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Abstract
The rate at which impoliteness strategies increase on the social media calls for attention. This is so because it is capable of causing disintegration in the society. Scholars have worked on impoliteness and hate speeches and offer recommendations as to minimize both. Work on the use of impoliteness to aggravate hate speech on social media is scanty in the academics. The thrust of this work is to further study this aspect of language use as we believe it is important to emphasize it so as to maintain a peaceful society. We therefore examined impoliteness as evident in the response to president Buhari’s posts on Facebook. Data were collected from the Facebook page of President Buhari. Responses were selected at random from the president’s timeline on Facebook. Impoliteness was adopted as the theory for this analysis. The analysis shows that readers did not respect each other’s public image in their responses. This is capable of causing chaos in the society. Consequently, we are of the opinion that such responses should be discouraged on the social media.
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Introduction
The use of language has a great effect on the society. There are different ways of using language. It could be used in a polite or impolite manner. Both politeness and impoliteness are pragmatics phenomenon that has been studied by scholars. Culpeper, Iganski & Sweiry (2016:1546) states that work on impoliteness originally developed as a kind of counterpoint to linguistic pragmatic work on politeness. The use of Language in an unfriendly manner that attacks others and causes offence is the preoccupation of impoliteness scholars. Politeness in this regard deals with the public self-image of an individual. When this is observed and respected, we say the person is polite and when otherwise, we say the person is impolite. Impoliteness is the use of language in such a way that the addressed person is attacked and made unhappy. The use of language in a negatively evaluated manner which attack the identity of others is refers to as linguistic impoliteness. It usually brings emotional reactions such as anger. This basically can lead to misunderstanding and conflict in the society. It is important to note that impoliteness and hate speech are mutually related.

Hate speeches are those speeches that reflect hatred and discrimination against others as a result of differences in ethnicity, gender, religion, colour/race and so on. Hate speech normally leads to crisis in the society. When the other party retaliates, it may even result in war. Hate speech does not give room for mutual relationship. Following Bagdikian (1997:4), hate speech is a communication that employs intolerant appellations to insult and denounce others either on the basis of their race, religion, ethnicity, gender, or other forms of group membership. Scholars
have worked on hate speech and impoliteness. For example, Kuntsi (2012) studies linguistic 
politeness and impoliteness in the speech of lawyers. The study adopted Brown and Levinson 
(1987)’s version of politeness. And the impoliteness theory used was formed by Culpeper 
(1996). The hypotheses in the work are that lawyers use both polite and impolite linguistic 
strategies when they are communicating with their colleagues, the judge and witnesses, and that 
more occurrences of polite linguistic strategies than of impolite strategies occur in the 
courtroom. The results show that lawyers do use both politeness and impoliteness strategies in their 
speech in the courtroom. However, the number of politeness strategies was significantly greater than of 
impoliteness strategies. Therefore, the results correspond with the hypotheses presented.

Culpeper, Iganski & Sweiry (2016) works on Linguistic impoliteness and religiously aggravated 
hate crime in England and Wales. The research takes its approach from the field of linguistic 
impoliteness, a field the author claimed to have yet to consider hate crime. Whilst the work 
reveals some linguistic support for the way religiously aggravated hate crime is framed in the 
law and discussed in the legal literature, it highlights areas of neglect and potential ambiguity. 
Regarding impoliteness, the study demonstrates the effectiveness of impoliteness as an approach 
to the data gotten, but the work also highlights areas of neglect in the literature, notably, non-
conditional threats and incitement.

Culpeper, Bousfield & Wichmann (2002) focus on impoliteness, the use of communicative 
strategies designed to attack face, and thereby cause social conflict and disharmony. Using 
television documentary recordings of disputes between traffic wardens and car owners as our 
data, they revisit the impoliteness framework mapped out in Culpeper (1996). Having justified 
why an impoliteness framework is needed, the work explores the notion of impoliteness and 
considers whether the impoliteness strategies identified in Culpeper can be found in another 
discourse type. The paper argues that for impoliteness to be fully appreciated we need to move 
beyond the single strategy (lexically and grammatically defined) and examine both how 
impoliteness pans out in extended discourse and the role of prosody in conveying impoliteness.

Aremu (2015) studies fourteen randomly selected invective songs of Western Nigerian 
Politicians (WNPs), utilizing the modified version of Eckert and McConnell-Ginet’s (1992a) 
community of practice (CofP) as the pragmatic tool for data analysis. Findings revealed that, 
invective songs of WNPs were characterized by impolite/belligerent utterances, indirect speech 
acts, political confrontational behavior, lexical borrowing, code-mixing, direct speech acts, use 
of paralanguage, imagery, and symbolism. The paper concluded that, CofP clearly explicates the 
signification in invective songs of WNPs and shows the participants’ intention in the discourse.

Okafor and Alabi (2017) examine from perspective of pragmatics, instances of hate speeches 
made by political actors during the 2015 general election campaigns in Nigeria with the aim of 
revealing their pragmatic import. The Speech Act theory (SAT) by Austin (1962) and Searle 
(1969) were used to analyse the data. Data for the study were retrieved from publications of 
purposively selected Nigerian newspapers and magazine between 2012 and 2015. The findings 
revealed that campaign speeches made prior to the 2015 general elections in Nigeria serve as 
weapons of intimidation, blackmail, incitement and coercion and thus created an atmosphere of 
fear and anxiety within the polity. Based on this, the paper recommends enlightenment 
programmes on the tenets of democracy and good governance for all citizens to protect 
Nigeria’s nascent democracy.
Finally, Opeibi (2005) examines negative political campaigns in Nigerian political discourse and noted that politicians employ smear campaigns with the goal of discrediting, damaging and blackmailing the opponent.

The above review provides us with useful information about impoliteness, politeness and facework. It also exposes us to the study of hate speeches. These works are helpful to the existing study. However, none of the works investigates linguistic impoliteness and aggravated hate speech on Facebook. This makes the present work a novel contribution to knowledge. The work is relevant to the society as it unveils the role of linguistic impoliteness in the aggravated hate speeches as used on the social media. It will help to know the effect of Facebook comment on the society.

The recent aggravated level of hate speeches in Nigeria calls for concern. It has become a source of worry to all and sundry. This has been condemned by everyone, however it still persists. The rate is so high to the extent that the federal Government of Nigeria has to react and warn people against such. This is because it can disintegrate the country. The use of hate speech is not limited to one region of the country. Prominent among this is the speech credited to the Arewa Youth Forum tagged Kaduna Declaration, the IPOB and Niger delta response to the Arewa Youth Forum Declaration. The statement and the response by these two groups show how far the use of hate speech can go to disintegrate the country. The use of hate speech is originally meant to hurt the other party. It is usually a coercive word directed at a particular group of people to hurt or seek for compliance.

Tedeschi and Felson (1994:2) states that coercive action is an action taken with the intention of imposing harm on another person or forcing compliance. Actors engaged in coercive actions expect that their behaviour will either harm the target or lead to compliance, and they value one of these proximate outcomes. The value they attach to compliance or harm to the target arises from their belief about the causal relationship between compliance or harm and the terminal values. There are many values that might be pursued through coercive means. Tedeschi and Felson (1994:9) psychologically observes that, for example, actors might value harm to the target because they believe it will result in justice, or they might value the target's compliance because they believe it will lead to tangible benefits.

The use of hate speech is a reflection of lack of respect for other’s public self-image. The attack or threat to others public face is termed impoliteness. This is capable of aggravating the rate of hate speech in the society. Fraser and Nolen (1981: 96) states that no sentence is inherently polite or impolite. We often take certain expressions to be impolite, but it is not the expressions themselves but the conditions under which they are used that determine the judgment of politeness. This may be correct to an extent following what Yoruba will called ija l’ode t’orin d’owe (it is when there is misunderstandings that ordinary song turns hate speech).

The general aim of this work is to examine linguistic impoliteness and aggravated hate speeches in reader’s-response to President Buhari’s speech on Facebook while the objectives include; to know the type of impolite responses to the speeches of President Buhari on Facebook, to investigate how impoliteness can aggravate hate speech or not and to determine how impoliteness and hate speeches are capable of affecting the country.

It is usually expedient for people to maintain harmonious relationship so as to allow development and peace in the society. With the use of hate speeches, this may be difficult to achieve. Hate speech is a serious hindrance to peaceful co-existence. This has been a major source of worry to all meaningful Nigerians in the recent times. To lend our credence to this, we
shall at the end of this work be answering the following research questions: What are the impolite words found on the responses to Buhari’s speech? How can impoliteness aggravate hate speech? How can impoliteness and hate speeches be of adverse effect to the country? These researchers adopt a textual analytical method. A textual analytical research means that data for analysis are sourced only from text(s) and interpreted in accordance with how the data are used in the texts where they are selected. Textual analytical method does not allow external idea, opinion or influence either in the form of gathering data or in the data analysis. Since writings on Facebook are also a text, data for this work were gathered from the responses of the people to the speech delivered by President Buhari on his return from London after his medical trip and the October, 2017 independence speech. There are over one thousands responses on each post. Readers were attacking one another through their responses. We however selected at random to sample representatives from different regions and political affiliations. We used names to determine the likely region an individual belongs to and choice of words, in most cases to determine political affiliation. Occurrences of impoliteness strategies were searched for in the data and picked at random. The data are categorized according to the impoliteness strategies as explained by Culpeper (1996:356).

**Impoliteness as a Theoretical Framework**

It is important at this juncture to examine impoliteness as a theoretical framework for this work. This is to enable us show its appropriateness to the present work. Culpeper (2011:22) states that impoliteness involves attitude that comprised of negative evaluative beliefs about particular behaviours in particular social contexts, and the activation of that attitude by those in particular context-behaviours. He further considers the functions of impoliteness events, which according to him may overlap. The three functional types are identifiable: affective, coercive and entertaining. Tedeschi and Felson (1994) cited in Culpeper (2011), observe that "social harm may be imposed by insults, reproaches, sarcasm, and various types of impolite behaviour. Culpeper identifies some impoliteness concept in the literature, face, social norms and rights, intention and emotion. Following Culpeper (1996:1), impoliteness is divided into two different categories: inherent impoliteness and mock impoliteness or banter. Culpeper (1996: 2) states that there are acts that innately threaten one’s face regardless of the context of the act, this is called inherent impoliteness. Furthermore, impoliteness that stays on the surface and is not intended to insult anyone is called mock impoliteness (Culpeper 1996: 4). It is imperative to note that intentionality is a criterion in the definition of impoliteness. Impoliteness comes about when the speaker’s communication intentionally attack addressee’s public self-image, or when the hearer perceives and/or constructs behaviour as intentionally face-attacking, or both, (Culpeper 2005a: 38). Impoliteness constitutes the communication of intentionally gratuitous and conflictive verbal face-threatening acts (FTAs) which are purposefully delivered: (1) unmitigated, in contexts where mitigation is required, and/or, (2) with deliberate aggression, that is, with the face threat exacerbated, ‘boosted’, or maximised in some way to heighten the face damage inflicted, (Bousfield 2008: 72).

According to Culpeper (2011:22), current definitions of impoliteness deploy the following concepts: face, social norms and rights, intention and emotion. They generally lean either towards the notion of face or the notion of social norms. Although these notions are not entirely separate as earlier mentioned, for some definitions of impoliteness, intentionality is a criterion. However, Culpeper (2005:11) showed evidence that people take offence even if they know that the behaviour that caused it was not fully intentional.
Impoliteness Strategies

Culpeper (1996:356) enumerates five super-strategies of impoliteness. He states that each of the impoliteness super-strategies has its opposite in politeness super-strategy. They are opposite in terms of orientation to face. Instead of enhancing or supporting face, according to Culpeper, impoliteness super strategies are a means of attacking face. The strategies will be useful to us in this analysis as our data will be grouped under these strategies. The strategies are discussed briefly as follows, according to Culpeper (1996).

1. Bald on record impoliteness: the face threatening act (FTA) is performed in a direct, clear, unambiguous and concise way in circumstances where face is not irrelevant or minimised. It is important to distinguish this strategy from Brown and Levinson's Bald on record. For Brown and Levinson, Bald on record is a politeness strategy in fairly specific circumstances. For example, when face concerns are suspended in an emergency, when the threat to the hearer's face is very small (e.g. "Come in" or "Do sit down").

2. Positive impoliteness: the use of strategies designed to damage the addressee's positive face wants.

   Positive impoliteness output strategies:
   Ignore, snub the other: fail to acknowledge the other's presence.
   Exclude the other from an activity
   Disassociate from the other: for example, deny association or common ground with the other; avoid sitting together.
   Be disinterested, unconcerned, and unsympathetic
   Use inappropriate identity markers: for example, use title and surname when a close relationship pertains, or a nickname when a distant relationship pertains and so on

3. Negative impoliteness: the use of strategies designed to damage the addressee's negative face wants.

   Negative impoliteness output strategies:
   Frighten: instill a belief that action detrimental to the other will occur.
   Condescend, scorn or ridicule: emphasize your relative power. Be contemptuous. Do not treat the other seriously. Belittle the other (e.g. use diminutives).
   Invade the other's space: literally (e.g. position yourself closer to the other than the relationship permits) or metaphorically (e.g. ask for or speak about information which is too intimate given the relationship).

4. Sarcasm or mock politeness: the FTA is performed with the use of politeness strategies that are obviously insincere, and thus remain surface realisations.

5. Withhold politeness - the absence of politeness work where it would be expected. [...]For example, failing to thank somebody for a present may be taken as deliberate impoliteness. (Culpeper 1996: 8-9)

Data Presentation and Analysis

The data will be segmented according to the impoliteness super-strategies highlighted by Culpeper, Culpeper (1996: 8-9). Where name of a person or group of persons is mentioned, we will deliberately delete the name to avoid a further attack on the person or group mentioned. Ellipsis will be used to bridge such gap.
1. **Bald on record impoliteness**: the face threatening act (FTA) is performed in a direct, clear, unambiguous and concise way in circumstances where face is not irrelevant or minimized.

a. **This shows clearly you have a mental problem.**

The statement is affirmative. It shows the conviction of the speaker about the health situation of the addressee. To have a ‘mental problem’ is to have a psychiatric problem. It is an offensive term meaning to be affected with a psychiatric disorder. The statement is a clear attack on the face of the other person that comments on the speech of President Buhari. To say somebody has a ‘mental problem’ is a serious attack. It is an example of hate speech. This shows unfriendliness and it aggravates hate speeches on social network because the attacked person may also decide to respond to such attack. If this is done, the society may be thrown into chaos. The use of language cannot be neutral to the society.

b. **We are not expecting praises from you…. So to hell with you and your likes. Idiot terrorist.**

The first part of the statement is a condemnation of the addressee. It shows the person cannot feature anything good. This is another example of bald on record impoliteness because it is direct and clear attack on the other person. The phrase ‘to hell with you’ and ‘idiot terrorist’ is a serious attack that can lead to the spreading of hate speech. The statement berates the addressee. The statement is a approach to pursue their ideology. To, use this on an innocent person on Facebook is a serious attack. The commentator does not even limit attack to the addressee but extend it to his/her associates. This should not be welcomed at all as it can cause disintegration in the society.

c. **We are not expecting everyone to commend his speech, but your background argument is baseless and actually require your brain to be scrutinized @ psychiatric hospital. Arrant rubbish.**

The clause ‘your brain to be scrutinized @ psychiatric hospital simply means the person is mentally imbalanced. Arrant rubbish’ is also an attack on the addressee face. It will definitely not make the addressee happy. This is saying that all what the person is doing or saying have no seriousness in it as he/she has mental problem. This is telling the addressee that he/she is mentally imbalanced. Nobody will hear this and be happy. It is capable of causing hatred in the society. This should not be encouraged.

d. **As nonentity as you are, you have the hand to comment ignorantly. Please, make you commit suicide baba will continue lead the country….**

This is consist of element of two different languages, English and Nigerian pidgin. The underlined part is pidgin while other aspect is English. The person open the statement with a verbal attack on the addressee. ‘As nonentity as u are’ is a serious insult that attacked addressee public face. This is regarding the addressee as unimportant and ignorant. It is never a friendly word. Asking somebody to go and commit suicide is a direct and clear attack on the person’s public face. It is simply a means of condemning the person to death. Such statement will never make the addressee happy and any response to such may cause further damage to the face. It is not a welcome speech because it can aggravate hate speeches which can cause disintegration in the society.

All the examples presented here are cases of **bald on record** impoliteness because they directly attack addressee’s public face with clear and concise words. These are little out of the numerous comments of such on the Facebook. This shows the level of intolerance in the society.
2. **Positive impoliteness**: the use of strategies designed to damage the addressee's positive face wants. Positive impoliteness has such inputs as; Use inappropriate identity markers, use obscure or secretive language, use taboo words, call the other derogatory names and so on. These are found on the comments of people on face book. The following are examples.

a. **are blood sucking vampire**

Blood sucking vampire is metaphorically used here to refer to a particular person. The metaphor is as a result of the number of people that have died as a result of some blood sucking activities. This is a case of the use of inappropriate identity marker because vampire is used to refer to animals or spirit that suck blood. It then means the addressee is an animal or a spirit that suck blood. Referring to human being here as a blood sucker is an impoliteness strategy used to attack the public image of the person.

b. **Ewu, were, dindinrin, ode, suegbe, that is what u are.**

This is another example of impoliteness. Obscure and secretive language is used. The use of languages that are not universally understood on the platform is an attempt to conceal information and insult. The addressee may not understand but others that understood will be laughing at the addressee. Ewu derogatorily means goat in Igbo. Dindinrin, ode and suegbe in Yoruba means idiot or nonentity. All are just insult and definitely attack on the addressee.

c. **you are a mass murder and blood sucking vampire. The hand of clock is dangerously ticking against you.**

Vampire and blood sucker are the same. Also, the use of murder is a criminal allegation. This shows that people are not happy with extermination of lives. The addresser is frustrated and powerless as he reminded the addressee of his end of time on earth. He threatened the addresser that the hand of clock is dangerously ticking against him. This is a threat to his life and an attempt to scare him to take responsibility by telling him/her that he/she has a limited number of days on earth. This is an impoliteness strategy used not only to attack the public face of the addressee but also to scare him to be responsible. It is frightening and can cause chaos in the society but also a means of telling people to be responsible.

d. **Uncircumcised hausa/foolanis in the zoo....**

Uncircumcised in this context means the addressee is not a believer and an unbeliever (does not have god) is capable of doing anything that is inhuman. The use of foolani in the zoo is an insult and abuse to the concerned race in Nigeria. Fulani is an important race in Nigeria but the writer plays on word to threaten the public face of the addressee by abusing the name derogatorily. Going further to say they are in the zoo threatens the face of the addressee. It is a known fact that animals are the specie that lives in the zoo. The addressee is therefore indirectly being referred to as animal that has been caged.

e. **U brainless animal, mumu**

Brainless is a direct insult. Every human being is created with functioning brain to think and reason appropriately. Mumu simply means foolishness. This corroborates the fact that the addressee is brainless. All these are impoliteness strategies that are used to attack face. To be brainless and mumu is almost the same pragmatically. It means the person cannot act like a normal human being.
The above examples show the use of impoliteness strategies on Facebook. Obscure names and languages, derogatory names and threat are employed as a strategy. These should not be encouraged. It is a form of hate speech and it is capable of inciting the society into crisis.

3. **Negative impoliteness**: the use of strategies designed to damage the addressee's negative face wants. Its output include the following. Scorn or ridicule, explicitly associate the other with a negative aspect.

a. **There are few … that are reasonable so, there wouldn’t be need to make generalization.**
   This is an attack not on an individual but on a race. This is indirectly saying that the mentioned race is not reasonable. Saying somebody is not reasonable means whatever such person says should be disregarded and not be taken serious. The tribe referred to here is an important tribe in Nigeria. Therefore, whatever they say should be considered. Referring to them as unreasonable is not welcomed. This kind of utterance is capable of causing a racial crisis in the society. It is a form of discrimination.

b. **May the blood of the ones you already spilled come after you I command**
   This example comes with a threat that can frighten the addressee. It is associating them with the spilling of innocent blood. It therefore constitutes a threat. The commentator is invoking the spirit of the blood of those that have been killed. Insinuating that they were killed by somebody is another threat to the addressee face. Until the killers are arrested, prosecuted and found guilty, nobody has the right to refer to anyone as the killer. Such reference will only cause chaos in the society. This threat also reflects frustration and is intended to force he addressee to possibly take positive action.

c. **…I am convinced that you don’t have solutions to these national problems that you have created.**
   The commentator claims that he/she is convinced that the President does not have solution to the problem of the country. That is indirectly calling the President a failure. It is a way of equating the efforts of the President to zero. Another part of impoliteness in the statement is to say that the President caused the problem of the country. This is ridiculous and threatens the public image of the President. This is discouraging as it does not anyway appreciate the smallest action of the President, instead, it brings down the effort of the President. To the president, he is doing all he could to solve the problems of the country.

d. **I couldn’t even see … clearly… you people are still lying.**
   Another means of ridiculing the effort of the President is to say that the President is not clear on the television. In addition to that, the commentator still call the President and his supporters liars. Calling him a liar is a direct attack on his face. This is another form of impoliteness usually used on the social media. It is a deliberate means of condemning the President because the clearness or otherwise of the television is not the President’s making at the moment. However, it is a means of condemning the president publicly and possibly making him to perform better.

e. **Do yourself a favour and resign.**
   To request for the resignation of the President is to tell him that he is not performing and he has failed. This is contrary to the claim of the Presidency and his supporter that he is the messiah the country has been waiting for. The statement is to ridicule all the acclaimed effort of the President that it means nothing. It is a serious attack on his public image which is capable of aggravating hate speech in our society as his supporters too can retaliate. The addressee even sees resignation as a self favour. This may not be the same to the incumbency because resigning may mean acceptance of failure.
The above examples are just few examples of negative impoliteness with the use of scorn, ridicule and fright. They are serious attacks on one another including the president’s public image. This type of comments are capable of causing crisis in the society and should therefore be discouraged.

4. Sarcasm or mock politeness: the FTA is performed with the use of politeness strategies that are obviously insincere, and thus remain surface realizations.
   a. A President that can’t even appear on the TV to address his people and you … monkeys and baboons still believe the pedophile is still alive.
      The address of the President was broadcast on the national television and transmitted by other local stations with the President speaking live. For this commentator to have claimed that the President was not on the television is a deliberate action to undermine the President. It is a way of reducing the president’s effort to nothing and thereby capable of attacking the public image of the President. It can be inferred from that statement that the President saw on the television is a ghost or dummy of the real President. This is impolite. The choice of the word pedophile is also insincere of the commentator about the supporters of the President. It is also an impolite word to be used. The issue at hand does not involve anything related to sex. It is either a misuse of word or a deliberate deviation to attack the president’s supporter.
      b. When you said you will address the nation on Monday I thought you will be making a live broadcast…
         This statement is also not correct of the real situation because the President really made the broadcast after his return from his London medical trip. The commentator is invariably saying that the speech of the President is insignificant to him/her. This could be said directly but the commentator decided to use insincere statement to attack the face of the president. The commentator is of the opinion that the President is a liar. That is the speech that has changed Nigeria since May 29, 2015. If you don’t have job, just read the speech and be employed. If you are hungry just read the speech and be filled. This is a speech of ‘why we failed’…
         This is a pure sarcasm as the commentator is making fun of the President’s speech. What he is insinuating in other words is to ask if the speech has ever solved any problem since the President has been delivering it. The statement is saying that the country does not need speech at this time but action. This may be true but it is an attack on the public image of the President. The statement is simply telling readers that the President has left his real and genuine assignment and venture into another something insignificant that will never help the nation to move forward.
         The above examples represent instances of impoliteness on the speeches of the President using sarcasm and insincere as a strategy to attack him. This is obvious in the examples given. These are capable of disintegrating the society. They are also capable of aggravating hate speeches on social media.

5. Withhold politeness -the absence of politeness work where it would be expected. For example, failing to thank somebody for a present may be taken as deliberate impoliteness. This means to be impolite is not limited to assault or insult, but also ingratitude.
   a. Nigeria is not working and can never work. Let stop deceiving ourselves.
      The above comment is tantamount to impoliteness. The government is claiming to be doing the best any government has ever done in the country and his supporters are praising that. To the government and its supporters, the country is far better than they met it and everything is in good order. However, this commentator has refute this in a simple statement by saying the country is not
working. The government and its supporters will not be happy with this as it has attacked the public image of the government. The commentator has withheld politeness. Instead of joining the encomium, he/she is saying we are deceiving ourselves. This will amount to ingratitude.

b. **Nigerians has suffered in the last two years of this disastrous & confused government was completely made by …. Clueless government without focus and worst President the country has ever had…**

This is another example of withhold politeness as the commentator condemns the government by saying the government has rather added to the problem of the country instead of ameliorating it. Calling the government ‘clueless government’ contradicts and condemns the claim of the government that they have solution to national problems. This is an attack on the public image of the government because they claim to have solution to the problem of the country but this commentator is disagree with the claim. This is showing the level of discomfort that people have with the government under President Buhari. Although this may not be correct to some people. The government claims to be working. This comment contradicts the claim and this may not go down well with the supporters of the present government. It is therefore capable of causing conflict.

c. **A failed government … has failed in everything he should go to Katsina and look after his cows.**

To tag a government that claims to have fulfilled its campaign promises a failed government is an example of withheld politeness. To the government under President Buhari, they have achieved more than expected. This commentator therefore voice out to debunk the claim of the president in his speech that the administration has achieved a lot. This directly condemning all the efforts of the president. He/she therefore wish the president resign and go home. This contradict the claim of the government about performance.

d. **…cluelessness of the … led government has led Nigeria into a great disaster.**

When the presidency under Buhari claims that they have been able to steer the ship of the country to a safe destination, this person is saying he has rather led the country into disaster. This contradict the claim of the president Buhari’s achievement claim. This is a withhold politeness. The commentator is referring to his government as a disaster which means it is a worse government. However, the incumbent is claiming to be performing at a noticeable pace. From the foregoing, withheld politeness is showcased by the commentators on President Buhari’s speech. This impoliteness strategy is used to refute the claim of the government that they have achieved a lot. It is used here to call the attention of the government to their incompetence It is not ordinarily used to insult but also to call the government to order and the reality on ground. However, it insults the public image of the presidency and its supporters. It is capable of generating more hate speeches as the supporters of the government will not agree with this claims. It will show ingratitude to them.

**Summary and conclusion**

This work is an analysis of the comments on President Buhari’s speech after returning from London medical trip in 2017 and the 2017 independence speech. We carefully selected elements of impoliteness strategies found on the comments. This we examine in relation to the widespread of hate speeches in the country. The five impoliteness strategies explained by Culpeper (2011) were identified in the comments. They are Bald on record, Positive, Negative, Sarcasm or mock, Withhold politeness. Evidence of these are reflecting on the comments to the president’s speech. This reflects the frustration and hatred of people towards the present administration. People did not hide their feelings on Facebook as they are determined to attack the president’s public image and that of their fellow citizens. The attack goes back and forth among the Facebook users.
We conclude that impoliteness is a dangerous weapon that can result into chaos in the society. As shown in the above analysis, it is capable of causing crisis in the society and thereby disintegrating the society. These strategies are not only used to insult but also result to hate speech. Hate speech in any society is capable of disintegrating the society. That is why we warn against the use of such languages especially on social media where its reach has no bound. Both impoliteness and hate speech work together. It is therefore not encouraged. Although it has its own advantages as it helps to checkmate the activities of the political class. However, the harm it may unleash on the society is more than the good. It is rather better to guard our words and choose more polite words than impolite words.
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