themselves that they go hungry. They are not delivered the right kind of food. One told Reuters news agency in Borno recently. He said 'BH are much better equipped than we are...	10.Government indicted: the military not well-catered for; conclusion reached and supported with reports.	10. Face threatened: government callous, not meeting the basic needs of the military.	**10. I can't take some of these informations (sic) as credible. It was Reuters that broke the news that the President was going to go to Chibok and it was not true.**	10. Report rejected; credibility of its source questioned;

The interviewee's government is indicted in the tenth locution which reaches the conclusion that the military is neglected and deliberately exposed to danger. This is supported with facts. This face threat is confronted with facts that undermine the credibility of the source of the interviewer's information. It will require (stronger) facts to counter a face threat supported with facts.

It is pertinent to note here that, as has been seen so far, it is not only the provocative questions or utterances of the interviewer that provoke similar unfriendly reactions. As can be deduced from the tables above, the 'confrontational' or reprimanding responses of the interviewee equally induces another 'strong' move by the interviewer. It then appears like a tug-of-war: 'strong' assertions trigger equally strong or even stronger ones, and those in turn trigger more of such. But this is not an indefinite cycle. It stops when one party finally breaks the chain. Usually, if the interviewee succumbs to the allegations wittingly or otherwise, the cycle is broken; but if not, the interviewer may switch to another issue. And then a fresh line of criticisms and counter criticisms begins. All this shows that neither party wants to lose face. And this is what prolongs the chain. By admitting the allegations or by not countering

them effectively, the interviewer may lose face. Similarly, by having his assertions/ allegations refuted or faulted as baseless, uninformed or incorrect, the interviewer's face is threatened, as he might be seen as one who does not have a reliable source of information or one who is simply raising dust unnecessarily or one who is unnecessarily critical, etc. Thus, aresponse can become a stimulus.

Furthermore, it is evident that both the interviewer and the interviewee encounter face-threats as they engage in the dialogue. The way the interviewer asks a question can pose a serious threat to the interviewee. In the same vein, the way the interviewee responds to the questions raised by the interviewer can also constitute a face-threat to the interviewer.

4.3 Relationship between Interviewer's FSA and Interviewee's Response

STIMULUS (QUESTION) PERLOCUTION ⇒ **RESPONSE**

LOCUTION	**ILLOCUTION**		**LOCUTION**	**ILLOCUTION**
11. S: you are the government's –er—the President's chief sole spin doctor, media public adviser...	11.Acknowledgement of interlocutor's important status and position; face saving.	11.Feeling of importance, recognition and satisfaction.	11. **D: [laughs]**	**11.** Acceptance of recognition.

In the move above, the interviewer recognises and praises the interviewee's status. This appeals to the interviewee's positive face. In reaction, the interviewee is not harsh in his response. In fact he laughs, perhaps showing satisfaction. The interviewer's comment has no face threat and, consequently, the interviewee's turn also has no face threat.

⇨ **STIMULUS (QUESTION) PERLOCUTION** ⟹ **RESPONSE** ⇦

LOCUTION	**ILLOCUTION**		**LOCUTION**	**ILLOCUTION**
12. how can you explain to me that first of all, the government in the very early hours and days after it happened, tried to tell the Nigerian media that most of the girls had been freed and returned home, which was taken to be untrue	12.Explanation requested or sought; face saving, as no judgement is passed.	12.Feels important as one regarded as having the wherewithal to provide needed explanations.	**12*.good, good. So, we've got three issues here. First of all, the first question was -- er--, you know, that the girls did what?***	**1**2.Acceptance of the request for explanation.

In this move which is equally face-saving, he is almost carried away as he has to ask to be reminded of the question that follows the praise. This is a form of 'packaging'. Perhaps this shows that more information would be obtained if a face-saving act (e.g. praise) should precede a face threatening act (e.g. questioning). Needless then to say that the more face-threatening a question is, the more the need to couch it in, or precede it with, some form of face-saving move.

⇨ **STIMULUS (QUESTION)** **PERLOCUTION** ⟹ **RESPONSE** ⇦

LOCUTION	**ILLOCUTION**		**LOCUTION**	**ILLOCUTION**
13.You now have some assistance from the United States' government and that has raised interest in the US government in what is going on. Just the other day, the Pentagon official, Alex French, did testify before the US Congress. She said this, she said ' We are looking at a military force in Nigeria that is afraid to engage and much of the funding that goes to the military,' she said, ' is skimmed off of the top which is why the resources are not adequate to the challenge'	13.Report and indirect request for information and explanation; uncritical, face-saving	13. Feels recognised as one to clarify issues.	**13.** ***I don't know where she got her information from. You know, we have one of the best military on the continent. We have records, outstanding records...***	13. allegation mildly refuted and backed by explanations.

In this move, the interviewer does not express critical personal comments, but merely reports someone else's opinion. He then indirectly seeks clarifications from the interviewee. His indirectness enhances politeness. Similarly, the interviewee does not make any comments directed at the interviewer as a person but focuses on the reported statement. The interviewer's attitude, more than that of the interviewee, determines the politeness tone of the whole interview process.

⇨ **STIMULUS (QUESTION) PERLOCUTION** ⇩ ⟹ **RESPONSE** ⇦

LOCUTION	**ILLOCUTION**		**LOCUTION**	**ILLOCUTION**
14.Let us get this straight. The girls were taken on the evening of April. Here we see, more than six weeks later the President has not even visited the town where the girls were abducted from. When is he going to go?	14 . Questions the delay in visit and seeks to know when the President will visit.	14.no (obvious) face threat.	***14. I'm not going to announce that, but he's going to go there. Stephen believe me, he's gonna go there. But you know, we're more concerned, you know, for you and for everybody else, you know, you know, and quite rightly so, you know 270 children have been abducted. They have been stopped from school. Their parents are in pain. The whole country is in a very very bad mood, including the President. But then, you know, when we finish this, we still have the BH problem to, I mean you know...***	14.assures that the President will visit and explains that delay does not mean lack of concern.
14b Absolutely.	14b Concurs with interlocutor's opinion.	14b positive face enhanced	**14b *Yeah, to battle with.***	14b Acknowledges the sympathy.

The interviewer, in this move, simply lays bare some facts without interposing his own personal opinions. This way, he exonerates himself from any allegations of biased or hostile disposition towards the interviewee or the government he represents. In 'When is he going to go' the interviewer displays even greater politeness. This is not face-threatening as it would be without the word 'when' which implies that the President will indeed go there albeit later

than perhaps expected. All this is considerate of the interviewee's positive face who in turn, responds with even more politeness, calling the interviewee by his first name and then going ahead to assure him and the audience that the President would visit the place in question.

Consequent upon this very polite response of the interviewee, the interviewer is further stimulated to respond with more politeness. This he does through the sympathetic concurrence with the speaker while he, the speaker, is still speaking. Other things being equal, politeness attracts politeness.

⇨ **STIMULUS (QUESTION)** **PERLOCUTION** ⇨ **RESPONSE** ⇦

LOCUTION	**ILLOCUTION**		**LOCUTION**	**ILLOCUTION**
15.You can send signals to the people of the north-east that they will no longer be neglected.	15. Makes a suggestion.	15. No threat: only a suggestion, not an imperative.	***15. Yeah, but then, but then, but then you have to win this war first. You cannot rebuild, you cannot rehabilitate, you cannot bring money, you cannot do anything unless there is peace***	15. Accepts suggestion but explains why it may not be practicable yet.

In this exchange, a suggestion is made, and as this is not an imposition, it is not face-threatening. The response does not threaten the interviewer's face either, as he acknowledges the suggestion and explains why it may not be feasible at the time. Face-threats are countered with face-threats, more or less. Therefore, when in an utterance, there is no face threat in reality or in perception, it is most unlikely that the next speaker will respond with one.

⇨ **STIMULUS (QUESTION)** **PERLOCUTION** ⟹ **RESPONSE** ⇦

LOCUTION	**ILLOCUTION**		**LOCUTION**	**ILLOCUTION**
16.Do you agree with your most successful businessman in all Nigeria, in all Africa, Mr Dangote(who) said the other day that ' If we don't tackle the roots of this insurgency, it threatens the very integrity, the very future of Nigeria,' do you agree?	16.Seeks interlocutor's view about an opinion.	16.No face threat; positive face enhanced.	***16. I agree. We've got to get over this. This is the greatest challenge of this generation of Nigerians. But I tell you, it's a Nigerian problem we're going to find a Nigerian solution. We're gonna get over it. We've always gotten over everything that has plagued us. And we will get over this.***	16.Accepts the view and expatiates on it

Here, the locution is not confrontational or critical but politely seeking the interviewee's opinion about a view expressed by a third party. The response is equally polite as the interviewee concurs with the view and sheds more light on it.

⇨ **STIMULUS (QUESTION)** **PERLOCUTION** ⟹ **RESPONSE** ⇦

LOCUTION ***(2nd interv.)***	**ILLOCUTION**		**LOCUTION**	**ILLOCUTION**
17.And that group, that philosophy, that is a challenge to everything that you have believed in and fought for through word and deed over the half century. Does it feel that personal?	17. Acknowledges interlocutor's laudable efforts and condemns a new philosophy seeking to undermine the efforts.	17. face-saving; positive face catered for.	***17.Absolutely. I feel it's a negativity, you know, in fact of my understanding of humanity, of society, community, ideology, even the very reason for existence is to be at this stage of my life and how 300 of my children abducted because this is what it means to me.***	**1**7.Agrees there is a challenge and explains how it feels.

As the interviewer's utterance is face-saving, containing tacit praise, so is the interviewee's own locution. He accepts the observation made by the interviewer and goes ahead to explain further. If the interviewer had made a face-threatening move, the interviewee would have perhaps been defensive. But since this is not the case, there is cooperation and the interviewee goes ahead to give more information.

⇨ **STIMULUS (QUESTION)** **PERLOCUTION** ⇨ **RESPONSE** ⇦

LOCUTION	**ILLOCUTION**		**LOCUTION**	**ILLOCUTION**
18.ER: Let me put you... about corruption, what the President Jonathan said. He said this a few days ago. He said, 'over 70% of what is called corruption is not corruption but common stealing. Corruption is perception not reality.' Do you think that is correct or is it just semantics?	**18. Report of what the President said and seeking the view of the interviewer.**	18. No face threat.	18. Em, you know, er, English is a foreign language and one has to make allowances for how individuals and groups use a language, er, especially when the language being foreign is convenient for evading realities and responsibilities of governance. For Heaven's sake, I ask you, when we talk of corruption, material corruption, and somebody says it's not corruption we have to deal with but stealing, now what does that tell you? Either a total lack of understanding of the society you live in or an attempt to confuse your listener.	**18. Personal opinion expressed.**

In this move the interviewer appeals to the positive face of the interviewee by asking him to comment on a statement credited to the President. There is no face threat in this. It is rather face-saving. It sees the respondent as one able to comment on the matter. The response of the interviewee does not contain any face threat either. It is a supply of the information requested by the interviewer.

STIMULUS (QUESTION) **PERLOCUTION** **RESPONSE**

LOCUTION	**ILLOCUTION**		**LOCUTION**	**ILLOCUTION**
19. er: Let's go back to October 17th, I think it was, when a senior defence official announced that there was an agreement with BH. Now you have been intimately involved in efforts to try to arrange a dialogue mediation with BH. So was there a deal and is there a deal?	**19.** **A report is given and confirmation is sought**.	19. No face threat.	19. ee: Well, the pronouncement that came from the Nigerian government, specifically from the security officials is one of so many that we have had on the last few years. In the last 2 years we have had pronouncements from government that there had been ceasefire and the possibility of ending this violence. But it has always come from the side of the government and it has most times ended with no results. And the option before the Nigerian government is two, in terms of ending the insurgency or	**19. Personal opinion given, confirming the report.**

			getting the girls freed. The first is to use force to storm the camp and rescue the girls and the second is to explore the options of dialogue is the only possible way to by which these girls can go free.	

The interviewer gives a report and seeks confirmation. There is no face threat here. The interviewee is seen as one in a position to comment on it. This is appealing to the interviewee's positive face who goes ahead to confirm the report.

⇨ **STIMULUS (QUESTION)** **PERLOCUTION** ⇨ **RESPONSE** ⇦

LOCUTION	**ILLOCUTION**		LOCUTION	**ILLOCUTION**
20. er: [interrupting] you're a human rights campaigner. you 've devoted a lot of your life to defending human rights. you're playing with fire here aren't you, you are now telling the Nigerian government that in your view they should release, you say, 16 dangerous	**20. The interviewee's status highlighted and juxtaposed with what he said.**	20.Face threat mitigated by the first part of the move.	20. ee: the state of Israel er swapped Dilashaleed(?) with almost a thousand Palestinians whom they call terrorists and the United States also swapped 5 Taliban members with one of their soldiers. there is no reason the Nigerian government	**20. Interviewee defends his statement substantiated with facts.**

BH militants and I know from the Nigerian media that the names include people who've been convicted of planting car bombs of mass murder and your message as a human rights campaigner is that these people must be freed.			should not be able to do it. what should matter most to us is the lives of these girls and not keeping some insurgents in prison for a very long time. the insurgent group	

The face threat that would have occurred is mitigated by the first part of the question which foregrounds the important position of the interviewee. The part of the question that is threatening is countered with facts by the interviewee.

4.5 FTAs FROM IMPLICATURES/ IMPLICATED MEANING

⇨ **STIMULUS (QUESTION)** **PERLOCUTION** ⇨ **RESPONSE** ⇦

LOCUTION	**ILLOCUTION**		**LOCUTION**	**ILLOCUTION**
21. *With respect, in an interview, you have to give me an opportunity to ask some questions.*	**21. Interlocutor reprimanded.**	21. Face threatened: I am disorderly.	**21. You also have to give me opportunity(sic) to answer your questions**	**21. face threat returned: if I'm disorderly, you are equally so.**

This extract has the implicature that the interviewee is disorderly. This is face- threatening. This threat induces and produces a response that is also face-threatening with the implicature that the interviewer is unfair, not allowing the interviewee enough time to respond to the

issues he raises. When one's face is threatened, one can save one's face by returning an equally face-threatening response. In other words, countering a face-threatening comment with another comment that is face- threatening is a face-saving strategy.

STIMULUS (QUESTION) **PERLOCUTION** **RESPONSE**

LOCUTION	**ILLOCUTION**		**LOCUTION**	**ILLOCUTION**
22 **Why is the President not prepared to go to Chibok?**	**22. Conclusion reached: the President is not prepared to go to Chibok**	22. Face threatened: my boss is either cowardly or callous	**22. Who said the President is not prepared to go to Chibok?**	**22. The assertion is faulted.**

This is a conclusion based on an implicated assumption which portrays the President in bad light. This poses face threat to the interviewee who counters it with another face-threatening locution that faults the veracity of the act. The face threat would have been minimised had the interviewer framed his question thus 'Is the President prepared to go to Chibok?'

⇨ **STIMULUS (QUESTION)** **PERLOCUTION** ⟹ **RESPONSE** ⇦

LOCUTION	**ILLOCUTION**		**LOCUTION**	**ILLOCUTION**
23.Do you think your boss, the President of Nigeria is aware that every single day dozens of bodies are transferred from the military headquarters—a prison called Giwa—to the morgue in the hospital in Maiduguri...	**23. Presupposition: daily, people are tortured and killed in a military prison**	23. Face threatened: my government is killing its citizens.	23. That is not true, that, that is not true...	**23. Allegation faulted**

In this utterance, there is a presupposition that people are tortured and killed in a military prison. But this presupposition is carefully hidden behind the first part of the statement ('Do you think that your boss, the President is aware...'). As Yule(2010)rightly notes, if therefore, he only answers the first part of the question, by stating whether the president is aware or not, he is admitting the presupposition that summary killings are actually taking place, which has some serious implications. Expectedly, he deftly ignores the distracting part of the question and counters the presupposition, which is actually the focus of the question.

⇨ **STIMULUS (QUESTION) PERLOCUTION** ⟹ **RESPONSE** ⇦

LOCUTION 24	**ILLOCUTION 24.**		**LOCUTION**	**ILLOCUTION 24.**
And why would the people of Nigeria believe you now after a record of your government 3 years of failure	**Your government has failed and should not be taken seriously.**	24. Interviewee's negative face threatened.	24. Because in another couple of months down the line, they will, you know, just like we have done, you know, in the infrastructure , railways were dead, you know for 20 years, we revitalised it . We were generating 2000 mega...	**There are still indications that my government is on course.**

Here, there is also a presupposition that the government has failed so far. But again, this is carefully concealed in the first part of the utterance. Unfortunately, the interviewee fails to take cognisance of this as he only addresses the first part ('and why would the people of Nigeria believe you...'). However, in the response, there is an implicature that the government has not failed as instances of success are mentioned which will become manifest in the course of time.

⇨ **STIMULUS (QUESTION)** **PERLOCUTION** ⟹ **RESPONSE** ⇦

LOCUTION 25	**ILLOCUTION 25.**		**LOCUTION** 25.	**ILLOCUTION 25.**
S: [interrupting] twenty billion dollars in eighteen months siphoned out by the state petroleum company...	**Allegation of government failure substantiated with a popular corruption case**	25. Face threatened as evidence of failure is cited	D: [interrupting] Stephen, you're an international journalist. I do not expect you to, you know, comment on things that are unreal...	**The veracity of the corruption case cited is denied, and the interviewer is cautioned.**

In this move, the interviewer further drives the allegation that the interviewer's government has failed, especially in the area of effectively tackling corruption. A sore case of embezzlement is cited to substantiate this accusation. This sore corruption case cited no doubt induces a serious face threat. The interviewer faults the authenticity of the case cited and adequately tackles the face threat with a reprimand.

4.6 Summaryand Discussion of Findings

By their utterances, interviewers and interviewees perform a variety of acts. Some of these acts include questioning, accusing, alleging, asserting, debunking, denying, concurring, reprimanding, cautioning, announcing, affirming, requesting, informing, clarifying, obscuring, defending, reporting, denigrating, admitting, rejecting, approving, attacking, bragging and naming, among others. All of these acts are classifiable under Searle's (1979) categorisation of speech acts: Assertives/Representatives, Commissives, Expressives, Directives and Declaratives.

Face-threats occur in interviews. This agrees with the assertion of Scollon and Scollon(2001) as cited by Wardhaugh?(2006) that 'There is no faceless communication'.

Face threats can also arise from the implicatures invoked or embedded in the utterances of the interviewers and the interviewees. Certain statements appear innocuous on the surface, but their implicatures in relation to their illocutionary forces reveal their face threat properties. All this shows that face threats also arise from the implied meanings of what is uttered.

When one's face is threatened, one can save one's face by returning an equally face-threatening response. In other words, countering a face-threatening comment with another comment that is face- threatening is a face-saving strategy. This is like a law of attraction:' unlike poles attract; like poles repel'. A face-threatening move will naturally call for a face-threatening response, except where the respondent chooses to act contrarily.

Actions provoke reactions. **Face-threatening moves attract face-threatening responses,** usually**.**Face-threats are countered with face-threats, more or less. Therefore, when in an utterance, there is no face threat in reality or in perception, it is most unlikely that the next speaker will respond with one. Other things being equal, politeness attracts politeness.

The way the questions are posed affect the way they are answered. **The interviewer's attitude, more than that of the interviewee, determines the politeness tone of the whole interview process**.This corroborates what Fairclough(1985) cited by Tilney(2015) says, that interviews are unequal interaction and that the interviewer has the power to open and close the interview and initiate turns. **However, in this study,it is obvious that even the interviewee can, through interruptions and refusal to be interrupted, control the flow of the discussion.**It is apparent that more information would be obtained if a face-saving act (e.g. praise) should precede a face threatening act (e.g. accusing). Needless then to say that

the more face-threatening a question is, the more the need to couch it in, or precede it with, some form of face-saving move. Perhaps, if the interviewer had 'packaged' his utterance(see tables 1-7) as a question rather than a conclusive assertion, it would have been less threatening to the interviewer's face and would not have, therefore, provoked an equally face-threatening reaction from the interviewer.

Face-threats also arise from implicatures. Sometimes subtle but 'dangerous' presuppositions are concealed in questions and statements. It is actually such presuppositions that should be tackled, not just the expression as it appears on the surface. Both the interviewer and the interviewee encounter face-threats as they engage in the dialogue**.It is not only the provocative questions or utterances of the interviewer that provoke similar unfriendly reactions. The 'confrontational' or reprimanding responses of the interviewee equally induce another 'strong' move by the interviewer.** Neither party wants to lose face. And this is what prolongs the chain. By admitting the allegations or by not countering them effectively, the interviewer may lose face. Similarly, by having his assertions/ allegations refuted or faulted as baseless, uninformed or incorrect, the interviewer's face is threatened, as he might be seen as one who does not have a reliable source of information or one who is simply raising dust unnecessarily or one who is unnecessarily critical, etc.

One art of saving face threat (arising from a comment or assertion) is to substantiate it with circumstantial evidence. However, it will require (stronger) facts to counter a face threat supported with facts. This is because a fact stronger than the circumstantial evidence is required to counter it.

When each party is more interested in or concerned about saving his face, there is a higher risk of hurting the other's face. But when each party, especially the interviewer, is

conscious of the face needs of the other party, there are likely to be fewer occurrences of face threats. This applies to both parties: when the interviewer is conscious of the face needs of the interviewee, he will be careful not to frame his question in a face threatening way. In turn, the interviewee will not be under pressure to save his face since it has not been threatened. Consequently, his reaction is not likely going to threaten the interviewer's face.

This study shows that the Stimulus-Response theory holds even in communication, especially dyadic conversations.But it has also shown that what is regarded as a response can in turn serve as a stimulus. A face-threatening response from the interviewee can induce an equally face-threatening move from the interviewer.

Face threats are basically man-made. In other words, face threats, though may occur accidentally, are preventable. Threats to face are not inescapable in conversations. Their occurrence or otherwise is dependent on the interlocutors' ability or inability to manage or mitigate them.

In some instances, what one person may adjudge a threat to his/her face will be interpreted differently by another person. Factors such as perception, prejudices, mood, cultural differences and linguistic ability, among others, influence interlocutors' interpretation of what constitutes a threat to face. Context goes a long way in helping to clarify what constitutes a threat to face or not.

CHAPTER FIVE

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

5.1 Preamble

This section of the research contains the summary of the work. Conclusion is drawn based on the findings of the study. Limitations of the study are also stated.

5.2 Summary

The study is aimed at investigating how the Face-Saving and Face-Threatening phenomena of the Politeness Principle operate in interviews on international media stations, using the BBC as an example. The aim is to identify what acts have been performed, how they are performed and their impacts on the interlocutors. The literature review divided into conceptual review and review of previous studies, situates the study within the thematic, authorial, textual, contextual and theoretical purviews.

The theoretical model adopted for the study is the interplay of Austin's (1962) Speech Act Theory and Thorndike's Law of Effect otherwise known as the Stimulus-Response Theory. Language, being a principal aspect of human behaviour, is amenable to investigation under the Stimulus- Response Theory.Data is sourced as podcasts from the website of the BBC. The data is presented and analysed based on the application of the theoretical frameworks adopted. Within each table of analysis is a presentation of what is said, what is done by what is said and the (likely) effect of what is said and done by the addressor on the addressee. In addition, each table is followed by a brief discussion.

Among other things, the study has established that interviewers and interviewees perform a variety of acts as they interact. Face-threatening moves attract face-threatening responses

In every conversation, there is a potential threat to face. This threat can be put at bay or made prominent, depending on how it is managed. The study has identified some strategies of managing face in radio interviews. Both the interviewer and the interviewee are at risk of having their faces threatened. However, in concurrence with Fairclough (1985)'s view cited by Tilney(2015:181) that the interviews are unequal interactions as the interviewer has the power to open and close the interview and initiate turns,the management of face threats is largely dependent on the interviewer. If a question is couched in a face-threatening way by the interviewer, the response from the interviewee is likely going to be face-threatening. One strategy of tackling an utterance with a face threat is to respond with another with a face threat.

5.3 Conclusion

Language is a tool, a weapon for the 'battle' of talk (Ibileye, 2007). The way this weapon is wielded affects the outcome of conversation encounters. If the weapon is wrongly used, it could result to disastrous consequences. Furthermore, Scollon and Scollon (2001:48) cited by Wardhaugh (2006:276) assert that 'any communication is a risk to face; it is a risk to one's own face, at the same time it is a risk to the other person's'. Therefore, in every conversation there is a potential threat to face, especially in public and formal contexts. Radio interviews provide a platform on which individuals showcase their ability to wield the weapon of language. By their words they are 'condemned' or 'justified'. What they say impact on each party as well as on the audience. How they manage threats to face affects the whole exercise.

It is interesting to see how people do things with words in a media interview, where the interactants engage in the act of using words to perform actions. The interview is a matter of manipulation of language to achieve an aim. When pragmatic lights are beamed on utterances, an amazing array of deductions, interpretations and semantic imports are realised.

Virtually every turn made by the interviewee is either concurring with or debunking certain notions or perceptions. The success of this is largely determined by the masterful use of language. This battle of asserting and refuting views and ideas is even fiercer when the discussion is political and the topic is a controversial or highly sensitive one, as the ones here investigated.

Face-Threatening Acts undermine politeness. The more an interlocutor feels his face threatened, the less polite (and perhaps, cooperative) he/she will be at every given time. But when FTAs are mitigated by careful phrasing and couching, the threat level becomes very minimal.

In political interviews, where the interviewer is neutral or anti-government, an interviewee who is pro-government is usually more aggressive and can greatly alter/ influence directly or indirectly, the direction of flow of the interview, especially when highly controversial/sensitive matters are raised.

Although interviewers are said to have control of the discourse in interviews, this study has shown that in some instances, the interviewee can assume orwrest this position from the interviewer or at least highly influence or determine the direction of flow of the discourse. For instance, by refusing to entertain interruptions when speaking and by successfully interrupting the interviewer, the interviewee can alter the course of the exchange.The interviewer, when interrupted or disallowed to interrupt, may modify or change what he/she was originally intending to ask or say.

5.4 Limitations

This study is situated within the confines of face-saving and face-threatening acts between the interviewer and the interviewee on radio interviews on international stations using the BBC as an example. It does not incorporate how FTAs and FSAs impact on, and are impacted by the audience. No doubt, the presence of the audience does influence FTAs and FSAs between the interviewer and the interviewee.

In addition, since this study is based on radio interview, not much emphasis is placed on the paralinguistic aspect of communication which can also bear on the aspects of the Politeness Principles here examined. A television version of the interview will be able to cater for this. The study focuses on what interviewers and interviewees say; what action they perform by what they say and how these bear on the phenomenon of face.

5.5 Contribution to Knowledge

Some of the contributions to knowledge this study has made are as follows.

It has affirmed that interlocutors on interviews perform various acts by their utterances.

It has established that participants in interviews encounter face threats. This confirms the assertion of Scollon and Scollon(2001:48) cited by Wardhaugh (2006:273) that ‘‘There is no faceless communication.’’

It has also established that one strategy of tackling face threat in interviews is interruption and this could be a viable tool to repel face threats in interviews.

Face-Threatening Acts undermine politeness. The more an interlocutor feels his face threatened, the less polite (and perhaps, cooperative) he/she will be at every given time. But

when FTAs are mitigated by careful phrasing and couching, the threat level becomes very minimal.

In addition, as observed in the main interview in this study, the interviewee can employ the use of interruptions to affect the direction of the interview. This means that the interviewee can, to a very large degree, influence the whole interview process. This slightly contradicts the view expressed by Fairclough that interviews are unequal interactions because the interviewer has the power to open and close the interview and initiate turns.

This study shows that the Stimulus-Response theory holds even in communication, especially conversations. But it has also shown that what is regarded as a response can in turn serve as a stimulus**.** A face-threatening response from the interviewee can induce an equally face-threatening move from the interviewer.

Face threats can also arise from the implicatures invoked or embedded in the utterances of the interviewers and the interviewees. Sometimes subtle but 'dangerous' presuppositions are concealed in utterances.

5.6 Areas for Further Studies

The investigation of the politeness principle can be done on television version of interviews. Such can incorporate the paralinguistic dimension of the dialogue. Furthermore, the influence of the audience on the use of FTAs and FSAs of interviewers and interviewees is also an area worth researching on.

REFERENCES

Abaya, A.S,(2008). A Pragmatic Analysis of Nigerian Military Coup Announcements. Unpublished PhD Thesis, Ahmadu Bello University, Zaria.

Abubakar, B. (2008). *Basic Semantics: Students' Handbook*. Zaria: Jerry Press & Publishers

Abdulrasheed, R.S. (2011). Textuality: an Analysis of Memoranda from the Federal House of Representatives, Abuja, Nigeria. Unpublished Ph.d Thesis, Ahmadu Bello University, Zaria.

Adanu, E. C. (2014). Dialogue and Discourse: an Analysis of NTA Kaduna Editorial Boards use of Language. Unpublished M.A Thesis, Ahmadu Bello University, Zaria.

Ahmadvand, M. (2008). *Critical Discourse Analysis: an Introduction to Major Approaches*. Zanjan: University of Zanjan.

Ajibola, M.A.(2001). A Discourse Analysis of the 'Eye Witness News' on the NTA. Unpublished M.A. Thesis, Ahmadu Bello University, Zaria.

Amodu, J. E. (2011). A Content Analysis of Presupposition and Overstatement in the Interpretive Language Use of Selected Advertisement of the Nigerian Print Media. An Unpublished PhD Dissertation, Ahmadu Bello University, Zaria.

Anifowoshe, I.O.(2006).A Pragmatic Study of Political Reportage in The Guardian and New Nigerian Newspapers. Unpublished MA thesis, Ahmadu Bello University, Zaria.

Ariel, M. (2008). *Pragmatics and Grammar*. Cambridge: CUP

Austin, J.L. (1962). *How to Do Things with Words*. Oxford: Oxford University Press

Bahago, S. (1999). A Pragmatic Analysis of the Language of Religion in Selected Sermons of WillianKumuyi. Unpublished MA thesis ,Ahmadu Bello University, Zaria.

BBC World Service(2014). *HARDtalk* [Audio Podcasts]. Retrieved from (http://www.bbc.co.uk/radio/podcasts)

Bello, S. G. (2015) A Pragmatic Study of the Interface between Informativeness and Conciseness in the Language of the Advertisement of the Nigerian Print Media. Unpublished M.A Thesis, Ahmadu Bello University, Zaria.

Clifford, C. (1999). *Media and Communication*. London: Dorling Kindersley.

Crystal, D. (2008). *A Dictionary of Linguistics and Phonetics* (6th ed.) Malden: Blackwell

Davidson, C. (2009). Transcription: Imperatives for Qualitative Research. In: *International Journal of Qualitative Methods. International Institute for Qualitative Methodology: University of Alberta*. Retrieved fromhttp://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/2.0

deSaussurre, F. (1967). *Course in General Linguistics*. in: Bally, C. and Sechehaye, A. (eds.) New York: McGraw Hill Book Company.

Doke, C. G. (2015). A Pragmatic Analysis of Visual Message Contents as used in New Media Advertisements. UnpublishedM.A Thesis, Ahmadu Bello University, Zaria.

Finegan, E.(2012). Language: Its Structure and Use (6th ed.). Wadsworth: Cengage Learning.

Frank, A. (2001). Information Collection and Dissemination: Types/ Distribution of Questions in Feature Radio Interview. in: Nasidi, Y. (ed). *Saiwa: a Journal of Communications*. nos 8&9. Zaria: ABU Press.

Frank, F. A. (1989). A Discourse Analysis of Feature Radio Interview: Shifts in Interactants' Manipulation of Language. Unpublished M.A thesis. Ahmadu Bello University ,Zaria.

Garba, A. (2008). A Pragmatic Analysis of the Language of News Reporting in Selected Nigerian Dailies. Unpublished MA thesis, Ahmadu Bello University, Zaria.

Grundy, P. (2000). *Doing Pragmatics* (2nd ed.). London: Arnold.

Gusau, Y.S. (2009). A Pragmatic Analysis of Sensational Headlines in Selected Nigerian Newspapers. Unpublished MA thesis .Ahmadu Bello University, Zaria.

Halliday, M.A.K(1985). *An Introduction to Functional Grammar*. London: Edward Arnold.

Hartley, A. F.(1982). *Linguistics for Language Learners*. London: Macmillan Press

Honey, J. (1997). *Language is Power: the Story of Standard English and its Enemies*. London: Faber and Faber.

Ibileye, G. (2007). Developing English and French for Territorial Integration in West Africa. In Ladani, B.A.(ed). *Journal of Educational Research and Development*. Zaria: ABU Press. vol2no. 3.

Jorgensen, M., & Philips, L. (2002). *Discourse Analysis as Theory and Method*. London: SAGE Publications.

King, R. D. (1969). *Historical Linguistics and Generative Grammar*. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.

Leech, G.N. (1983). *Principles of Pragmatics*. London: Longman

Leonardi, B. (2010). The Pragmatics of Literary Interaction in James Hogg's the Private Memoirs and Confessions of a Justified Sinner. Papers of the Lancaster University Postgraduate Conference in Linguistics & Language Teaching.

Liddicoat, J.A.(2007). An Introduction to Conversation Analysis. London: Continuum

Lycan, W.G. (1999). *Philosophy of Language: A Ccontemporary Introduction*. London:Routledge.

Malmkjaer, M. (1991). Pragmatics. in: Malmkjaer, M. (1991) (ed). *The Linguistics Encyclopaedia*. London: Routledge.

Mamdam, P.H.(2015). A Discourse Analysis of Parliamentary Debates: A Case Study of the National Assembly, Nigeria.

McCarthy (1991). *Discourse Analysis for Language Teachers*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

McCarthy, M., Mattliessen, C.& Slade, D. (2010). Discourse Analysis. In: Schmit 2010 (ed). *An Introduction to Applied Linguistics.* (2nd ed). London: Hodder and Stoughton Ltd.

Mey, J.L. (2001). *Pragmatics*: *AnIntroduction*. (2nd ed). Malden: Blackwell Publishers

Meyer, C. F. (2009). *Introducing English Linguistics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

Mukherjee, A. (1972). *Educatiional Psychology*. Calcutta: K P Basu Publishing co.

Mullany, L. J. (1998). Linguistic Politeness and Sex Differences in Broadcast Interviews. Unpublished MA thesis, University of Leeds.

National Open University of Nigeria (2010). *Pragmatics*. Lagos:NOUN

Ndace, R. Z. (2011). A Pragmatic Analysis of the Language of Diplomacy in Selected Interviews of Kofi Annan Former United Nations Secretary General. Unpublished MA thesis. Ahmadu Bello University, Zaria

Ndukwe, J.I. (2005). *A Study Book on English Language Teaching Methods II: For Secondary and Tertiary Institutions*. Zaria: FCE

Nzeakor, N.C. and Akano, R. C.(2013). The Place of Language/Rhetoric Communication and National Consciousness. In: Nnolim, C.E., Ezeigbo, A.A. and Chima-Udeh, N. (eds). *Literature, Language and National Consciousness*: First International Conference of the Department of English, Anambra State University, Igbariam Campus. Onitsha: Divine Touch Press.

Ogunsiji, Y. and Farinde, R.O. (2012). Pragmatics in Forensic Linguistic Development for National Re-orientation and Transformation in Nigeria. in: *British Journal of Arts and Social Science*.Vol.7 No.II. British Journal Publishing, Inc. Retrieved from http://www.bjournal.co.uk/BJASS.aspx

Okphen, O.P. (2011). A Discourse Analysis of the Language of Prophecy in Selected Sermons of Pastor E.A. Adeboye. Unpublished MA Thesis. Ahmadu Bello University, Zaria.

Okon, B. A. and Ansa, S. A. (2002). The Techniques of Teaching 'Been' and 'Being' in a Second Language Situation. In: Lawal, A., Isiugo-Abanihe, I. and Ohia, I. N. (eds). *Perspectives on Applied Linguistics in Language and Literature*. Lagos: Nigerian Association of Language Educators, NALE.

Oliver, T.R. and Cortright, L.R. (1951). *New Training for Effective Speech*. New York : Henry Holt and company, inc.

Osisanwo, W. (2003). Introduction to Discourse Analysis and Pragmatics. Lagos: Femolu-Fetop.

Radford, A., Atkinson, M., Britain, D., Clahsen, H. and Spencer, A. (2009). *Linguistics: An Introduction*. (2nd ed.) Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Rodman, R., Fromkin,V. and Hyams, N. (2003). *An Introduction to Language*. (7th ed.): Boston: Wardsworth Thompson

Saminu, I. (2014). Language and Media Reporting: A Study of Transitivity in Selected Nigerian Newspapers. Unpublished PhD Thesis. Ahmadu Bello University, Zaria.

Spencer-Oates and Zegarac(2010). Pragmatics. In: Schmit 2010 (ed). *An Introduction to Applied Linguistics*. (2nd ed.). London: Hodder and Stoughton Ltd.

Tilney, M. (2015). Keeping the Upper-hand: Pragmatic Techniques in the Media Interview. In: *Critical Discourse Analysis Across Disciplines*. Retrieved from http://cadaad.net/journal Vol. 7 (2): 180 – 199 ISSN: 1752-3079

Urbanova, l.(1998). Semantic Indeterminacy in Authentic English Conversation. Unpublished MAthesis, Faculty of Arts, Masaryk University Brno.

Wardhaugh, R.(2006). *An Introduction to Sociolingusitics*. (5th ed.)Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishers

Widdowson, H.G. (1996). *Linguistics*. Oxford: OUP

Yule, G. (2010). *The Study of Language* (4th ed.). Cambridge: CUP

APPENDICES(DATA TRANSCRIPTS)

Appendix A: With DoyinOkupe

Welcome to Hardtalk on the BBC World Service with me, Stephen Sackur. My guest today is a specialist in political spin, a Senior Adviser on political affairs to the President of Nigeria, Goodluck Jonathan. Right now, DoyinOkupe will surely acknowledge that there can be few politicians in more desperate need of a positive headline than the Nigerian leader. Dr Okupe has had to deal with a flood of negative stories about the failings of his boss and the Nigerian government over which he currently presides. Most damaging of all was the abduction in mid April of more than 200 schoolgirls from their boarding school in north-eastern Nigeria. It was the most attention- grabbing attack by the Islamist extremist movement, Boko Haram, which has been at war with the Nigerian state for 5 years. The girls remain captive. The Nigerian security forces have appeared impotent and the case exposed deep failings at the heart of the state. Despite its oil riches, Nigeria is ragged by political violence, is undermined by corruption and afflicted with massive social and economic discontent. The international community is watching the spread of instability in Nigeria with a sense of foreboding. Where is the leadership capable of rescuing Africa's most populous nation? Well, DoyinOkupe joins me now.

S: Welcome to Hardtalk.

D: Thank you very much, Stephen.

S: I think we have to start with the on-going story of the 200 and more schoolgirls who were abducted from their boarding school in Chibok. 1.**While taking those girls, it is clear Boko Haram(henceforth, BH) made the most brazen challenge to the authority—the credibility of your government—and is a challenge your government is failing to meet**.

D: 1.Stephen, **that is wrong. That, you know, the act itself is dastardly enough, I agree, but it's not a reflection of the seriousness of the challenge**. And I will explain to you why: the girls were soft targets, you know, here were over 200 and something girls in a secondary school. The principal was not on sight. Vice principal was not there. None of the teachers were there (sic).It was just the girls, you know, no light, no electricity, no generator. So they just like seating targets. So it's not a reflection on the capability(sic), you know, of our military or preparedness to, for nothing...

S: 2.**sure, it is the most basic challenge to the capability of the state to protect its most innocent civilian population**. In the words of Amnesty International...

D: [interrupting] 2.**Stephen, that is also wrong. You know, Borno state, I must tell you from here,**Borno state is a massive state. It's about 160 000 squared km of land. There are over two-three- thousand schools in this place. So, you know, what we could do, what we do have is, we have security in these schools and then if there is any problem, they contact the base. But in this particular situation, I mean schools have been instructed to close down, you know, and federal government has closed down all its schools. Schools in Yobe were closed

down and because of this examination, our, you know, pupils were taken to more secure areas. But for some reason, Borno didn't get it right...

S: [interrupting] 3.**Hang on! Four hours before the abduction operation began, military headquarters in Maiduguri was informed this attack was going to take place and the military did nothing about it.**

D: 3.**That's another dys-information or misinformation**. You know, the military in Borno, **the military in these areas generally on a regular basis, almost hourly basis, receive information** of possible attacks all over the states...

S: [interrupting] 4. **And they routinely ignore them**.

D: 4. **No! they don't ignore them**. You know, **most of them are hoax, alright, that's the truth**. Then let me also tell you: in this particular case, you know, the information was not that BH was coming to attack the schools. It was that BH was coming to Chibok, you know, it's not that, you know, they were not prepared. I mean, they may not know exactly where the target is going to be.

S*: **1b** you are the government's –er—the President's chief sole spin doctor, media public adviser...*

D: ***1b****[laughs]*

S: ***2b****how can you explain to me that first of all, the government in the very early hours and days after it happened tried to tell the Nigerian media that most of the girls had been freed and returned home , which was taken to be untrue*. 5.**Your government doesn't appear to even now to have one steady, specific number for how many girls are still missing. And it took more than two weeks for your boss, the President, to make any public statement about these situations...**

D: ***2b*** [interrupting] *good, good. So, we've got three issues here. First of all, the first question was --er--, you know, that the girls did what?*

S: Your officials claimed in the early hours that most of the girls had been freed and returned home.

D: [interrupting] 5.**No, no, no. Ok, that is not what happened. You know, when this event happened, I just told you , there was no official of the Borno state government, neither the principal nor the vice principal or any of the boarding house mistresses or masters were on ground(sic)**. So when the military approached them the next day to find out what exactly happened there, the principal told the military that, were, you know, about 129 girls were in the school and well, 121 of them, you know, have returned and that only 8 parents cannot find their children...

S: [interrupting] The confusion, the confusion began, the exists today. You tell me exactly how many girls are missing today from this school...

D: [interrupting] Stephen, on this say...

S: [interrupting] You must know...

D: I will tell you the truth on this set—only God, the Governor of Borno state, the Commissioner of Education and the principal of the school, know the truth about this matter...

S: [interrupting] O, come on...

D: This is the real issue...

S: [interrupting]6. **O, come on, some officials know and won't tell the Nigerian public...**

D: [interrupting] 6.**This is the real issue. You know, you cannot sit here in England and understand the problem that we have in Nigeria,** this whole thing, in the fullness of time and by God's grace, we will exactly know what has happened. But I'm telling you that only God, the governor of Borno state, the commissioner of education and the school principal. Because in this matter...

S: [interrupting] 7.**Well, I'll tell you what. Gross dereliction of duty... your president does not even know...**

D: Can I tell you something? What I'm trying to tell you is that there is nobody that has spoken on this matter, nobody, whether the governor, the principal, the parents, you know, that have said the same thing. There are so many versions, so many views as the same number of people that were asked. So, you know...

S: [interrupting] why did it... **stop for a second. Why did it take your President more than 2 weeks to address the Nigerian people on this matter?**

D: Hold on. The issue...

S: [interrupting] just a simple answer would do

D: 7. **the issue isn't addressing the Nigerian people but taking, you know, immediate actions that will assist in rescuing the girls. I mean, I am DoyinOkupe. I work with this President. I'm with the President almost 24 hours a day. I know the night that this news broke(sic) and I know immediately the news –er—er—er—security agents, I mean military officials in the country were summoned the very next day, you know, the—the—the—council meeting was held, instructions were given... actions were taken...**

S: [interrupting] 8. **wh—wh—why do you think that all of these actions that you talked about have failed so completely?**

D: 8. **For the same reason that, you know...you know, I mean kidnapping all over the world is not a soap opera!** It's not easy...

S:[interrupting] W e do not know the number, but this is more than 200 girls...

D: 200 and something girls are taken alright. Let me tell you, the Chief of Defence staff said recently...he said that, you know, it's not that, the intelligence is not working. We know where the girls are, but can you really approach them...

S: [interrupting] You know? There has been so much confusion about this...

D: There is no confusion about that...

S [interrupting] YOU know exactly where the girls are...

D: the military know where the girls are...

S: [interrupting] Do YOU know?

D: I may not know, you know, I'm not a military person. But I rely on what my Chief of Defence staff said. And the President is aware.

S: 9.**So what a terrible indictment of your security forces. They know exactly where the girls are but it appears they are completely impotent to actually deliver their rescue.**

D: 9.**Stephen, I'm surprised that you are saying that. You know, the Americans were held hostage, 54 of them where held hostage in Tehran in 1979 or something like that. It took the American government, I mean 444 days to free them. I mean, why are you talking like this? 444 days—one and half years. They know the venue, it is their embassy. They could not get those hostages released for 444 days!**

S: Yes, their hostages happened to be in the middle of Tehran. Yours...

D: [interrupting] These hostages happened to be in the middle of Sambisa forest!

S: [interrupting] Exactly. Which is sovereign Nigerian territory...

D: Yes, which is extremely difficult to navigate

S: [interrupting]- - - -

D: [continuing] and then the number of girls makes it extremely difficult for us because we don't want to lose any of the girls...

S: [interrupting] wittingly or not...

D: [continuing] the whole world...

S: [interrupting] - - - Hang on! Hang on!

D: Just hold on. You hold on! The whole of the world is concerned. Everybody is worried. But we have a greater burden. We must not lose any of these girls. ..

S: [interrupting] If I may say...

D: [continuing] The President has promised that he will get the girls out and he's gonna do that...

S: [interrupting] If I may say that…

D: [continuing] He's gonna do that.

S: [interrupting] Well I don't know why we believe that promise made by...

D: [interrupting] I believe that promise. Nigerians believe that promise.

S: what you have just wittingly or unwittingly said to me is that there are swathes of territory in your country, particularly in the north east, where the grip of your government does not run.

D: That is not true. You know, we have a very expanse of land. We have 1800km of, you know, of desert land that forms a border between us, Cameroun, Chad, Niger, you know,- - er - - and I mean, Cameroun, Chad and Niger. So, you know, it is difficult, it's a very difficult terrain. It's made up of hills and mountains and deep forests.

S: ***3b****You now have some assistance from the United States' government and that has raised interest in the US government in what is going on. Just the other day, the Pentagon official, Alex French, did testify before the US Congress. She said this, she said ' We are looking at a military force in Nigeria that is afraid to engage and much of the funding that goes to the military,' she said, ' is skimmed off of the top which is why the resources are not adequate to the challenge'.*

D: ***3b****I don't know where she got her information from. You know, we have one of the best military on the continent. We have records, outstanding records...*

S: [interrupting] 10.**You have soldiers who are not paid. Who have said it themselves that they go hungry. They are not delivered the right kind of food. One told Reuters news agency in Borno recently. He said ' BH are much better equipped than we are...**

D: [interrupts] - - -

S: [continuing] He said ' I'm taking...

D: [interrupting] I can't take...

S: Hang on! He said, 'I am taking a knife to a gunfire...

D: [interrupting**] 10. I can't take some of these informations (sic) as credible. It was Reuters that broke the news that the President was going to go to Chibok and it was not true.** So you know...

S: [interrupting] Reuters was told by official sources he was going...

D: [interrupting] Official sources?

S: Yes!

D: What does that mean?

S: Well, people like you...

D: No, I didn't. If I did, I would have come out to say so, - - er- - Reuben Abati did not. The President did not.

S: [interrupting] Well, I will tell you what!

D: Yeah.

S: If the President is...

D: [interrupting] So the point I'm trying to say, the point I'm trying to make is that...

S:21 [interrupting] **With respect, in an interview, you have to give me an opportunity to ask some questions.**

D:21 **You also have to give me opportunity(sic) to answer your questions**!

S: I think I have done that.

D: Yes.

S: 22. **Why is the President not prepared to go to Chibok?**

D: 22. **Who said the President is not prepared to go to Chibok?** But the President cannot go to Chibok when it has become...

S: [interrupting] I'm just hearing you saying he has no intention of going...

D: [interrupting] I never said so. I never said so. I said Reuters, you know, broke a news (sic) that was not true. And therefore I will not rely on some of the information...

S: [interrupting] Sorry, let's get this straight...

D: [continuing] I've also seen other...

S: [interrupting]- - -

D: [continuing] ...(I've seen other) networks interview people purportedly to be Nigerian soldiers with their faces, you know, shielded, you know, we don't know who they are talking to. That could be anybody in the desert...

S: ***4b***[interrupting] *Let us get this straight. The girls were taken on the evening of April 14. Here we see, more than six weeks later the President has not even visited the town where the girls were abducted from. When is he going to go?*

D: ***4b****I'm not going to announce that, but he's going to go there. Stephen believe me, he's gonna go there. But you know, we're more concerned, you know, for you and for everybody else, you know, you know, and quite rightly so, you know 270 children have been abducted. They have been stopped from school. Their parents are in pain. The whole country is in a very very bad mood, including the President. But then, you know, when we finish this, we still have the BH problem to, I mean you know...*

S:[interrupting] *Absolutely.*

D: [continuing] *Yeah, to battle with...*

S: [interrupting] You do.

D: [continuing] you know, yeah, and if they take these girls, they can take other people, so...

S: [interrupting] I wanna talk about the wider issue in just a second...

D:[continuing] W e are looking at a more holistic approach to this thing.

S: Holistic approach?

D: Yes, holistic approach.

S: alright, let us, one more question on the specific case of the girls. The last specific question is this, mixed with messages on one other aspect of the case. Is the government or is the government not prepared to negotiate with BH about the principle of a prisoner swap for the freedom of the girls?

D: the President has announced and he has said that we're not going to negotiate. But the problem here is...

S: [interrupting] There are...

D: Just hold on. Hold on a minute...

S: [interrupting] there are individuals who're negotiating right now. Are there not?

D: You see the options available to Nigeria are not just either military or negotiations. There are other options that are available to Nigeria. Ok, I mean, it's a Nigerian problem, we're going to find a Nigerian solution to this matter. It does not have to form or fit into the jacket...

S: [interrupting] What's this other option you 're talking about?

D: Ok, fine, you know, for instance, you know, I mean, the President has now offered something that looks like, 'Ok, fine, you guys, surrender, you know, give the girls, you know, let's have the girls, surrender your arms, you'll be fully forgiven, you'll be integrated, reintegrated and rehabilitated in society. We also have the information some of these guys are getting tired, you know, and they're getting really, really frustrated. So they want to come out and we're ready receive them...

S: [interrupting] Well...

D: [continuing] So it's not just A or B. there are so many options...

S: [interrupting] - - - -

D: [continuing] also, we have in Nigeria, very highly credible people, stakeholders who even the BH tend to respect. We're ready to now mobilise every of these people and to ensure that, you know, some kind of discussion take place and the girls are released...

S: [interrupting] Are you...

D: [continuing] but it is a Nigerian problem and we will get a Nigerian solution to it. It may not comform to what the world thinks, but it's a Nigerian solution and we're Nigerians, we always get it right. We have always gotten it right...

S: [interrupting] You always...

D: [continuing] even when people gave up on us, we always got it right {he is clapping}, that is what makes us Nigerians...

S: [interrupting] interesting...

D: Yes, very interesting! But that's the truth.

S: You always get it right?

D: We always get it right!

S: So when Amnesty International, Human Rights Watch, the US government and Nigerian media as well, all report that in recent months your security forces have been responsible for not just dozens but hundreds of extra-judicial killings; that they routinely detain and beat suspects—people they believe to be from BH—across the north-east of your country. That is part of getting it right, is it?

D: how can you ask me this. If I ever have to regret doing this interview, it will be because I have to really confront, you know, major, you know, well-known establishments for instance, you know, Amnesty International or human rights organizations. These were the same people who published, you know, one hideout 'Baga saga', you know, where they said that you know, the Nigerian military burnt 7000 houses, killed people. And all ended up to be a major hoax, a major international scam. It was not true, it did not happen, and evidence today has proved that that was not correct, so you know...

S: [interrupting] Ok, alright, ok, I have heard government officials in many countries...

D: Yes,

S: protesting Amnesty International isn't fair

D: Yeah,

S: Would you say the same thing about the United States govessrnment's Robert Jackson, deputy assistant security of state for African affairs, who said the other day...

D:[interrupting] Can I explain...

S: Let people hear what he said!

D: Yea,

S: ' We have been urging the Nigerian government to reform its approach to BH when soldiers destroy towns, kill civilians and detain innocent people with impunity, mistrust takes root'.

D: Now, you know, if an American is speaking about BH or terrorism in Nigeria, he's probably looking at it from the 'alqaidan'(?) prison. But you see, we're dealing with...

S: [interrupting] I think he is looking, with respect, at it from a human rights prison.

D: No, no, no. Yes, yes, we're dealing with an internal crisis where the insurgents are Nigerians. They're not different from you and I. Now I want to tell you, in Kano, in Kano, a lady that sells oranges with wheelbarrow was sitting on an AK47, in the main street of Kano. Now, hhow do you distinguish between that and the BH? If a soldier had an information(sic) and went and harass the lady and bundle her into a car. They will say ' Oh, you know, see how they're treating the ladies? Do you see how they're treating civilians?' So these are some of the problems we have had...

S: [interrupting] I'm interested in this specific question. Do you think your boss, excuse me, I'm interested in this specific question.23.**Do you think your boss, the President of Nigeria is aware that every single day dozens of bodies are transferred from the military headquarters—a prison called Giwa—to the morgue in the hospital in Maiduguri...**

D:[interrupting]23.**That is not true, that, that is not true...**

S:[continuing] ...every day with signs of torture, some of them with their hands...

D: [interrupting] Stephen, that is not true. Nigeria and the Nigerian military, we're suffering from a major, major, orchestrated, you know, issues that causes (sic) disaffection, yeah...

S: [interrupting] Who's orchestrating this conspiracy? Uh...

D: No, no, you must understand this, you know, that is the problem. You do not understand the holistic problem of Nigeria. Goodluck Jonathan has committed an offence. His major offence is that he won an election when some people in Nigeria very strong and powerful feel that he ought not to have won and that you know, power ought not to be where where it is presently resident. So you know, people want to take this power by all means, at all, employing all sorts of - - er- - gimmicks and they have a lot of money, and they have a lot of influence both in Nigeria and outside Nigeria.

S: Do you think there could be any relationship between the militant movement BH and its power, currently in the north-east of your country and the fact that the north and north-east of Nigeria is suffering the most desperate poverty...

D: [interrupting] No, no...

S: [continuing] ...that 72% of the people in the north and north-east are living in absolute poverty.

D: No, you know, go and ask, you know, very objective Nigerians, including northerners. They will tell you this is as a result of long-standing negLECT...

S: NEGlect!

D: NEGlect. By, you know, by various governments in the past...

S: [interrupting] including your own.

D: No, I mean, this government is only 3 years old, Stephen, I mean that is the truth...

S[interrupting, laughing sarcastically] what is the truth...

D: You can't produce this level of poverty of poverty in 3 years. These are things, these are results...

S: [interrupting] *You can send signals to the people of the north-east that they will no longer be neglected.* That you will directly...

D: [interrupting] *Yeah, but then, but then, but then you have to win this war first. You cannot rebuild, you cannot rehabilitate, you cannot bring money, you cannot do anything unless there is peace.* I mean if I ask you as an expatriate, 'Come to Borno state, come and help me establish a school,' would you go?

S: Maybe the people of the north-east might take seriously your claims that your government cares for them if...

D: [interrupting] The government has already started. You know, in this year's budget, some measure,Imean,some substantial amount of money has been put into studying what will need to be done after this work. We have already began(sic) that. Obviously there is not, you know, a marshal kind of plan will have to be done specially, you know, for the north-east and the north in general. The poverty in the north is a lot. It's high, you know, these are statistics, these are facts...

S: [interrupting] The next day which is...

D:[continuing] Poverty anywhere endangers prosperity everywhere. So it will be foolhardy for not just Goodluck Jonathan, for any government in Nigeria and in future to neglect issues of poverty, the ravaging poverty in the north and elsewhere in the country.

S: To actually address issues of poverty in the north-east, your government is gonna have to address the issue of endemic systematic corruption throughout the nation of Nigeria but particularly in your oil business. You said 'We've only been in power 3 years', what in 3 years has your boss done to root out the systemic corruption in the oil business?

D: The oil business is one area that is, you know, we know there's a lot of challenges and government has taken a lot of steps, you know, you don't...

S: [interrupting]25.**twenty billion dollars in eighteen months siphoned out by the state petroleum company…**

D: [interrupting] 25.**Stephen, you're an international journalist. I do not expect you to, you know, comment on things that are unreal...**

S: [interrupting] Excuse me, that's not my analysis. That's the analysis of the Governor of the Central Bank, Mr Sanusi.

D: But do you know that, that same Sanusi, you know, did not start with 20 billion? He started with 50 billion, he changed it to 12 billion, he came back to 10 billion, and when he did have the problem with the government, he now come up with 20 billion. So that's a major joke! I mean that's a major joke, it's not true. There's no way you can withdraw 20 billion from Nigeria economy and the economy is not gonna sink. It's absolute fallacy!

S: [interrupting] Here's what might be a joke to some Nigerians: the fact that the Governor of the Central Bank alleges corruption in the state petroleum company and lo and behold within weeks he is detained; he is suspended from his...

D [interrupting] He was never detained.

S: He was suspended from his job...

D: [interrupting] He was never detained, he was never detained...

S: His passport was confiscated. Hang on!

D: [interrupting] No nono. Stephen, Stephen, are you Sanusi'slawyers(sic)? {Laughs}

S: Sanusi's case is being tested in the court. I know the case of Sanusi just as well as you do, but what I'm telling you is that Mr Sanusi's allegations are backed by Shell oil company in Nigeria...

D: [interrupting] I'm not aware of that, I'm not aware.

S: There are a host of independent analysts who say that the corruption, the bunkering...

D: [interrupting] Are you aware, you know, now there's an independent auditing that's going on currently in the oil sector? And this President has vowed publically that, you know, once that auditing is concluded whatever is recommended will be implemented to the letter no matter whose ox is gored.

S: *Do you agree with your most successful businessman in all Nigeria, in all Africa, Mr Dangote said the other day that ' If we don't tackle the roots of this insurgency, it threatens the very integrity, the very future of Nigeria,' do you agree?*

D: *I agree. We've got to get over this. This is the greatest challenge of this generation of Nigerians. But I tell you, it's a Nigerian problem we're going to find a Nigerian solution. We're gonna get over it. We've always gotten over everything that has plagued us. And we will get over this.*

S: 24 .**And why would the people of Nigeria believe you now after a record of your government 3 years of failure.**

D: 24. Because in another couple of months down the line, they will you know just like we have done, you know in the infrastructure , railways were dead, you know for 20 years, we revitalised it . We were generating 2000 mega...

S: So you don't recognise this failure that I'm talking about?

D: Which failure? There's no failure in Nigeria. In governance in Nigeria, there's no failure.

S: Ok

D: I'm just about to read to you the achievements of this administration. It is not by chance that we become the largest economy in the world. It is because we created an enabling environment, got people who are smart, like Okonjo-Iweala, to run the economy.

S: [interrupting] Alright, we have to...

D [continuing] We've got some of the best people running this government.

S: And we have to end there. DoyinOkupe, thanks for being on Hardtalk.

Appendix B: With Wole Soyinka

Hello and welcome to Hardtalk on the BBC World Service with me shawnlayin?. My guest today is Wole Soyinka. **Nigerians know him as a writer who defied persecution and imprisonment to champion the cause of independence against colonisers of democracy, against dictatorship.** He is the son of a schoolteacher, grew up a Christian with neighbours who are Muslims. So Boko Haram(henceforth BH) the militant group that has burnt schools to the ground, killed children and recently abducted schoolgirls is an anathema to everything he believes. yet the Nigeria of today is far from the free nation he's championed. Oil has brought great wealth, great corruption too and has done little to reduce poverty. As Nigerians mark the country's centenary, is there anything to celebrate and any reason to hope that Nigeria will last for another century. Wole Soyinka, welcome to HARDtalk.

ER: ***And that group, that philosophy, that is a challenge to everything that you have believed in and fought for through word and deed over the half century. Does it feel that personal?***

EE: *Absolutely. I feel it's a negativity, you know, in fact of my understanding of humanity, of society, community, ideology, even the very reason for existence is to be at this stage of my life and how 300 of my children abducted because this is what it means to me.*

ER: And you wrote last month, you posed a question, you said 'are the people themselves sometimes collaborators in the shrinkage of that space of choice, that space of freedom?' Could BH have established themselves in this way if there was not that group ?

EE: yes, yes, BH took advantage of that er..er.. of the negation of equality of space and rights. some politicians recognised that fact that the opportunity was there so they brought together this religious fanaticism on the one hand and established a reign of impunity.

ER: But would any of these be possible if there was not a perception in large parts of the north that the state... had become a state for some and not for all?

EE: That's absolutely correct. And this is why where issues like marginalisation come in, where er the class distinctions become so wide. Corruption becomes almost a kind of ideology of the nation. you see the undeserving actually living in palaces and doling out little, little leftovers to the foot soldiers.

ER: Let me put you... about corruption, what the President Jonathan said. He said this a few days ago. He said, 'over 70% of what called corruption is not corruption but common stealing. Corruption is perception not reality.' Do you think that is correct or is it just semantics?

EE: Em, you know, er, English is a foreign language and one has to make allowances for how individuals and groups use a language, er, especially when the language being foreign is convenient for the evading realities and responsibilities of governance. For Heaven's sake, I ask you, when we talk of corruption, material corruption, and somebody says it's not corruption we have to deal with but stealing, now what does that tell you? Either a total lack of understanding of the society you live in or an attempt to confuse your listener.

ER: So, the President is trying to evade that responsibility in your view?

EE: He's trying to evade the er situation

ER: 40 years ago, in The Man Died, you wrote 'justice is the first condition of humanity'. isn't that the failure which draws together a number of these problems – that the state has in a sense, Nigeria, the country that you love has institutionalised injustice?

EE: Yes, if justice is, which I believe, the condition of humanity, then a large swath of the nation has been dehumanised.

ER: So how should the nation respond to this? How should that be utilised by the state machinery? how should the nation deal with this problem?

EE: yes, first of all by going backwards, understanding as we say in our society, where the rain began to beat us. Go back there and recognise where the culture of impunity became established in that nation.

ER: And where do you think it became established?

EE: *uuuuf*!.certainly not before I was born because when I was born I remember a harmonious existence between all the religious groups...everybody has their own space. And then find out how did it change? By the time you look at the entire picture you find the enthronement of impunity and so you begin to eradicate impunity... and that includes an international that what is happening in Nigeria, even if it was home-grown, has since enlarged, crossed its borders, admitted the virus, the pores of fundamentalism in other societies.

ER: But if you pour in help, if you have Europeans and Americans suddenly in Nigeria don't you create a propaganda coup for a group like BH who say actually the Nigerian state is just a cover for colonialism?

EE: Nigerian soldiers have performed, have intervened in Yugoslavia, in Liberia, we have our soldiers still in there in Central Africa. well, if we have responded to the crises of other nations not just on the African continent, so what is wrong with our calling for help now, it's not cashing in , you know , our cheques which is saying we are one common humanity and we recognise there are certain common problems which cannot be solved internally alone.

ER: And in a situation where you believe there has been political impunity, I mean we've seen calls in recent days as a result of the government's perceived slow response to the schoolchildren kidnapping for the resignation of the government. do you think the President should go?

EE: Well, you know, I especially, in particular I have to be very careful about this erer I see it as inciting a total situation of social anomie. At the same time, I must express my feeling that this government has failed the nation...

ER: My question was whether the President should go?

EE: Well, let me tell you something – if I have the conviction, one way or the other , I will be the first person to call the President and tell him 'for the sake of this nation you must sacrifice whatever ambitions you have...

ER: You've written about your childhood in Nigeria very powerfully as a time when you first experienced the thrill and excitement of political debate... Do you see any sign of that fervour in the modern Nigeria, or has Nigerians given up on politics?

EE: We thank goodness Nigerians have not given up – they have not – otherwise you will not have demonstarations going on, discourse in very, very, strident terms, er, each society has its own moment of critical nass(?), Nigeria has finally reached that moment of critical nass(?).

ER: It's led one newspaper recently in Nigeria to say the country has become a failed state. Do you share that feeling?

EE: There are moments when I feel Nigeria is a failed state, but it is not beyond redemption.

ER: So what has to change?

EE: What has to change is on multiple levels. As I said, we have an immediate, an immediate, er, crises on our hand. I believe that the Nigerian nation is to be defined one way or the other. if we don't fond those children, then for me, Nigeria is a hopeless state and let us sit down and decide that Nigeria is too much to manage and that it's easier for instance to manage a crisis of this kind or even to prevent it if we were a smaller nation.

ER: And as its future as a country, it is now the centenary, are you saying that it has a future as a single country or is Nigeria's best hope to recognise its differences and to allow it to slowly separate?

EE: I will say that we are poised on the thin edge of the knife. I think most nations go through this from time to time. It's not unique to Nigeria. The important thing is for Nigeria to recognise this as perhaps the most critical test ever over and above even the Civil War of unity...

ER: Do you believe in your heart that Nigeria still exist one hundred years from now as it has existed for the last 100 years?

EE: The structure of Nigeria either changes drastically anything from that (National) Conference or Nigerians might as well just say 'the British did a number on us and we have been able to get over it.''

Appendix C: WITHSHEHU SANI

Welcome to HARDtalk on the BBC World Service with me Stephen Sackur. My guest today has a long experience of the painful and unpredictability of Nigerian politics. **ShehuSani is a long-time human rights activist who was a political prisoner during the dark days of Nigeria's military dictatorship. In recent years he's campaigned to clean up government and build a stronger civil society. he has also been sporadically involved in the highly sensitive effort to find and negotiate and end to the violent insurgency launched some five years ago by Islamists calling themselves Boko Haram**(henceforth, BH). that insurgency focused primarily in the predominantly Muslim north east of the countryhas cost thousands of lives and captured global headlines last April when the militants kidnapped

more than 200 schoolgirls from their classrooms in Chibok. almost all of those girls remain captive. just days ago, Nigerian government officials had announced that a ceasefire deal was in the offing and the release of those girls was imminent. but since then nothing – no rreleases, no ceasefire, no end to the confusion. sanishehu remains involved in the efforts to bring the violence to an end and remains convinced that a deal can be done. but on what basis and at what cost? shehusani joins me now.

Er: welcome to HARDtalk

EE: thank you

ER: let's go back to October 17th, I think it was, when a senior defence official announced that there was an agreement with BH. Now you have intimately involved in efforts to try to arrange a dialogue mediation with BH. so was there a deal and is there a deal?

EE: well, the pronouncement that came from the Nigerian government, specifically from the security officials is one of so many that we have had on the last few years. in the last 2 years we have had pronouncements from government that there had been ceasefire and the possibility of ending this violence. but it has always come from the side of the government and it has most times ended with no results. and the option before the Nigerian government is two, in terms of ending the insurgency or getting the girls freed. the first is to use force to storm the camp and rescue the girls and the second is to explore the optionsof dialogue is the only possible way to by which these girls can gofree.

ER: [interrupting] I want to push you on my opening question which is when the government announced there was a deal, was there actually a deal?

EE: well, that is what I'm saying. these pronouncement have been on for a long time and this is one of so many. I don't think there was a deal, it is either the government has fallen into a scam or it is part of the scam. but I can tell you that the last 2 years , there has been 16 pronouncements from government that there would be an end to insurgency and there is dialogue going on, but I think result has never come out much.

ER: [interrupting] but er there's a salutary point you made ' I'm very mindful that we 've sort of been down this road before' and indeed you going back to 2011 with former president Obasanjo were involved in an effort to reach out to the militant movement. but you're still involved. you still have contacts with the militant movement. but what is your direct involvement today? are you trying to negotiate, mediate today?

EE: well in the last 2 years what I and others were trying to do is to see the possibility of facilitating a talk between the government and the insurgent group. but for now of immediate need is how we can bring back these girls home through negotiations and dialogue. and these girls have been I captivity for months now and it is very clear that the safest way we can get them out is through dialogue and we initiated another process of which we will bring the insurgents to the table together with the government and we've been able to achieve that...

ER:[interrupting] sorry, sorry. you've been able to achieve it. so you're telling me in recent weeks and months you have been directly involved in processes in which government officials and representatives of BH are sitting in the same room and talking about a deal to both get a ceasefire and to return the more than 200 Chibok girls to their families?

EE: yes of course. and the details of this iis this, erm, the idea is to see that er a swap{/swap/} deal is realised.

ER: [interrupting, correcting] a swap {/swop/} deal.

EE: yes a swap deal. and that includes the insurgent group, they gave us the names of 16 of their members they want them to be freed and in exchange for the girls. and the talk reached a deadlock whereby the government is insisting that all the girls must be freed but they could not provide freedom for all the 16 members of the grou p and the group was insisting that it is only o basis that all of their 16 members are freed before they will talk of releasing the girls, and they said they are not prepared to release all of them at a time, they're prepared to do it in bits in which the government said they won't accept that.

ER: alright we've had mixed messages I think on the Nigerian media on this question of what they're prepared to negotiate and who will. just be clear with me, who was representing the Nigerian government in these talks that you are talking about?

EE: well, the persons who represented the Nigerian government asked that kept them off the camera and those ones that represented the group also. but what I can authoritatively tell you was that the ICRC was involved in it and the idea

ER:[interrupting, clarifying] the Red Cross.

EE:[affirming] yes. and the idea of bringing the ICRC was to help in the dialogue process, they don't dialogue, they don't mediate, but to facilitate dialogue that happen between the government and the insurgency

ER:[interrupting] but as far as...

EE:[continuing] but we wanted to bring in the Red Cross there, the ICRC is to see that the ICRC will receive custody of the girls and hand them over to the government and they will also receive custody of the insurgents and then hand them over to their members.

ER: but despite what the officials said in ermid October about a deal being done and the girls coming home soon, you are telling me that as far as you understand it today this deal based on a swap the girls' release for prisoner releases that's all fuzzy.

EE: we reached a deadlock, I can tell you that er for the fact t he government is not prepared to release all the members requested by the insurgent. they requested that 16 of their members should be released but government only provided 4 and as far as the insurgents, they were not prepared to release all the girls . what they intend to do was to release a few of them and then they say they will do later, gradually. but what is very clear to both sides is they're asking ,

there's mutual suspicion and distrust from both side and to which they could not follow up to the pledges.

ER: [interrupting] are these talks continuing?

EE: the talks are continuing but erm we've been trying to see that we implore on both sides to make concessions and they're not prepared to do that for now

ER: [interrupting] you're a human rights campaigner. you 've devoted a lot of your life to defending human rights. you're playing with fire here aren't you, you are now telling the Nigerian government that in your view they should release, you say, 16 dangerous BH militants and I know from the Nigerian media that the names include people who've convicted of planting car bombs of mass murder and your message as a human rights campaigner is that these people must be freed.

EE: the state of Israel er swapped Dilashaleed(?) with almost a thousand Palestinians whom they call terrorists and the United States also swapped 5 Taliban members with one of their soldiers. there is no reason the Nigerian government should not be able to do it. what should matter most to us is the lives of these girls and not keeping some insurgents in prison for a very long time. the insurgent group

ER: [interrupting]but when we talk about Mustapha Umar, for example, convicted terrorist planted a bomb in a shopping plaza in Kaduna state which killed several civilians; KabiruSokoto a BH commander convicted for his part in the Christmas day bombing of a Church in 2011 which killed 37 people. how do you think Nigerian families listening toyou, families of those who were murdered by these people will feel as you advocate their release and presumably their return to BH and their previous activities?

EE: I share the pains of those families and I also consider such acts as condemnable. but what is very clear to us now is that we have over 275 Chibok girls that are in the BH camp and we also have twice that number of people who are also in the camp

ER:[interrupting] and how many more girls do you think will be taken as a result of what will be seen by BH as a successful operation, bartering these girls for the return of men with blood on their hands. how many more hundreds of girls do you expect taken as a result?

EE: well, if you consider the fact that we need to get these girls back alive and right now they live in camps whereby both the insurgents and the girls are the cross rears of the military and global security system. so you cannot do anything about the insurgents without first of all getting the girls out. and first of all the idea is you get the girls out and then you decide what you want to do with the insurgents, whether you want to storm the camp, whether you want to dialogue with them, but first of all get the girls out of the harm's way and that is most important