

**LINGUISTIC ANALYSIS OF THE LANGUAGE OF STEREOTYPE IN THE
KENYAN SOCIAL MEDIA**

MERABA CHARLES OKEMWA

C50/CE/23434/2010

**A PROJECT SUBMITTED TO THE SCHOOL OF HUMANITIES AND
SOCIAL SCIENCES IN PARTIAL FULFILMENT OF THE REQUIREMENT
FOR THE AWARD OF THE DEGREE OF MASTERS OF ARTS OF
KENYATTA UNIVERSITY**

JULY, 2024

DECLARATION

This project is my original work and has not been presented for a degree in any other institution.

Signature:..... Date:.....

Meraba Charles Okemwa

C50/CE/23434/2010

Department of Literature, Linguistics and Foreign Languages

This research study has been submitted for examination with our approval as the university supervisors.

Signature:..... Date:.....

Dr. Emily A. Ogutu

Department of Literature, Linguistics and Foreign Languages

Kenyatta University

Signature:..... Date:.....

Dr. Maroko Geoffrey

Department of Literature, Linguistics and Foreign Languages

Kenyatta University

DEDICATION

I dedicate this work to Dr. Purity Nthiga for her mentorship and influence to start the journey of higher education.

I also dedicate it to my sons Levy, Stephen, Samuel my wife, Naomi, my parents and Maseno School students for standing with me in this rigorous and very long process.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

I wish to express my gratitude to all my lecturers in the Literature, Linguistic and Foreign Languages departments. In particular Dr. Maroko and Dr. Ogutu whose patience, guidance and insight have had a profound influence on me and the fruition of this project.

I wish to recognize the efforts, input made by Vincent Onchiri and Mary and Sammy of Kenyatta University English Resource Departments, who typeset and formatted this work. Besides, I honestly appreciate the constant prayers and encouragement of Mary and Frasier of the English department even when the sun did not seem to set they encouraged me to soldier on.

I appreciate the encouragement to seek post graduate studies by my Kenyatta University mentor: Dr. Purity Nthiga, and my long term friend, teacher and mentor the Maseno School principal Mr. Paul Otula.

I am also thankful to Bong'onta fraternity for their encouragement especially Sister Vane, Miss Vuku and Mr. Samson Gitamo, the Principal, pastor, Mr. Mokamba, Mr. Wycliffe, Mr. Ayuka Mr. Nyacheo, Madam Diana, Mr. Ong'era, my late brother, John Mayagi Meraba and Amos Mochama.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

DECLARATION	ii
DEDICATION.....	iii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENT	iv
TABLE OF CONTENTS	v
DEFINITION OF TERMS	ix
ABSTRACT	x
CHAPTER ONE	1
BACKGROUND TO THE STUDY	1
1.0 Introduction	1
1.1 Background to the Study	1
1.2 Statement of the Problem	5
1.3 Research Objectives	6
1.4 Research Questions	6
1.5 Research Assumptions	6
1.6 Rationale of the Study	7
1.7 Scope and Limitations of the Study	8
CHAPTER TWO	9
LITERATURE REVIEW AND THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK	9
2.0 Introduction	9
2.1 Hate speech study in Europe	9
2.2 Pragmatics studies related to hate speech	10
2.3 Studies on definition of hate speech.....	12
2.4 Prejudice, stereotype and communication.....	15
2.5 Studies of hate speech in Africa	18

2.6 Theoretical Framework	21
2.6.1 Benesch’s model of identifying hate speech	21
2.6.2 Speech Act Theory	23
2.6.3 Halliday Systemic Functional Linguistic	26
CHAPTER THREE	29
RESEARCH METHODOLOGY	29
3.0 Introduction	29
3.1 Research Design	29
3.2 Site of study	30
3.3 The study population and sampling procedure	31
3.4 Data collection techniques	31
3.5 Data analysis technique	32
3.5.1 Qualitative analysis	32
3.6 Ethical consideration	33
3.7 Summary of Chapter Three	34
CHAPTER FOUR.....	35
DATA PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS	35
4.0 Introduction	35
4.1 Analysis of the stereotypical texts by use of Systemic Functional Grammar Theory	35
4.1.1 Material process	38
4.2 Relational process types	40
4.3 Relational process of intensive identification with carrier as subject and an attribute as complement	40
4.3.1 Relational process of identifying	41

4.3.2 Relational process of possessive attribution	44
4.3.3 Mental process	45
4.3.4 Mental process of desideration with nominal group post modified by preposition phrase	46
4.3.5 Mental process of the Emotion with the compound noun phrase as a phenomenon	46
4.4 Analysis of language of stereotype using Speech Act Theory.....	47
4.4.1 Assertives	48
4.4.2 Further examples of assertives	52
4.4.3 Expressives.....	54
4.4.4 Declaratives.....	58
4.4.5 Directives	58
4.5 Description of stereotypical texts using Benesch model.....	60
4.5.1 Analysis of stereotype texts using Benesch model of identifying hate speech...61	
4.6 Summary of chapter four	69
CHAPTER FIVE.....	70
SUMMARY OF FINDINGS, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS...70	
5.0 Introduction	70
5.1 Summary of Findings	70
5.1.1 Identification and description of selected Stereotype texts.....	70
5.1.2 Summary of findings of material process types	71
5.1.3 Summary of findings of Relation process types	71
5.1.4 Summary of findings of mental process.....	72
5.1.5 Summary of findings of Stereotype Texts	72
5.2 Conclusion.....	73

5.3 Recommendation for Further Research	74
REFERENCES	76
APPENDICES	79
Appendix I: Letter of Introduction.....	79
Appendix II: NACOSTI Research License.....	80
Appendix III.....	82

DEFINITION OF TERMS

Communication climate: the emotional tone of relationship as it is expressed in the message that people send and receive.

Discrimination: actions that result from the feelings of prejudice

Ethnocentrism: a tendency to view one's culture as superior to others.

Hate speech: words that encourage hateful regard against a certain group of people usually based on certain shared common features and can foster violent acts towards them.

Intercultural communication: The process of exchanging meaning with individuals from different cultures.

Linguistic Context: words that come before or after a phrase that may assist interpret its meaning.

Prejudice: a negative feeling that one may harbor towards a certain ethnic group which is based on hardly any or no experience.

Situational context: factors outside an utterance that may influence its meaning.

Stereotype: exaggerated belief associated with a category of people which usually lacks a factual basis.

ABSTRACT

This study is an exploration of language of hate speech used online in the Kenyan realm. The motivation of this study springs from the political turmoil of the Kenya's 2007 interethnic post-election violence. At this time, facebook users from different political divide were posting hate stereotype texts that had polarized the harmonious communication of the nation. The study identified hate texts used online after which their speech acts and grammatical features were explained. The theories used in the study were Benesch Model of identifying hate speech, Halliday Systemic Functional Grammar and speech Act Theory where the expressions were analyzed based on the nature of the verb they exhibited and the attitude inferred towards the targeted audience. With regard to language of stereotype, the study focused on only texts selected using the Benesch Model criterion. Twenty five texts were obtained from the online sources. These are facebook sites were namely: *Pwani si Kenya* and *Cord Effect*. In some case, the researcher presented the findings using tables and some cases some examples were listed before analysis base on the study's objective. The main objectives of this study are: to describe the selected facebook stereotype texts by use of Halliday Systemic Functional Theory, to analyze the facebook selected stereotype texts using Speech Act Theory and to establish the connection the hate texts speech acts and the Benesch Model of identifying hate speech. In the findings, the study noted that the Systemic Halliday Functional Grammar theory was applicable in the analysis and description of hate speech texts in terms of their grammatical features. The analysis was done by placing the sampled texts into categories like material, mental and relational processes. These categories were drawn based on the nature of the verbs exhibited on the text. This is the principle that governs the SFL theory. The study also noted that using the Speech Act Theory, Searle's categories were further applicable in analysis of hate speech texts. Searle's categories were drawn using the speech acts exhibited in the texts. Finally, the study noted that for ease of sampling of the hate speech texts from a group of online texts, the Benesch model criterion was applicable. Using this model, categories were further drawn based on the nature of the stereotype exhibited towards the target group. This is the principle that govern the Benesch Model of identifying dangerous speech further drawing for analysis. The study is intended to contribute to the development of the corpus necessary for defining and analyzing of hate speech in the Kenyan context.

CHAPTER ONE

BACKGROUND TO THE STUDY

1.0 Introduction

This section will focus on the background to the study, statement of the problem, research questions, research objectives, research assumption, the rationale of the study and the scope and limitation of the study.

1.1 Background to the Study

Many times Kenyan people communicate via facebook, a social media platform, where people can chat online and where they can choose to keep their identity anonymous (Umati 2013). This anonymity makes it possible for facebook users to chat about any topic without losing face. The context of facebook allows the communicators to express their inner feelings or sentiments naturally. This study linguistically explores how the Kenyan Facebook users express the feelings of hate towards one another. This phenomenon usually arises when politics in Kenya is at its peak. Mbugua (2021) shows Spolitics in Kenya is ethnic based and people largely support political leaders from their cultures while shunning those from other ethnic backgrounds, leading to divisions that may harm the harmonious communication of the nation. In their chats, some facebook users may occasionally trade insults or use words that tend to dehumanize members opposing their supporters from other partis.

This study falls in the linguistic field of pragmatics. Pragmatics is a specialized category of language that deals with relationship between natural language and users of that language. The concept of pragmatics focusses on conversation implicatures. In line with this study, conversation implicatures is that which a speaker implies.

Pragmatics emphasizes that language must be studied in the context of a dialogue as in the case on online conversations by various facebook users. Pragmatics also focuses on the way people converse or communicate their desires, feelings, points of view and a variety of things about their life though sometimes they have many desires which they do not express. This could be due to reasons like feelings of inferiority, personality which is erratic, fear, volition and even insult. Language of hate may portray unexpressed desires or prejudice towards some target people. This may be less common in interpersonal communication but may easily be manifested on Facebook subsequently. Facebook media may hence, provide a context for enthusiast of pragmatics to get data to analyze texts with language of stereotype since it involves language study in its natural context by real actors (Levinson, 1983).

This study can also be linked to Language and Culture studies especially in inter-ethnic communication. Dodd (1998) defines inter-ethnic communication as conversation that takes place between persons of diverse ethnic backgrounds. Hence, in language of stereotype studies, people from different ethnic background or different political persuasions may utter metaphors that may castigate others, thereby revealing contempt for them. Ordinarily, conversations of this kind are characterized by aspects of fear and anxiety. This is probably due to differences in cultural backgrounds of the speakers. This feeling of fear and anxiety could also be fostered by ethnocentrism (Neuliep & Mcrosky, 1979). Neuliep & Mcrosky (1979), also assert that it is probable that ethnocentrism can hinder inter-ethnic communication. According to Chung (1988) Ethnocentrism, a tendency to view one's culture or even point of view as superior than others can hinder harmonious intercultural communication. According to Chung, ethnocentrism hinders positive communication in the sense that, it may prevent one

from accepting others line of thought mply because they come from a different culture. When one imbibes cultural stereotypes coupled with ethnocentric feelings, a fertile context is created for commissioning of hate utterances.

According to Singer (1998), inter-ethnic communication may be characterized by language of stereotype, prejudice and discrimination as precursor of hate speech. Stereotype, prejudice and discrimination constructs, together with ethnocentrism lay the premise for studying hate speech. Stereotypes may spring up due to a negative experience. For instance, a person who has had a not so pleasant encounter with a certain kind of people, probably from a different cultural group, may go ahead to attach those unpleasant feelings to all people from that group.

Stereotype is also closely linked to prejudice which is defined as undesirable feelings towards a certain people without any viable or logical reason. It is a pre-judgment of some kind, (Castiglion, 2004). Ordinarily, stereotypes give a cosmetic view on how an ethnic group should be seen by a particular audience, while prejudice informs the audience on how it should feel or treat them when in contact with the same ethnic group (Castiglion, 2004).

In the framework of interethnic communication, another impediment of intercultural communication related to stereotype that lays the foundation for hate speech is discrimination. Singer (1998) defines discrimination, as that which results from the action of stereotyping or feeling of prejudice. It may involve open actions like deliberately avoiding one, abusive verbal utterances or violence, exclusion and creation of social distance towards some targeted cultural group. In some cases, mass killing of

the targeted group may occur after the discriminative or stereotypical acts, like the infamous 1994 Genocide in Rwanda (Mowarin, 1994).

Hate speech discourse may also exhibit features of prejudice and discrimination. Hate speech can be defined as a discourse with speech acts that are intended to degrade, intimidate, or incite violence or prejudicial action against a person or group of people, based on their, group membership, race, gender, age, ethnicity, nationality, religion, sexual orientation, disability, language ability, moral or political values, socio – economic class, appearance, mental capacity and any other distinction (Castiglioni, 2004). Furthermore, language of stereotype is manifestation of ethnocentrism.

In identification of language of stereotype, it is important to note the close relationship between language of stereotype and that of hate speech. Hate speech seem to emanate from language of stereotype or unprofaned negative generalizations (Newcomb and Charter 1950). Newcomb and Charter (1950) further affirm that people of different cultures are distinct from one another based on the stereotypes commonly held by a particular ethnic group. These stereotypes may become pronounced during a political strife as in Kenya during 2007 election where politically rival ethnic groups were using offensive metaphors to describe each other (Umati, 2013).

Although language of hate speech is highly censored in generally public discourse, it seems to have found solace in the social media due to the anonymity of the bloggers. According to Meddough (2000), the genesis of hate speech in the internet dates back to 1995. This is when Ku Kluk Klan members in America formed racist social groups in the internet to reach out to their supporters faster.

In Kenya, intercultural communication was severely affected during 2007 election period. According to Umati (2013), a research team that monitors hate speech in the internet so as to give warning signs to avoid a repeat of the politically motivated violence akin to 2007, confirmed the amount of dangerous speech that had gone up and that the people who uttered hate speech were overtly doing it. Some face book users wanted others from different ethnic background killed, evicted or even their properties stolen.

Berry and Kalin, (1995) noted that the universe has become a small world with people from various ethnic entities interacting often. This interaction may bring people with bad intentions, like senders of hate texts, together via various online platforms like facebook. Therefore, there is a need to find out a proper framework to describe hate speech online so as to put it on check. The current study, saw it desirable to study hate speech on facebook.

1.2 Statement of the Problem

In a nation, people should communicate harmoniously despite their various cultural backgrounds, however; while using the social media platforms like facebook, some people may send text messages using language that may evoke or reflect hate. These hate metaphors may not only be divisive but also may aim at demeaning, degrading and disorienting other parties. These hate epithets usually emerge during national presidential elections. This is because Kenyan politics is ethnic based. Therefore, rival political ethnic groups emit hate epithets that profile each other. This study aims at identifying the hate texts posted in social media sites of face-book with a view to

linguistically describe and analyze them using language theories of Halliday's Functional Systemic Grammar and Austin's Speech Act Theory.

1.3 Research Objectives

The research objectives in this study are:

- i. To describe grammatical features of some facebook selected stereotype texts by use of Systemic Halliday Functional Grammar theory.
- ii. To analyze speech acts as manifested in selected facebook stereotype texts by use of Speech Act Theory.
- iii. To establish the connection between the speech acts manifested in selected facebook texts and language of stereotype using the Benesch model of identifying hate speech.

1.4 Research Questions

The research questions in this study are:

- i. Which grammatical processes exhibited in selected stereotype texts may be described using Systemic Functional Grammar Theory.
- ii. Which speech acts noticeable in stereotype texts can be analyzed using Speech Act Theory.
- iii. Which connections exist between the selected facebook speech acts and language of stereotype according to the Benesch Model of Identifying hate speech.

1.5 Research Assumptions

The study will assume the following:

- i. Stereotype texts bears grammatical processes that can be described by use of Systemic Functional Grammar Theory.

- ii. Stereotype text perform acts that can be analyzed using Speech Act Theory.
- iii. The Benesch model of describing hate speech can account for the connection encapsulated in selected facebook texts with the language of stereotype.

1.6 Rationale of the Study

Kenya being an interethnic society, the people of Kenya need to communicate harmoniously. This is not usually the case as people's communication is sometimes disrupted by hate texts posted online in Facebook social media platform. While there are many studies on communication, there are not enough studies on how to communicate disharmoniously especially about the Kenyan social media platform of facebook context. The study therefore hopes to contribute in narrowing this gap.

The findings may give some important data to people in the field of education and politics. For instance, those in language research program may theorize on how to handle data related to hate utterances. This study seeks to provide data on hate speech, an ingredient with the potential of fostering disintegration in Kenya. This will form part of the language corpus that will help develop this genre for further analysis in terms of linguistic features. Through application of the Benesch model of identifying hate speech, in language and communication study for instance, this study may reveal more on challenges of embracing pluralism and culture of relativism as a way of fostering positive intercultural climate in Kenya. The study may also contribute to studies on language and culture as it may show a community's collective consciousness on an issue especially if it is based on some shared stereotypes.

1.7 Scope and Limitations of the Study

Linguistic study of intercultural communication can be approached from various perspectives but this study was confined to interethnic communication. This is because Kenya is a multi-ethnic community who sometimes may communicate negatively.

The data scope was limited to twenty texts to avoid the complexity associated with large data. A large data does not necessarily represent a genre better than a small one. This is according to Labov (1972) and Hyland (2005).

In theoretical scope, the study put the theory of Halliday Systemic Functional Grammar-The Experiential Metafunction tenet to test. The tenet assisted the study to analyze hate speech texts thereby, revealing grammatical features of the texts. The study was also limited to the Speech Act Theory categories of locutionary and illocutionary acts. The other tenet of perlocutionary needs an actual context to be realized which may not have been possible as per the objectives of this study.

There are many social media platforms like Twitter, Facebook and Instagram, but this study used Facebook platform because of its richness in data and the fact that Facebook postings last long even when the issue seemed outdated in light of new issues. This makes them easily traceable. Since Facebook is vast, the study was restricted to two sites only: namely Cord Effect and Pwani si Kenya.

CHAPTER TWO

LITERATURE REVIEW AND THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

2.0 Introduction

This section will review some of the studies of hate speech in Europe and Africa, theoretical studies, pragmatics field of language study, studies on definition of hate speech, studies on prejudice, stereotype and communication, and studies on hate speech in Africa.

2.1 Hate speech study in Europe

Uzarlan (1997) studied hate speech in Turkey using the speech act theory. He points out that hate discourse goes beyond verbal attack meted on one and should be viewed as illocutions with some harm on the target group. Uzarlan also says that, hate speech or language of hate stereotypes refers to some specific target and this could be due to a mindset informed by racism that cannot be separated from a particular social and cultural context peculiar to a nation. In the Turkish case, hate discourse was meant to hurt and demean the Kurdish cultural group due to diverse political reasons of some citizens. This study in Turkey shares some aspects with this study as hate speech stereotypes are uttered in a particular social context. The study reflect some ethnic collective conscious in the Kenyan situation disregard of people from different political persuasion unlike various Turkish citizens' nationalistic feelings expressing desire to secede.

Uzarlan (1997) studies is relevant to the Kenyan context. Uzarlan studies reveals the challenges of intercultural communication which is akin to Kenya's political context. In both Turkish and Kenyan context, the political situation can trigger people to post

hate epithets against each other. Therefore, using the speech act theory just like Uzarlan studies, I was able to analyze hate metaphor in a polarized political situation just like Turkish context where the Kurdish ethnic group was being profiled due to their desire for nationhood. In the next review, I shall review pragmatic studies linked to language of stereotype with a view to give more insight to how stereotypes manifest themselves.

2.2 Pragmatics studies related to hate speech

Under pragmatic studies Brown and Levinson (1989) politeness theory shall be extensively reviewed. This study is based in the field of Pragmatics. Levinson (1983) defines pragmatics as a section of language that explores the manner of speaking or communicating meaningfully in a given context. He argues that, unlike semantics which looks at intrinsic or surface meaning of a linguistic expression, pragmatics describes meaning that goes beyond intrinsic as the language item is said to operate within the natural context. According to Levinson, for a discourse to be meaningful, there has to be a speaker, the recipient or person addressed and other characteristics of the context surrounding the utterance. As pragmatics shows how interlocuters exchange their ideas, feelings and points of view, sometimes these exchanges may not be possible due to reasons like feeling of inferiority, abuse and discrimination. Therefore, there is need of a particular context for meaningful communication to take place (Levinson, 1983). According to this study, the covert feelings may be revealed via Facebook social media. Facebook provide the right context for data of this study as it gives room for anonymity to Facebook users engaged in commission of hate.

Context plays a key role in pragmatic studies since it may reveal the circumstances that may lead to hate stereotypes speech like discourse. Pragmatics also shows how context

may influence meaning. There are two categories of context namely: linguistic and physical context. Linguistic context is that which comes before or after a phrase singled out for interpretation or analysis while physical or situational context encompass factors outside an utterance for example one's world view about the actors in a given discourse (Levinson, 1986). Facebook provided the physical context while the political climate of the Kenyan election mood of the year 2013 provided the situational context that enabled data of this nature to be located and collected for further description so as to make sense of their perceived linguistic features of the texts.

According to Brown and Levinson (1981), a discourse should reflect politeness. In a discourse one should use language that conforms to acceptable societal rules. They also say the discourse should follow four language maxims. These four maxims are namely: the maxim of quantity: in speech a speaker should provide appropriate information for meaning to be implied or inferred, maxim of quality: in a speech the speakers ought to be factual in their utterances, maxim of relativity: one's contribution ought to be connected to what others say, and maxim of manner: contributors in a discourse or speech should say what is free from ambiguous or unclear interpretations.

Language of stereotype may not reflect politeness and acceptable societal norms as argued by (Brown and Levinson 1981) due to its divisive nature. Furthermore, language of stereotype may flout some maxims of communication for example, the maxim of quality since some stereotype texts may not be factual. It may also not conform to the maxim of manner since some contributors of hate speech may post texts with ambiguous interpretation. In this study, language of stereotype will be studied as a distinct genre that may not conform to rules of an ordinary discourse.

After the review of pragmatic studies, the researcher shall review studies related to the definition of hate speech because hate metaphors are synonymous to stereotypes in most contexts. Here, Anderson and Lepore (2011), Hornsby (2001), Langton (2012) and National and Integration act of Kenya (2008) thoughts on hate speech were reviewed to provide the right perspective for the study the of language of stereotypes to draw an elaborate definition in the context of this study.

2.3 Studies on definition of hate speech

According to Anderson and Lepore (2011), hate speech stereotypes are linguistic items which target a people on the basis of their race, where they come from (nationality), their religious beliefs, their sexuality and among others. Also, Hornsby (2001) argues that to count as hate speech stereotype, an utterance should target a group of people with some shared features and should express hateful feelings towards them. Although there could be other positive words about the same target group in a given context, in a different context, words that convey hatred are likely to occur in a discourse. As such the hate speech stereotype speakers' main aim is not just to discriminate a target group, but to psychologically harm the target group and probably stir hostility towards the target from its audience (West, 2012).

Langton (2012) compares hate speech stereotypes to a derogatory speech that conveys hatred and negative attitudes towards the target and its members so as to belittle, dehumanize and injure them. He gives an example when a speaker says "Larry is a Nigger" for instance, the N-word conveys hatred and negative attitudes toward Larry and all black people in general. In doing so, hate speech stereotypes have not only the

potential to offend, but also injure psychologically (or even physically in cases where such speech incites violence as the case in Nazi Germany during Jewish holocaust or mass killing at the peak of the second world war times or the Rwandese 1994 genocide). The trend begins with verbal attack or illocutions then translates to physical harm or perlocution, in Austin terms, of the target group in both Rwanda and Germany.

Some scholars give differences between the cultural and political action. According to Erzsebet (2012), hate speech discourse can be linguistically described as language items with a singular meaning. Therefore, hate speech stereotypes corpus can be identified and analyzed. This makes it a genre for researchers to delve into and unearth its lacuna.

Also, Alloport (1954) in his book, 'The nature of prejudice', regards hate speech stereotypes as expressions of a person's ethnic adverse judgment and can be said arguably to be the initial premise towards chaos or violence between different ethnic groupings. Furthermore, in her *Excitable speech*, the philosopher Judith Butler critiques that the origin of the language of harm towards a particular target was found to be in the linguistic performance.

The same concept is confirmed by St. Clare (2003) in his philosophical analysis of hate stereotype speech. Hate, in his lens, is seen as powerful, and the very mechanisms by which words of hate come to have that power also hold the keys to undoing some of the damage caused by hate speech. Furthermore, according to Langton (2012), it is a speech that promotes racial hatred. For Anderson and Lepore (2002), insults from hate discourses exhibit prejudicial feelings towards certain group. Being a form of speech

that can be harmful, hate speech is thus an important phenomenon for this study to examine as it has increasingly become a distinct genre since it has features that stands out.

Tthesis (2002) further states that hate discourse is majorly created by a minority people who consciously choose their target and are aimed at oppressing, demeaning or even promoting violence towards the victim group. The same definition is linked to the Kenyan National Cohesion and Integration commission (2008) definition of hate speech as words of incitement and hatred against individuals based on certain group characteristics that they share. Hate speech also includes that which advocates or encourages violent acts against a specific group, and creates a climate of hate or prejudice, which may in turn foster the commission of hate.

The National Cohesion and Integration act of Kenya (2008) contextualize language of stereotype – when defining hate speech; section 3 of the act expounds that `ethnic hatred could be feelings of hate towards a section of people probably based on their shared features like common race, their citizenship or nationality or even complexion or color.

Therefore, in consolidating all these definitions, the working definition of hate stereotype speech in the context of this study shall be: Hate speech stereotypes consists of words that foster incitement and hatred against certain individuals due to their certain shared group attributes, for instance, ethnic group in the Kenyan context, and are aimed at encouraging violent acts against them.

After the review of studies on definition of hate speech, the researcher shall review the concept of prejudice, stereotype and communication since they are closely related to hate speech. In this review Alloport (1954) and Pettigrove (1981) among others' thoughts on stereotype shall be reviewed as they provide an elaborate outline on the concept of stereotype and how they emanate.

2.4 Prejudice, stereotype and communication

Hate speech stereotypes are closely related to prejudice and stereotypes. Sometimes there is a thin line between the three constructs. They may be treated as synonyms in some context. Hate speech, prejudice and stereotypes are described as the forgotten constructs in linguistics by some linguists (Alloport, 1954).

For instance, another problem that affects intercultural communication is prejudice, judgments which usually result from a person's past experience rather than rational thought or evaluative situation. Ideally, prejudice can be said to be positive feelings or negative feelings. However, often times, it is usually related or attributed to negative judgments and bias. Related to this is stereotyping, which unlike prejudice arises from information that one gets than one's prior or past encounters. Prejudice can occur at individual level or institutional category (Urlin, 2001).

Also closely linked to hate speech is stereotype. Stereotypes may result to hate speech if unchecked hence they cannot be ignored. Pettigrove (1981) says stereotypes are impossible to be removed or managed because they have been internalized widely by people who use them. For instance, when a community views some groups as people

of lower rank, negative stereotypes shall take root. This could lead to disintegration of a once harmonious society.

Brewer & Kraner (2007) think it is possible to reduce or even do away with stereotypes when various intercultural groups interact freely. In contrast some studies show that the people who have been prejudiced imbibe the stereotypes and can even keep out members of their group who want to challenge the notion so as to maintain the state of being stereotyped (Brewer & Kraner 1988). This explains why stereotypes last long upon inception.

Stereotypes, like hate speech, can be seen as providing the context of social categories. Allport (1954) says stereotypes may lead to categorical judgment and can fallaciously exhibit prejudices which can seem normal as human rational thought.

Hearstine and Giles (1993) give three aspects of stereotypes which the study may find similar to hate speech.

- i. Some category of people may stratify people on the basis of certain salient features which may be peculiar to their sex, ethnic group or even their speech styles as in the data below:

(Kumbe wameru wako na akili ndogo hivi. Fundakabisa. Hasiramingi na kula miraa kama mbuzi. Merus are idiots, kufieni mbali naizo kura zenu za TharakaNithi. Kubafu! (So Merus have small brains like that, donkey! They are quick to anger and chew khat like goats. Meru are idiots you people should just die) (Umati 2013).

- ii. A set of traits, rules, emotions, abilities, intentions, etc, are attributed to nearly all people in that group. Persons in that category could be inferred to be having common features peculiar to the group being stereotyped but dissimilar from the stereotyping group. Like the example above Meru People are stereotyped as Khat chewers, vote fraudster, quick to irrational anger hence stupid and should therefore be exterminated. This could be in line with trends of hate speech. The salient features or characteristics are associated with any person who emanate from the stereotyped entity as the Ameru ethnic group above.

Fishman (1956) poses questions that are vital in the conceptualization of hate speech. He argues that we are often misinformed about a certain people that it is quite difficult to combat this fallacious generalized misinformation with true information. There are no direct answers as to how this misinformation arise and the way they are enhanced by whatever reason or condition. Answers to this critical question can give a good insight into the nature of hate speech discourses. Therefore, after reviewing various insights about stereotypes, stereotypes may be argued to be the genesis of hate speech hence it justifies the need for the conducted study.

Since hate speech is knitted closely with language of stereotype, types of stereotypes should be examined as they may help classify data of hate speech using same criteria. Newcomb and Charter (1950) established that there are two types of stereotypes. These are namely the shared stereotypes and individual stereotypes. Shared stereotypes are characterized by general agreement or consensus by members of a group while individual stereotypes are feelings or ideas held by a person towards a group of people.

The study shall lay emphasis on group-shared stereotypes as they have greater influence on the study of intergroup communication than do individual measures. Fishman (1986) also confirm that private stereotypes keep changing and lack unlikely consensual validation from others.

After reviewing the above concepts of stereotypes, the researcher shall as well review studies related to hate speech in Africa having previously reviewed hate speech in Europe. Here Mowarin (2002) studies on hate speech in Rwanda, Mengistu (2012) studies in Ethiopian profiling of the Tigreans and Umati (2013) studies on dangerous speech in Kenya were reviewed. It provided a close context since the setting of the study is in Kenya, an African state.

2.5 Studies of hate speech in Africa

This section shall review studies on hate speech in Rwanda, Ethiopia and Kenya. Although some studies have been done on hate speech, few have documented its linguistic features and comprehensively analyzed them. Some merely picked lone words like ‘nigger’ ‘inyenze’ (cockroach) and stopped short of looking for other linguistic features like verb groups and adjectival groups. For instance; in Mowarin (2002) analysis of hate speech in Hotel Rwanda. The article analyzed speech acts that called for the annihilation of Tutsi by Hutu extremist forces. It used Systemic Functional Grammar as espoused by MAK Halliday (2004). The article shows an investigation on how the Hotel Rwanda Film uses language resources at the level of syntax and lexis to highlight the destruction created by the genocide. Furthermore, the article reveals how rhetoric devices were employed to portray the mass killing, sexual violence and other heinous atrocities done in Rwanda. At the onset of civil war,

dehumanizing speech acts were attributed to the Tutsi who were commonly referred to as 'inyenzi' or cockroaches a very offensive term in Kinyarwanda language. For example, Mowarin looked at the speeches syntactic choices.

Mowarin's study or journal looked at how language was used at syntax level to analyze hate discourse in the Film Hotel Rwanda. The journal found the parts of the sentences used are, what he called psychological descriptive sentences. They were used to negatively describe the targeted stereotyped groups with an aim of revealing the thematic concerns of Rwandese Film. They were an admixture of paratactic and hypotactic structures. These sentence fragments are also known as psychological sentences, dominated in the film. The news bulletin is made up of descriptive statement as below:

When people ask my good listeners, 'why you hate all the Tutsi?' I say: it is the history: The Tutsi were collaborators for the Belgium colonialist. They stole our Hutu land; They wiped us. Now they have come back. This Tutsi rebels. They are murders and invaders. We will squash the infestations; we will wipe out the Rwanda patriotic front rebels (RPF). This is RTL. Hutu power Radio: watch your neighbors.

According to Kuperman (2001) the saying Inyezi, cockroach in Rwanda was attributed to rebels who wanted to overthrow the then government of 1961 from their hideouts in the neighboring countries of Uganda and Burundi. They got the name due to their ability to dodge the government forces who could not easily defeat them since they usually launched their attacks at night just like cockroaches. However, in Kinyarwanda language, the word cockroach is metaphorically used with an aim to demeaning the Tutsi. The word was disrespectfully used by the Hutu in the onset of the 1994 genocide to refer to the Tutsi rebels and moderate Hutus.

According to Mowarin (2002), the phrases, terrible news and horrible news serve to incite the ethnic group of the Hutu into action of committing violence and the imperative verb “cut” the tree’s pragmatic meaning also serves to set into action the war mongering militia to commit genocidal acts.

In Ethiopia just like Kenya the social media revolution has led to hate speech escalation especially between the ruling elite who mostly come from the Tigrean and other ethnic communities. Mengistu (2012) gives this as an example of hate text in Ethiopia social media:

This ‘criminals’ (the ruling leaders) are more than capable of inflicting some atrocities. The mission of the militia is to go into the Oromo and Amhara regions of Ethiopia and eliminate anyone suspected of supporting the opposition. Meles and his militia commandos are carrying out this mission of search and destroy in the name of protecting Tigreyans and non Tigreyans and use this as a pretext to divide the country and the people.

In the hate post above, the writer seems to have prejudice towards Meles and his fellow rulers. In the Kenyan context Umati (2013), a research team that monitors hate speech online captured some hate texts and classified them as: offensive speech, moderately offensive speech and dangerous speech.

This study differs from Umati Team at the level of analysis of this language phenomenon. While the Umati Research team monitor and publish their finding, this study linguistically identified, described and analyzed the language of hate speech stereotypes using linguistic theories. The next review shall be about the theoretical framework necessary for analysis of data in line with the study’s objectives.

2.6 Theoretical Framework

This study was guided by three theories namely: Benesch Model of identifying hate speech, Speech Act Theory and Halliday Systemic Functional Linguistic Framework. In analysis and presentation of the data, first, the stereotype texts were separated from other texts that do not stereotype using the Benesch model of identifying and categorizing hate speech. Secondly, the stereotype texts were described by use of Systemic Functional Linguistic Framework. Further analysis was done using the Speech Act Theory using Searle (1969) categories. First the researcher begins by reviewing the Benesch Model of identifying hate speech.

2.6.1 Benesch's model of identifying hate speech

Professor Susan Benesch, an American linguist and an authority in analyzing hate speech, established a framework of identifying hate speech. Benesch (2012), established a framework that has been quite instrumental in the identification of hate speech by various research groups, for example, Umati (2013). The Benesch model has markers that may help distinguish hate speech discourse from other ordinary speeches. In Benesch (2012) *Dangerous speech: A proposal to prevent Group violence*, she developed a guideline which was anchored on five variables to determine the dangerousness of a particular speech act or hate text, as in Facebook, in time and place it was made. The variables are: the speaker, the audience, the speech act itself, the social and historical context and the model of dissemination. For the purposes of verification and the ambiguity involved in analysis of the data of this nature, this study shall be confined to the variable of the speech act and socio-historical context.

According to Benesch (2012) an utterance qualifies as hate text if it has at least one of this four attributes:

- a) If the text is interpreted as a call to violence. Such a text can be performing speech acts such as shouting, giving a command. Such texts may also take a form of a song, web page, sms blast, leaflet, a tweet and etc. The inflammatory speech may also be metaphorically used and interpreted as a call to violence towards the target group.
- b) If the hate text negatively describes the target people using some demeaning epithets like animals, pests and insects, then the text may fall in the category of hate speech. Benesch (2012) emphasizes that, this could be a premise for mass killing as in the case of Rwanda after belittling the target persons.
- c) If the text or speech acts asserts that the stereotyping group could encounter some imminent harm from the target or stereotyped group hence should have some self -defense to avert the situation, this scenario shall make text to be classified as a hate text.
- d) If the speech acts or texts have implied or specially coded words or word segments with metaphorical meaning as understood by the reader of the text, for example; in this expression used in Eldoret town during the 2007 post-election violence call to evict the Agikuyu ethnic group by the Nandi ethnic group, “uproot the mushroom”, the text therefore can be labelled as a hate speech text. The metaphor “mushroom” was used to demean the Agikuyu’s Akorino sect that adorns white caps as a religious outfit. Such coded language is also typical of this kind of phrase like ‘go to work’ used metaphorically as signal for killing to begin during the Rwandan genocide or the word like

‘inyenzi’ Kinyarwanda for (cockroach) used to refer to Tutsi and non-Tutsi who sympathized with Tutsi (Benesch 2012).

According to Benesch, social-historical variable can help to contextualize a speech as hate speech; if it reveals that there was an underlying conflict between relevant groups.

Therefore; through Benesch model, I was able to select hate texts from Cord Effect and Pwani si Kenya facebook sites. I purposively selected texts using the criteria mentioned above namely, if the text can be inferred as a call to harm someone based on their ethnic group or even political persuasion and if the text is inferred to derogatorily describe the target by comparing them to animals, pests and insects other than humans. The selected texts formed a basis for further analysis using other theories such as the Speech Act Theory.

This study was guided by Speech Act Theory and Halliday Systemic Functional Linguistic framework. I shall review the Speech Act Theory next so as to draw further categories in which the data can be place into.

2.6.2 Speech Act Theory

The Speech Act Theory is attributed to J.L. Austin (1962). Austin came up with two constructs with which to describe language namely, constatives and performatives. Austin describes constatives as those remarks that strive to reveal the reality. This reality could be determined as true or false statement while performatives are utterances that are used to do things. An example of performative utterance is ‘I name this baby John’ where the speaker names a child. Therefore, Language is usually used

to bring out some reality as revealed by Austin constative tenet. Austin's Speech Act Theory has three parts that do simultaneously occur in an utterance namely: locutionary, illocutionary and perlocutionary acts. Locutionary act or aspect is that which applies to a specific aspect of an utterance, whereby an utterance made should conform to some rules of grammar and besides it should meaningfully communicate within a language and should be uttered in the right context. According to Singer (1998), the context may be both physical and social. It may also simply mean the speech acts that have taken place for instance the posted texts by bloggers in Facebook sites under the study. Illocutionary acts are action based or resulting from an utterance or speech that equates the utterance or act, for example, to order, to welcome and issue a threat. Perlocutionary acts as per Austin terms is the outcome or consequence or achievement of one's speech acts. This achievement could be negative or positive for instance hate utterances that had led to the killing in the Rwandese context received worldwide condemnation hence is a negative effect.

According to the tenets of the Speech Act Theory, there is assumption that hate texts portray both locutionary, illocutionary and perlocutionary speech acts. As Mtsuda et al (1993) states, some words could harm, assault, wound and even injure a person or groups of people. From this perspective, this study can deduce that hate speech's acts or saying could imply the actual action as intended by the speaker or writers of hate texts. According to Mackinnon (1996) some hate discourse can victimize the target group and could have some negative consequence on the target group. Later Searle classified illocutionary acts comprehensively as Assertives, Directives, Commissives, Expressives and Declaratives.

- a) Assertive: assertive is an illocutionary act which reveals things as they are in the world. The acts could be utterances that represent false or true information. In this type of acts, a speaker is obligated to the fidelity or truth of the said assertion. The acts may include to state, to claim, to hypothesize, to depict, to report, to assert, to swear that what is said is the truth, to suggest, to inform, or even to insist.
- b) Directive: directives are illocutionary acts that serve to make the person spoken to or addressed, to do some action. The remark usually makes the addressee to conform to the dictates of the utterance. Usually, it gives the order hence causing the addressee accept to do a specific action, advice or command. This may entail speech acts like, ordering, commanding or challenging.
- c) Commissive: commissives are statements that commit the speaker to certain future action. It could be in the form of promise. Examples include promising, threatening, intending, and vowing to do or to refrain from doing something.
- d) Expressive: epressives are illocutionary acts that express how the speaker feels about a situation. These utterances include: thanking, apologizing, welcoming and deploring. For example, I am sorry I lied to you.
- e) Declarative: declaratives are illocutionary acts or speech acts that reveal the action which is verbally implied, or change the state of the world in an immediate way. These utterances are not only ideal but also practical for instance in a court case one can be declared guilty and he goes to jail, or declaring war on some group of people as in the case of the Rwanda during the infamous 1994 genocide where the phrase “work” meant kill. (Searle & Vanderveken, 2005).

This study focuses on the illocutionary force. These acts reveal the intentions of the hate texts writers especially in the context of interethnic animosity. Ordinarily, the hate texts writers intend to get some specific effects on the target group. This could be by influencing their audience's conscious, cultural beliefs feelings and thought to negatively view the victim group (Kimotho, 2016).

The Speech Act Theory is useful to the study because of the following reasons: Firstly, the context of the utterance is crucial in influencing the posting of hate speech texts. Therefore; before a posted text is identified as hate text it, must be a locutionary act first with some grammatical features and meaning. Secondly the illocutionary speech acts occur simultaneously with locutionary as well as perlocutionary speech Acts. This theory will help analyze the second objective, which is to describe the lexico- semantic features of hate speech text from selected face book text as locutionary and illocutionary acts. Searl's improvement of the theory was adopted so as to categorize the data as Assertives, Directives, Commissives, Expressives and Declaratives. In this study, I focused on these categories as they likely to be drawn from the data.

The next review shall be on Halliday Systemic Functional Linguistic. SFL further helped describe the data by unearthing grammatical features that may be argued to be peculiar to language of stereotype.

2.6.3 Halliday Systemic Functional Linguistic

The other theory used is the Hallidayan Systemic Functional Linguistic. Systemic Functional Linguistic was initially conceptualized by Michael Alexander Kirkwood Halliday. SFL view language as a resource for making meaning.

According to SFL, language is said to be a raw material for making meaning. SFL also shows how essential parts or components of a language functions in order to bring out meaning that various speakers could wish to communicate or convey. SFL explores the nature of participants in a conversation, especially the actions they do, and the environment or circumstances in which the actions or discourse takes place.

SFL shows three modes of meaning which fall under the category called Metafunction of language. According to Metafunction, language is used for a specific aim or reason (Halliday 2004:30-31). The modes or Metafunctions of language include, the ideation / experiential metafunction, the textual, and interpersonal metafunction. The three modes are interrelated and work simultaneous together in time and space according to SFL.

Under ideational metafunction, SFL explores the events as shown in a text, then the participants carrying out the process and the circumstances or environment the communication process takes place. SFL names five types of processes evident in most communicative event. These processes include, material process, that which entails the actual actions or processes taking place outside the human body and can be denoted by actions verbs such as come, sit, kill, cut, etc. This can be actually verified. The next is mental process, which is also called psychological process. This process is what takes place in the mind and can be denoted by mental verbs such as love, like, desire and hate etc. The next is the relational process, which is the process of being. It is denoted by use of copula verbs such as is, become, be and being. It is also an existential process which involves the process of existing and is denoted by primary auxiliaries like, is,

am and other verbs like come and go by, The last category is the behavioral process, which encompass both the mental and material processes. It is featured by verbs such as, love, hope, cough and wish etc.

In relation to this study, this ideational metafunction has been used to describe the linguistic feature of the posted texts. This is after the Speech Act Theory and Benesch model have been used to identify and categorize the hates text as grammatical and communicative units. The Ideational Metafunction also assisted this study to group the data collected as per processes enumerated in the tenet. These categories were drawn depending on the verbs exhibited in the posted texts, for example, if a text has a verb to kill, then it shall fall under the Material process since it denotes action taking place outside the human body. The purpose is to draw categories that can assist reveal the grammatical features peculiar to language of stereotypes. This makes the tenet relevant in the analysis of the objectives of this study since categories can be clearly drawn.

CHAPTER THREE

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.0 Introduction

This chapter focuses on the research design, the site of the study, the study population, sampling size and data collection.

3.1 Research Design

The research was done using qualitative content analysis whereby various facebook postings were identified, collected, documented and analyzed. The quantitative aspect was used to establish the frequency of some grammatical lexico- semantic features. This count was done manually as shown in studies related qualitative content analysis (Hanania and Akhtar, 1985). According to Selgar and Shohamy (1989, p. 205), there are different stages of analysis in a qualitative analysis: the researcher identifies, delimits and sorts the relevant segment of a text according to an organized scheme. In this study, hate texts stereotypes were sort using Benesch proposal model of identifying dangerous speech (Benesch 2012). According to qualitative design, researchers can approach data from predetermined criteria (usually from other sources) in mind. Such predetermined categories were adopted from the Benesch model of identifying hate speech tenets sin the case of this study.

The qualitative research design is preferred in this study because: first, as Seligar and Shohamy (1989) point out, qualitative research is a useful approach whenever an investigator is concerned with discovering or describing language phenomena in its natural context. Secondly, this design is hypothesis generating because questions are suggested from recurring pattern which emerge from the data itself. This was in

consistence with the purpose of the current study, where data was collected from a blast of online texts in two sites which had groups of people exchanging epithets, then using the Benesch model, the data was sort into categories of stereotype texts and non-stereotype texts. Further analysis was done using linguistic theories such as Speech Act Theory to describe the linguistic features of hate stereotype texts.

3.2 Site of study

The area of study was limited to Kenya`s social media selected Facebook sites namely Pwani si Kenya and Cord Effect. According to Umati Report (2013) a research team that was mandated to monitor hate speech in Kenya, hate texts are posted by anonymous web administrators and other Facebook users some of whom use pseudonyms while chatting online to hide their real identity. The use of pseudonyms helps solve the observers` paradox phenomenon frequently encountered in social – linguistic research of this nature. Facebook is more relevant, unlike Twitter which does not accept Tweets that are not in line with the administrator of the platform point of view, and authors of the Tweets are publicly ridiculed and forced to retract the statements or even close the Twitter account. Besides, Tweets lasts less due to change in Topics. Facebook posting can last long even when the issue seems outdated in light of new issues. Therefore, the postings are easily traceable. Facebook also has more followers since half of 35.5% who use the internet in Kenya are in Face book (Umati, 2013). Unlike Twitter, Facebook users have group pages like Cord Effect that are perceived to be rich in the hate speech data. Besides, other social media like WhatsApp, and Instagram had not taken roots in Kenya by 2013 hence were excluded. This study focused on most posts that were made in the month of August 2013. This is because

hate stereotype speech online monitors had recorded a sharp rise in hate speech during this phase due to Kenyan election mood (Umati, 2013).

3.3 The study population and sampling procedure

Burn and Grove (1997) define population as the whole collection of entities that have qualities that the researcher is looking for. Therefore, the target population in this study was all texts posted on the selected site of Facebook namely: Pwani si Kenya and Cord Effect. These sites were very active in the month of August, 2013. Purposive sampling was conducted so as to pick the required data that helped meet the research objectives of the study the Benesch model criteria as explained in the discussion of the data collection technique below. The study used twenty texts to avoid the complexity associated with large data as a large data does not necessarily represent a genre better than a small one according to Labov (1972) and Hyland (2005). Miles and Huberman (1994) also remarked that a study cannot include everything and that a researcher is not always in a position to research on everything and everyone. Furthermore, Lewis and Elam (2003) indicate that sampling that are qualitative in nature should often lie under 50.

3.4 Data collection techniques

The study used documentary method and purposive sampling to collect data. The purposively selected texts were stored in a flash disc and later printed. Purposive sampling was appropriate so as to pick only those text that may exhibit features of language that exhibits stereotype using the Benesch Model of selecting hate speech. According to Benesch (2012), a text qualifies as a hate text if it meets this criterion namely:

1. If a text can be inferred as a call to violence whether literally or metaphorically towards the target group.
2. If the sampled text negatively described the target group using demeaning epithets such as pests, animals and insects among other things other than humans.
3. If the text asserts that the author of the selected text and his ethnic group could encounter some imminent harm from the group it is directed to hence they may need some kind of self -defense to avert the situation. The texts that had met the above criterion were documented and formed the corpus for hate speech which were analyzed according to the researcher's three objectives afterwards.

3.5 Data analysis technique

The analysis of language of hate speech followed the steps outlined below:

3.5.1 Qualitative analysis

The first step included comparison between the hate sites under investigation. Benesch's model was then used to sieve the texts that exhibit features of language that stereotype by putting the texts under various categories of the model. These categories depended on the level of dangerousness of the speech in Benesch model terms. Although the Benesch model accounts for the third objective, it forms the basis of data identification before linguistic theories like Halliday Systemic Functional Grammar and Speech Act Theory were applied on the data. The current study employed conventional qualitative analysis, also known as inductive category, whereby the study derived coding categories directly from the perceived posted hate textual data (Mayring, 2000). The approach is ideal for areas of the study supported by little theoretical or research literature (Kondracki & Wellmen, 2002). The first objective in

data analysis was done by use of Hallidayan Systemic Functional Linguistic (SFL) ideational metafunctional tenet. The texts were put in various categories depending on the nature of the verb exhibited in the text under SFL. The second objective was analyzed using the Speech Act Theory. Speech Act Theory is a linguistic theory that helped unearth the linguistic features of the texts and further put the identified texts in linguistic categories depending on their various illocutionary forces. Data analysis followed an iterative process, beginning with repeated reading of the data and formation of criteria from the data based on background consideration and research objectives to identify hate texts (Barret, 2007). Texts were analyzed for patterns, from which descriptive codes were developed. These patterns may indicate the presence of larger themes.

As the analysis progressed, categories were either revised or removed based on their frequency and reliability. Emphasis was placed on identifying the relationship between speakers and targets- basically, who said what, about or to what, or to whom, and for what purpose.

3.6 Ethical consideration

So as not to foster de-escalation of hate speech, the study stuck to texts posted in the mentioned Facebook sites. This is because the texts were posted by anonymous Facebook online users hence it may not influence the public discourse. A notion that it may escalate hate feelings in Kenya is lessened.

Furthermore; research permit was sought for from the National Commission for Science Technology and Innovation department (NACOSTI) in line with the Kenyan research law.

3.7 Summary of Chapter Three

In summary, this section looks into: how the research was designed, the specific online facebook study sites, the purposively sampled study population and the procedure employed, data collection techniques, the criterion used to analyse the data and various ethical consideration that informed this study.

CHAPTER FOUR

DATA PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS

4.0 Introduction

This chapter looks at the analysis and presentation of the data. The analysis was done using Halliday Systemic Functional Linguistic Framework (SFL) and Speech Act Theory. First, the stereotype texts were purposively sampled from Facebook sites namely 'Cord effects' and 'Pwani si Kenya'. To separate texts that stereotype from texts that do not stereotype, the Benesch model of identifying and categorizing hate speech was used. Second, the stereotype texts were described by use of SFL theory. Further, they were analyzed by use of Speech Act Theory where further categories were drawn as per the Searl (1969) Speech Act Theory.

Stereotype texts were analyzed and put under linguistic terms such as Assertives, Commissives, Expressives, Declaratives and Directives. Finally using the Benesch model, the identified stereotype texts were further analyzed and put in two categories, namely; stereotype texts that describe the victims as less than human and stereotype text that assert the audience faced serious danger from the victim group.

4.1 Analysis of the stereotypical texts by use of Systemic Functional Grammar Theory

Initially the stereotype texts were identified using the Benesch model of identifying hate speech. Using the Benesh model criteria, for a text to be grouped under hate speech, it has to be inferred as a call to commit violence or harm the target group or it describes the target group using speech acts that demean the target group by comparing them to things like: animals, insects, pests among other things other than humans or if

the text is inferred to mean the target audience faced imminent danger from the author of hate texts (Benesch 2012). The blast of stereotype texts was obtained from various Facebook sites namely Cord effect and Pwani si Kenya. The identification of text was done purposively so as to filter out only those texts that have hall marks of language stereotype. The texts which were identified using the Benesch model either showed the victim audience was in danger or had words that demean the victim group. The following texts were sampled by the use of the Benesch (2012) model criteria as they show prejudice towards the target group:

1. The kikuyus avail very small brains equivalent to jiggers
2. Jaluos usually throw stones
3. A thief got killed what made the killing sweeter was the poor thing was a Kikuyu
4. Raila would reposes our land and make our men to wear shorts
5. Kikuyus are ungrateful idiot
6. Kikuyu you are foolish as the rest of their tribesmen
7. Luos are stone throwers
8. Luos are dirty
9. Pwani people are lazy, semi-illiterate and sly
10. Kikuyu are land grabbers
11. Kikuyu are shrewd
12. Kikuyu are selfish
13. Any one you see supporting Jubilee is either stupid or corrupt
14. I hope all Kikuyus should be re-circumcised and told the real meaning of circumcision

As will be illustrated shortly, I then analyzed the above identified stereotype texts linguistically using Systemic Functional Linguistic Grammar (SFL). Using SFL, the researcher then generated linguistic features of the language that profile individuals and their communities, as it will be demonstrated shortly.

Systemic Functional Linguistic Grammar theory has many tenets. The tenet of Experiential Metafunction was applied to linguistically describe the stereotypical text selected. Using Hallidayian terms, Experiential Metafunction falls under the clause as representation or system of ideational meanings. The system of ideational meanings shows how one's experiences and interprets the world around them. This theory assisted the study to show the point of view of the speaker at the moment of speaking. Under SFL, a clause as an actor and a residue. In Halliday Functional Linguistic theory the residue carries the content which is denoted by verb clause.

Halliday (1976), called it the clause as a Representation. In this case, the clause represents the content of our experience as it answers the question 'who does what', 'to whom' and different functional labels are given to participants which are usually realized by "nominal group". The participant roles include: process which is realized by the verbal group, and circumstance role which is realized by the prepositional phrase and adverbial group.

In analysis of the data, the texts were put under categories such as Material, Relational and Mental process. These categories were drawn depending on their verbal group, in line with the Halliday Functional Systemic Grammar framework. The first category to discussed is the Material process.

4.1.1 Material process

According to Halliday (1976), Material process refers to experiences of the external world and describes the process of doing and happening as well as answering the question ‘what did he /she or it do?’

In terms of the Experiential Metafunction, Butt et al (2000) state the role participants plays in the process. Labels such as Actors, Goals or Beneficiaries which can take subject position in grammatical sense are used. The clause is said to be material in the sense that it represents matter changing through time. Material process have an Actor- this is someone or something who does something either to himself or herself or to something else. The actor performs the action upon the patient as shown in the following data from “The Cord Effect” facebook site below:

Example 1.

The kikuyus	avail	Very small brains equivalent to jiggers brain
Actor	Process: material	patient

Example 2.

Jaluos	Usually throw	Stones
Actor	Process: material	patient

Example 3.

A thief	Got killed	what made the killing sweeter was the poor thing was a Kikuyu.
Actor	Process: material	Patient

Example 4.

Raila	Would reposes	Our land and	Make	Our men to wear shorts
Actor	Process: material	Patient	Process: material	patient

The Material process above denote an Actor as a function of an element in the transitive model of a language. Transitivity indicates an ongoing action. Material process above also denote a verb in active voice. What makes the above processes material are verbs like ‘**throw**’ and ‘**repossess**’. They denote the act of ‘**doing**’ or ‘**happening**’ and is in active voice. In the above data, the goal of land repossession by the actor, Raila could be propaganda aimed at making the opponents of Raila to develop fear of voting him president. The verb ‘**throw**’ shows action in the negative sense as it helps to stereotype the Luo community as people who are violent ‘**stone throwers**.’ It is also worth noting that the verb ‘**to kill**’ reveals the call to harm in readiness for the hate mongers especially if the victim is in the bracket of the stereotyped community as in the Kikuyu ethnic group above. The verb ‘**repossess**’ is to elicit fear in the victim community and the verb ‘to make’ further strengthen the propaganda that ‘Raila’ a 2013 presidential candidate could be harmful to the victim community if elected president. From the above examples, it has been observed that some texts are authored by people with prejudice towards some ethnic communities since some of the examples portray actors as less than human through the patient of the clause, for example, in (1) the Kikuyu brains is compared to that of jiggers and in example (2) the actor, Jaluos are stereotypically generalized via the patient as stone throwers. It was also observed that most verbs were in active voice save for example (3) in which the verb is in the passive voice (got killed).

4.2 Relational process types

Relational process is concerned with being possessing or becoming. The Relational process obligatorily require two labels namely: the carrier and the attribute or the token and the value. The Relational process is either identifying or attributive. If the process is identifying, the participants are token and value. Token is the subject in the grammatical sense and Value is the complement in grammatical sense. If the process is attributive the participants are Carrier and Attribute. A carrier is the grammatical subject and an attribute is the grammatical compliment. The relational process is further subdivided into process of 'being' which can either be 'intensive' or 'circumstantial' and that of 'Having' or 'Possessive'(Halliday & Matthiessen, 2004) The examples below illustrates the concept of Relational process of Attribution with Carrier and attribute as participants.

4.3 Relational process of intensive identification with carrier as subject and an attribute as complement

Example 5.

Kikuyus	are	ungrateful idiot
Carrier:	Process: Relational	Attribute
Nominal group	Verbal group	Adjectival group

In example above, shows the Relational process of attribution because the clause is non-reversible. That means that the grammatical subject, “**Kikuyus**” is always the carrier of the attribute, “**ungrateful**” which is the grammatical complement. An attributive process generally does not allow the participant to be reversed. The relational process

can be described as intensive because it shows X (carrier kikuyus) is Y(attribute ungrateful). Where X stands for subject and Y stands for complement.

Example 6.

You	are	Foolish as the rest of your tribesmen
Carrier:	Process: relational intensive attribution:	Attribute with nominal group with an adjective as the head
Nominal group	Verbal group	Adjectival group

Just like example 5, the example 6 fallaciously attributes the whole Kikuyus ethnic community as idiotic. The attributions bear also the markers of hate speech stereotype through the adjective 'foolish' which is directed towards the carrier which is the entire community where the target victim of the text comes from (Benesch, 2012).

4.3.1 Relational process of identifying

Example 7.

Luos	are	Stone throwers
Value	Process: Relational	Token
Nominal group	Verbal group	Nominal group with noun as a head

In the example 7 above, Halliday (1990), describe the process as that of identifying role. The process has two functions. The first function is the one which provide a new identity. The nominal group, Luos whether it comes first or last in the clause is labeled Identified and the new form identified as the identifier, “**stone thrower**”. It can also be labeled as token, Luos which is assigned the value ‘**stone thrower**’ and the reverse is

true. In example 7 above, the Token, Luos, are unfairly vilified by the value, ‘**stone throwers.**’ This generalization of the Luo ethnic group marks out the example as hate speech example according to Benesch (2012) second tenet of comparing the target group to stone throwers, just like in the example 8 that attributes the Luo community using the adjectival complemental epithet 'dirty' and example 9 that has the carrier, Pwani people labeled as **Lazy, Indolent** and **Semi-illiterate** as in Table 8 that follows below:

Example 8.

Luos	are	Dirty
Carrier	Process: intensive attribution	Attribute token
Nominal group	Verbal group	Adjectival group with adjective as head

Example 9.

Pwani people	Are	Lazy: indolent semi -illiterate and sly
Carrier		Attribute with adjectives as head
Nominal	Process: relational: intensive attribution	

In example 9, the carrier, Pwani people, have received a negative adjectival attribute such as ‘**lazy**’, ‘**indolent**’ and ‘**semi-literate**’. These attributes label these people unfairly hence bear the markers of hate speech stereotype texts as they lack factual verifications and could be based on prejudicial feelings of the author of such texts (Benesch, 2012).

Example 10 below is a further example of Relational clause of identification. This is because its nominal group, the Token (Kikuyu) whether it comes first or last in the clause is labeled identified. In other words, the Token (**Kikuyu**) and Value (**land grabbers**) can interchange position and still means the same. The example 10 obeys the reversibility test hence can be labeled as Relational clause of identification (Halliday 1990).

Example 10.

Kikuyu	Are	Land grabbers
Carrier	Process: relational: intensive attribution	Nominal group with noun as head

In the example 10, above the token, Kikuyu has a negative value assigned to it describing the people using the grammatical compliment '**land grabbers**'. It is of the nominal group but plays an adjectival role that stereotypically refer to the target victim as '**land grabbers**.' That makes the example a hate speech stereotype according to Benesch (2012) tenets since it unfairly targets the whole community of the Kikuyu, similarly, as the example 11 below:

Example 11.

Kikuyu	Are	Shrewd
Carrier	Process: relational: intensive attribution	Attribution with nominal group with adjectives as a head

The example above also has hallmark of hate speech through the carrier, the Kikuyu also receives negative attribution as they are described as a people who are "**shrewd**".

In some context the adjective “**shrewd**” can receive a negative connotation especially if used during inter –ethnic political tensions sometimes witnessed in Kenya. This negative attribution like in the previous examples is what makes this example to stand out as a hate text. Also, the example 12 below attributes the Kikuyu as the people who are selfish, thereby; condemning the whole community of the Kikuyu genealogy.

Example 12.

Kikuyu	Are	Selfish
Carrier	Process: relational: intensive attribution	Attribute with nominal group with adjacent as a head

4.3.2 Relational process of possessive attribution

Halliday (1990) define the Relational process of possessive attribution as that which is concerned with possessing. The process may denote that X, the subject has Y, complement (possessive) as in example 13 below:

Example 13

Kikuyu	have	Very small brain equivalent to jiggers’ brain
Carrier	Process: relational: possessive attribution	Attribute with noun group post modified by prepositional phrase

In the example above, the carrier has been attributed to possess the attribute of small brains which is further compared to that of jiggers as shown by the preposition phrase through post modification of the adjectival attribute. The comparison of the people to vermin such as “**jiggers**” as in the attribute above serves to sub-humanize the entire

Kikuyu community. Therefore, it qualifies the example to be classified as hate speech stereotype example (Benesch, 2012).

4.3.3 Mental process

According to Halliday and Mattisien (2004), Mental process constitute of sensing happenings within our consciousness. The mental process can be subdivided into process of emotion, perception and desideration- that which bring wishes into existence- mental process. In this analysis the subject was substituted with labels of sensor and what is sensed is labeled as phenomenon in Hallidayan terms. The sensor is the perceiver of the phenomenon as illustrated in example 1 below:

Example 1.

I	saw	Anyone supporting Jubilee is either stupid or corrupt
Sensor	Process: mental: cognition	Phenomenon

In the example above, the sensor has a negative mental perception that the Jubilee party, which is the ruling political party in Kenya then, has supporters who are subhuman being either stupid or corrupt as shown by the phenomenon in the above example. It is this negative perception in the phenomenon that makes this example to be grouped under hate speech according to (Benesch, 2012).

4.3.4 Mental process of desideration with nominal group post modified by preposition phrase

Mental process of desideration is a process that often bring wishes and ideas into existence by projecting a separate clause (Halliday and Mattiessen, 2004) as in example 2 below:

Example 2.

I	hope	All kikuyus to be re circumcised and be told the real meaning of circumcision
Sensor	Process: mental: Desideration	Phenomenon

In the example 1, above, the sensor, 'I' has his or her wish in the cognitive mind that the Kikuyu community ought to re-adjust their collective consciousness to overcome some unforeseen problem as implied by the phenomenon through the post modification, "to be re-circumcised" of the noun group 'all kikuyus.' The wish or hope has been realized as a phenomenon in a separate clause as in *All kikuyus to be re-circumcised and told the real meaning of circumcision* Given a context, this text can qualify to be a hate stereotype in the genre of hate speech since it calls for physical harm of the victim, the Kikuyus as above (Benesch, 2012).

4.3.5 Mental process of the Emotion with the compound noun phrase as a phenomenon

Some mental process in some data had verbs that portrayed strong emotions. The phenomenon-what was seen or the target of the verb depicting emotion was a noun

group with a compound noun phrase (Halliday and Mattisien,2004) as illustrated in example 3 below:

Example 3

I	Hate	Kikuyus and kalenjins nkt!
Sensor	Process: mental: emotion	Phenomenon

Unlike the other examples, in this example, the sensor has strong emotions or feelings of hatred for the phenomenon which is a compound noun since it combines two nouns- kikuyus and kalenjins. The sensor intensity of hatred is denoted by ‘nkt!!’ a way of clicking when one is extremely annoyed in the social media. Given a context the phenomenon shown by the compound noun phrase ‘Kikuyu's and Kalenjins’ may suffer even physical harm, Therefore, this text also forms part of the corpus of hate text stereotype speech (Benesch 2012).

In conclusion, this section answers the first objective of this study using Systemic Functional Grammar Theory so as to determine the grammatical features unique to texts with language of stereotype. Three categories were used to analyze the data namely: Material, Mental and Relational processes. The next objective shall be analyzed using The Speech Act Theory.

4.4 Analysis of language of stereotype using Speech Act Theory

The Speech Act Theory was used to organize the emerging themes of the posted texts as per the second objective: which is analysis of Language of Stereotype using Speech Act Theory. The Speech Act Theory was used to determine various types of illocutionary forces the examples exhibited. The theory served as the spread sheet for

the analysis and evaluation of the selected hate texts in the selected web pages. Under the Speech Act Theory, the examples were put under categories advanced by (Searle, 1975). The searle categories depended on the illocutionary forces a text had. They include categories such as Assertives, Directives, Commissive, Expressives and Declaratives. In this research, the examples that had similar illocutionary force were put under a group using the Searl categories of: Assertives, Directives, Commissive, Declaratives and Expressives; for ease of interpretation and analysis presented below beginning with Assertives.

4.4.1 Assertives

According to Searl (1972), Assertives are illocutionary acts which reveal things as they are in the world. The acts could be utterances that represent false or true information. The acts include: to state, to claim, to hypothesize, to depict, to report, to assert or to swear that what is said is the truth. Eleven examples of Assertives were identified as discussed below and three others examples were discussed separately. All were from the Cord Effect Site as below:

1. *Jaluo jinga ! that is why ull never rule Kenya (Luo people are foolish! That is why you will never rule Kenya)*
2. *Like all kikuyu, you are ungrateful idiot who think Kenya is for kikuyu only.*
3. *You are as foolish as the rest of your tribesmen*
4. *Wajaluo sisi wote ni MAUBMWA !! That is why we are the most HATED tribe on earth. Reason UJINGA WA AKILI.....I wish I was kale. Bullshit) (All of us Luos are dogs! That is why we are the most hated tribe on earth. Reason we are foolish in our minds...I wish I was born kalenjin Bullshit)*

5. *Freedom is never voluntarily given by the oppressor; it must be demanded by the oppressed.*

Let us join hands to fight for justice.

6. *Luos are stone throwers*

7. *Luos are dirty*

8. *Kikuyus are land grabbers*

9. *Kikuyus are shrewd*

10. *Kikuyus are selfish*

11. *Last elections there was a campaign going around in Gatanga telling us how Raila will reposes our land and make our men wear shorts.*

The above examples are Assertives. They are illocutionary acts that represent a state of affair. These statements describe a state of affair in the world which could be true or false. In the case of this study, they tell people how things are. Assertive speech acts can be definitions, assertions, statements and so on, which can be argued to be true or false. The Assertives were intended to state some perceived truths. For example, one of the authors of hate texts declared that some entire group was foolish as in this example below:

(1) *Jaluo jinga! That is why u'll never rule Kenya (Luo people are foolish! That is why will never rule Kenya.*

This is fallacious notion that portrays the whole ethnic group of the Luo "community as foolish which is not true. The example has illocutionary force of putting forward and concluding hence can be described as an assertive. The author puts forward a premise that all the Luos are foolish and further concludes that because of the perceived

foolishness of the entire community, a presidential candidate from the Luo ethnic group may never attract enough votes to win an election.

Example (2) referred the Kikuyu community negatively as below:

"Like all Kikuyu, you are ungrateful idiot who think Kenya is for Kikuyu's only. You are as foolish as the rest of your tribesmen.

This example is an assertive due to its illocutionary force of putting forward that the victim (kikuyu) are not only ungrateful but also concludes that the victim is as foolish just like the entire Kikuyu community. The main intention of such author seemingly is to sub humanize the whole ethnic group they target. It also serves to demean and belittle the target group (Kikuyu). Such assertions were also meant to make member of such ethnic group feel like they are to blame for the prevailing political phenomenon. These statements may not be true. Some assertions like examples (3) repeated below may draw mixed reactions from the reader:

"wajaluo sisi wote ni MAUBWA!!That's why we are the most HATED tribe on earth. Reason UJINGA WA AKILL...I wish I was a kyuk or kale. BULLSHIT!!(All of us Luos are dogs! That is why we are the most hated tribe on earth. Reason we are foolish in our minds ...I wish I was born a Kikuyu or kalenjin. Bullshit").

The above text is an assertive because it consists of a series of assertions that imply or condemns the Luo ethnic group by terming them as dogs and foolish. This state of affair denotes hate speech when the Luos are belittled and called foolish.

In this study, some example like (4) below had illocutionary force of persuading or suggesting. The assertion intended to persuade the target audience to do some unspecified action. The following example illustrates this notion: *"Freedom is never voluntarily given by the oppressor; it must be demanded by the oppressed. Let's join*

hands to fight for justice. "Some descriptive assertive stated some perceived truths which are stereotypes that hate mongers borrow from common existing interethnic stereotypes in Kenya. *They include text 5, 6, 7, 8, 9 repeated here below:*

"Luos are stone throwers (violent); Luos are dirty; Kikuyu's are land grabbers; and Kikuyu's are shrewd; and Kikuyu's are selfish"

The above example belongs to the assertive category of illocutionary acts. These assertives are statements full of prejudice and stereotype other ethnic groups like the Luo by describing them as **violent, dirty** and that the entire Agikuyu community consists of **land grabbers**, dishonest, and egocentric people. This are fallacious statements since not all Luos are dirty or violent besides not all kikuyus are land grabbers or selfish as the author of the text implies. These stereotypical texts are usually invoked by politicians from other political groups that view other groups as a threat to their political supremacy hence may serve to cause political division in the Kenyan context.

Some Assertives like example (9) have illocutionary forces of suggesting hence making a situation be the case for example,

"Anyone you see supporting Jubilee is either stupid or corrupt"

Unlike the previous texts that belittle the victim's ethnic group, the text above shows hate towards a person who supports the Jubilee political party. Words like stupid and corrupt shows hateful feelings thereby implying hate speech. Some assertive text like (11) below may have illocutionary force of inciting and therefore aimed at inflicting fear in the audience and their supporters; for instance,

"Last elections there was a campaign going telling us round in Gatanga how Raila would reposes our land and make our men wear shorts. The same propaganda is currently being propagated by kameme FM. Who benefit

from the propaganda? The thieving political class: why do you let these hyenas insult our intelligence?"

The above text is packed as an assertive to target a class of people in the society (political class) whom it derogatorily refers to as 'hyenas' as well as heightening fear among the target on how Raila' may belittle and demean them by forcing them to wear shorts besides conspiring to take their land. This assertive has hallmarks of hate speech since through its illocutionary force it may incite a section of people against others. For instance, the Agikuyu who lives in Gatanga and Luo community who may be represented by Raila, a 2013 presidential candidate. Given a charged political context interethnic political violence may flare up like that akin to 2007 chaos in Kenya. The next category is a further discussion of assertives with a slightly different theme which is discussed as below:

4.4.2 Further examples of assertives

There were other examples of assertives which are statements that commit the speaker to a certain future action. They look like commissives but differ in the sense that, commissives talk of the speaker himself or herself (Searl, 1969). It could be in form of promise. The illocutionary forces may include: promising and threatening.

Others have illocutionary forces of Intending, vowing to do or to refrain from doing something, (Searle, 1969). Three assertives examples were identified in this research as below:

11. *This is why Jaluo will NEVER rule this land! How can u carry US flag and call UA own? We are it not ready 2 go back 2 colonialism! UHURU 4REVA.*

12. *You can call Raila ur prez 2 ur graves but he will never be as long as he lives. Warmonger*

13. You will never rule this country...cursed man

Examples (11,12 and13) are assertives with illocutions that commit the speaker to a certain future action. In the study some of this assertives from the data used an anaphoric phrase "will never" probably the author's way of demonstrating resolve or swearing that something will never take place. The following example (11) well illustrates this scenario:"...*this is why Jaluo will NEVER rule this land! How can u carry US flag and call it UA own? We are not ready 2 go back 2 colonialism! UHURU 4REVA.You can call Raila ur prez 2 ur graves but he will never be as long as he lives. Warmonger... You will never rule this country... Cursed man*"

The words “will never” is capitalized so as to intensify a strong resolve that even in future time the author of example and his ilk is not ready to vote Raila president. This assertive type of hate texts insinuates in the mind of the author, that none from the Luo community will be elected president even in the near future. This fallacy paints the Luo community as traitors who may take the nation back to the colonial era especially in collusion with Obama, an American president with Luo roots, who had been elected as a US president during the time the text was sent. The examples arguably have illocutionary forces of vowing or opposing Raila bid of vying for presidency. This may be because he comes from “enemy” community of the text author.

The example was meant to incite other ethnic groups to distrust Raila bid for presidency and his Luo community, from its illocutionary force of opposing, hence the electorate should avoid electing him president on that basis. The next category is that of Expressive discussed as below:

4.4.3 Expressives

Expressives are illocutionary acts that commission the speaker to actions that express a person's mental state. Expressives may have illocutionary forces that may include to criticize, taunt, condemn or demean among others. Eight examples were identified. The first six shall be discussed in this segment and the next three in the next segment since they form the majority of the speech acts in this study.

15. *I want all kikuyus to be recircumcised and told the true meaning of circumcision*
16. *Jaluo are stupid ugly human beings who never accept defeat*
17. *I hate kikuyus and kales! NKTs*
18. *We acha chuki na kikuyu ur tribalistic shindwe we ...Burr kabsa....nktest!!(NKT!
You stop hating kikuyus, you are very useless....nktests!)*
19. *Jaluos are very thick do they really have brains that functions?*
20. *Did I just jiggers brains) hear someone say Kenya belongs to kikuyus. They
(kikuyus) have very small brains equivalent to jiggers' brains)*

The above examples (14-20) are Expressives. Expressives are illocutionary acts that express the mental state of the speaker about an event presumed to be true. The above examples are Expressives since they depict how the author of the examples feels about an event or situation. The texts above examined had six major types of illocutionary forces namely: criticizing, taunting, condemning, demeaning, dismissing, expressing anger or annoyance and use of swear words. This is through the authors of texts choice of negative words like: stupidly ugly, hate, very thick jiggers as in examples above. Although there were a few critiques that targeted individuals, most of the critiques seemed to target the whole ethnic group rather than an individual. For instance, there were numerous group that depicted shared stereotypical statements meant to reflect a whole ethnic group as "useless", "stone throwers, violent or even lazy." For example; texts from the data (14,15,). The example (14) stated below illustrates the idea of stereotyping a whole ethnic group better:

“I want all Kikuyu's to be re-circumcised and told the true meaning of circumcision” or “Jaluo are stupid ugly human beings who never accept defeat and usually throw stones and are not circumcised.

The above Expressives have illocutionary forces of criticizing especially the Luos for not accepting political defeat especially when a presidential candidate from the Luo community does not win. The text also has illocutionary force of demeaning the Luo as a people who are stupid and ugly. The illocutionary force of demeaning bears the hallmarks of hate speech.

Just like in Rwanda where ethnic Tutsi and moderate Hutus were referred as “Inyenze” or cockroaches, these group shared stereotypes that make the target group seem lesser beings or subhuman or even inferior. Therefore, given a context to actualize this hate, it becomes easier and it may seem normal for hate mongers to want to exterminate the target (the Luo).

Some illocutionary acts expressing anger and annoyance were characteristically introduced or followed by an interjection “NKT!” a textual representation of popular clicking sound by Kenyans as a mark of disapproval, annoyance or discontent (Tully and Ekdale,2012). For example, this Facebook author post this example to express illocutionary force of anger, annoyance and contempt for some ethnic group as in text (17 and 19) as shown below:

I hate Kikuyu's n kales! Nkt (For real I hate Kikuyu's and kalenjin nkt!) Nkt! Kikuyu u r tribalistic shindwe we...Burr kabsanktest!! (Nkt! You stop We acha chuki na hating Kikuyu's,you are very useless...nktest!).

Interestingly as seen in the above examples," nkt" was frequently conjugated with "nktest" to denote the intensity of the annoyance by the author of the example towards the target ethnic group.

Demeaning and dismissive speech acts or illocutionary forces also featured in most examples in the data from the web as in example (19 and 20). Some of the demeaning illocutionary forces seemed to question the intellectual capacity of the target ethnic groups. The examples are laced with insults mentioning brain, mind and *thinking*. For example, as below:

"Jaluos are very thick do they really have brains that functions? "Did I just hear someone say

Kenya belongs to Kikuyus. They (kikuyus) have very small brains equivalent to jigger's brains).

Further examples of Expressive are:

21. a thief got killed in my neighborhood what made the killing even sweeter he was a kikuyu.

Kikuyus are thieves anyway.

22. Jaluo jeuri who are you to judge?...style up you professional stone throwers...nktest (Arrogant Luos, who are you to judge?...style up you professional stone throwers....nktes

23. Luos are selfish! Must you always win even when you have clearly lost? You people am more frustrated by you behavior NKT!

The examples above are also expressives. These are illocutionary acts which also express the mental state of the speaker about an event presumed to be true. The examples also depict how the author of the examples may feel in a given context. The examples (21, 22, and 23) are Expressives since they reflect one's mental disposition. Words used in the examples like, *...who are you to judge, ... for these kikuyus and ...you have clearly lost* gives this examples a conversational tone that changes the state of the world they are interpreting. Some of the insults from the data were largely informed by the common interethnic stereotypes known to most Kenyans hence exist in a community collective conscious as a whole. Some referenced the Kikuyu community as thieves: as in example (21). For example, as shown below:

"a thief just got killed in my neighborhood what made the killing even sweeter was a Kikuyu.

Kikuyu's are thieves anyway"

The assertion that Kikuyus are thieves anyway is a stereotype that negatively and falsely portrays the Kikuyu community. The example also has an illocutionary force of insulting. There are other insults that referenced Luo community as violent and stone throwers. For example, in example (22) below:

(Jaluo jeuri who are you to judge?" Style up professional stone throwers.....nktest "(Arrogant

Luos, who are you to judge?....style you professional stone throwers...nktest).

Finally; the data yielded substantial Expressives illocutionary acts that have illocutionary force of blaming. The speech act meant to blame certain ethnic communities for different reasons. For instance, there were illocutionary acts that intended to blame another ethnic group for their selfishness. The following example (23) below captures this type of situation:

"Luos are selfish! Must you always win even when you have clearly lost? you people I am so frustrated by your behavior Nkt!"

Some of the illocutionary acts intended to blame can be interpreted in terms of "we verses them", a language that promote distance and Ethnocentric feelings of superior verses inferior relationships and may carry connotations regarding strong verses weak depending on who the author of the example is and the target audience. For instance, the author of example (24) condescendingly views the Luos as inferior ethnic group since their behavior seems to disgust him or her.

4.4.4 Declaratives

Declaratives are illocutionary acts which reveals the actions that are verbally implied. These utterances are not only ideal but also practical. In the context of this study, few examples were identified since they need a physical context to be actualized. These are illocutionary forces that seek to bring into existence the state of affair to which it refers. Only one example was identified as below:

24. For these kikuyus the jiggers in their brains need more prayers than the jiggers in their feet The example (24) above is a Declarative with illocutionary force of to demean or to humiliate the targeted. Such an example can be wittily called as “Jiggers insults”. The example implies the whole Kikuyu community as a jiggers -laden people. Ordinarily, jiggers are related to dirt and laziness thus the targeted community is implied as lazy and dirty (Kamotho, 2003). Most of the “jiggers insults” were directed at the Kikuyu ethnic group perhaps because of the high prevalence of this vermin in Central Kenya at that time, where Kikuyu ethnic group predominantly inhabit. The above example has illocutionary force of insulting and demeaning the Kikuyu at the same time especially when the author of the example likens their brains to jiggers.

4.4.5 Directives

Directives are speech acts that have illocutionary acts that serve to make the person spoken to or addressed to do some actions. Ordinarily, the remark intends the addressee to confirm to the dictates of the utterance. The speech acts may entail to: order, command or urge the addressee to do something. Directives exhibit the use of imperative verbs. In this study six examples were identified

25. *Liberation is a must!*

26. *Blood must be shed*

27...*we go ...we go...*

28. *I urge all Kenyans and especially kalenjins not to get it wrong, our plight as a community is well taken care where I am than where you are asked to go out of anger and pride*

29. *Fuck ur all n eat ur shit. Kama hujisikii kuongozwa na H.E Uhuru then u can go ahead n buildur country outside Kenya.*

30. *I guess u still av a foreskin u gentile. I repeat, fuck itself tribal baboon.*

The above examples are arguably under the Searlian category of Directives. These are illocutionary acts for getting the addressee to do something. Six forms of Directives emanated from the data and have the following illocutionary forces: challenging, commanding, admonishing, begging, ordering, advising and dismissing. The most prominent of these were the "must do acts." The following examples illustrate how such acts were framed by the authors calling people to violence as in text (25, 26 and 27): "*Liberation is a must! Blood must be shed, ...we go ...we gooo...*" The least used directives were those that intended to urge. As in example (26) "*I urge all Kenyans, and specifically kalenjins, not to get it wrong' our plight as a community is well taken where I am, than where you asked to go out of anger and pride.*" This text has illocutionary force of advising with hope of changing a community political stance.

Some directives have illocutionary forces of daring or ordering especially some group to leave the nation if they felt their interests are not catered for by the ruling political party. For example, in this (27) the author of the example *Fuck ur all n eat* seems to order the Luo community to leave the nation if their political interests are not catered for " *ur shit. Kama hujisikii kuongozwa na H.E Uhuru, then u can goba head n build ur country outside Kenya. I guess u still av a foreskin u gentile. I repeat, fuck itself tribal*

baboon" This example targets the Luo ethnic community who culturally does not initiate by circumcision. This example (27) above has the hallmarks of hate speech due to its demeaning and insulting illocutionary forces where Luos are derogatorily referred to as gentiles since they do not initiate by circumcision just like the biblical non Jews, and are further demeaned by insulting terms by comparing them to tribal baboon.

In this section, the second objective, which is analysis of stereotype texts using Speech Acts Theory, has been explored in description of the data. The identified examples were put under categories namely: Directives, Assertives, Commissive and Declaratives. These categorizations depend on the similarities of speech acts the data had. The analysis of the next objective shall be done using Benesch Model of Identifying Dangerous Speech tenet of Social-historical variable.

4.5 Description of stereotypical texts using Benesch model

The examples were analyzed using the Benesch (2012) model of identifying hate speech. The explanation of the third objective gives the background information of the texts that bears the features of stereotype. In this objective, stereotype texts were identified from various sites in face book based on a pre-determined criteria as advanced in the Benesch model. The model was used to sieve texts that convey stereotypical feelings towards the victim from a blast of posted texts in the selected websites. According to Benesch (2012) a text can be identified as a stereotype if it describes the stereotyped victims as less than human and also if the text asserts the audience faced danger from the victim group. The researcher looked at the attributes associated with language of stereotype in the blast of posted text and then drew categories using Benesch (2012) model criteria. The first category fell under the text

that described the victim as less than human and the second category has a feature that imply that the audience faced danger from the author of the text.

According to Benesch (2012), language that compares people using terms such as vermin, pests, insects, animals and other degrading adjectives maybe put in category of language of stereotype. Benesch (2012) further says this comparison is a rhetorical hall mark of incitement that may lead to genocide, ethnic cleansing and violence to the case of the already dehumanized victim to be. Mowarin (2004) further support the idea by implying that this scenario has been observed in Rwanda where nearly eight hundred thousand Tutsis and moderate Hutus were killed. The perpetrators of the violence compared the victim to insects search as cockroaches, a term that sub-humanized the victims before violence was meted on them. Although, the Benesch model is not a linguistic theory, it assisted in sieving the data from the blast of Face Book postings so as to identify only those texts with stereotypical features.

4.5.1 Analysis of stereotype texts using Benesch model of identifying hate speech

A number of texts were identified and their analysis and explanation are as below.

1. jaluo are stupid ugly human beings who never accept defeat and usually throw stones and are not circumcised.

The text (1) above, in Benesch terms, has features of hate speech or language that stereotype.

It has adjectives like ‘stupid and ‘ugly that serves to degrade the victim group (the Luo community). The Luo community is unfairly generalized and prejudiced as people who are stupid, ugly and perhaps hardly accepts political defeat. Luos are further

stereotyped as stone throwers. Since, they also do not initiate by circumcision, an attribute the author of the text uses to stereotype the whole community probably viewing them as inferior due to the authors of the examples' ethnocentric feelings. This implies that the author of the example feels his cultural orientation is superior to those of the Luo community. This is a fallacious view. Other examples with similar attributes were example (2,3 and 4) also identified and discussed below.

2. *Jaluo are very thick do they really have brain that functions.*

3. *Jaluo jeuris who are you to judge?.....Style up professional stone thrower. .nktest.(Arrogant Luos, who are to judge?.,.style Jaluo Jinga! That's why I'll never rule Kenya (Luo people are foolish!That is why they will never rule Kenya up professional Stone thrower...nktests)*

4. *Jaluo jeuris Who are you to judge...Style up professional stone thrower...nktests*

Using Benesch (2012) criteria, the above text 2,3 and 4 falls under the category of language of hate speech. This is because of the demeaning epithets used in reference for the victim group. For example, adjectival phrases like *very thick* as in text (2) are used to imply that the whole Luo community is foolish and stupid beyond measure. Other stereotypical terms like professional “stone throwers” like in example (3) above generally stereotype the Luo community and implies that they are not only violent but also have a penchant for throwing stones. Further, examples (4) stereotype the Luo communities by calling them “jeuris” a Swahili term for stubbornness. This is a fallacious stereotype that could probably imply some hatred the author of this text harbors towards the Luo people as a whole. Another example with similar features is 5 below:

5. *luos are dirty*

In Syntactic sense, dirty is an adjective that describes the subject (luo). The adjective dirty has been used to stereotype the whole Luo nation as unclean people. This shows prejudicial feeling the author of such examples harbor. The next example may also compare to previous text based on the prejudice since the writer seems to harbor prejudicial feelings towards the kikuyus.

6. Did I just hear someone say kenya ni ya okuyu? Wana akili ndogo kama ya jiggers !! (did I hear someone say kenya belongs to kikuyus? They have very small brains equivalent to jiggers brains.)

Example (6) above also falls under the language of stereotype and hate speech when the Benesch model of (2012) criteria is applied. The author of the example 6 above uses a simile which compares the Kikuyu community collective brain to that of jiggers. According to Benesch (2012) model, when a person compares the victim groups community to insects or vermin, like the way the Kikuyu people collective brains are compared to those of jiggers, then the text falls under the realm of language of stereotype or hate speech. It falls under hate speech because the comparison to insects serves to lessens or demeans the Kikuyu ethnic group by likening them to vermin (insects) such as jiggers. This is also seen in the text below.

7. for these kikuyus the jiggers in their brains need more prayers than the jiggers in their feet.

Example 7 also bares the language of stereotype according to Benesch model for it compares the brains of kikuyu community to vermin such as jiggers. The “jiggers” epithet may get its explanation from the jigger menace eradication campaign that was being done in Central Kenya in the year 2013 by various non-governmental organizations. The author of this example therefore, fallaciously considers the whole Kikuyu community as people infested with jiggers. This kind of attribution serves to

demean the members of the Kikuyu community as a whole consequently committing hate speech.

Just like in Rwanda, the Tutsi used hate words like 'inyenze' 'cockroaches' in the events leading to the infamous 1994 genocide according to Mowarin (2000). Similarly, here in Kenya, some hate texts compare their victims to vermin like jiggers. The next example also may have a similar theme like the ones discussed above.

8. Naona akina Kamau, Njoroge, Mwangi na izo takataka zingine wanaongea vibaya sana; ngoja vita ikianza ndo mtajua wakikuyu pekee wametawanyika sana... other tribes zinaishi their native land so ongeeni vibaya mkijua you are the ones who will lose more heads. (I see people like Njoroge, Mwangi, Kamau and other rubbish speaking negatively, wait till war begins, you shall realize only the Agikuyu are scattered everywhere in Kenya; other ethnic groups inhabit their native land so continue knowing that you are the ones who will lose more heads.)

The example has hallmarks of language of hate speech in line with the Benesch model first tenet since it seems to imply a call for violence. To cover up for lack of a good reason to support his or her view, the author of the text had resorted to threats. Seemingly the example was used to scare members of the Kikuyu community who demographically inhabit most parts of Kenya from expressing their political views freely. This is shown by the phrase 'loss of heads' as a metaphorical reminder of 2007 post-election chaos that saw some people lose lives, where most victims from the community for instance Kamau, Njoroge and Mwangi are names that symbolize as the Kikuyu nation, are compared to vermin (rubbish) like substances and may encounter some existential threats. This was to demean them in the eyes of the authors of such examples with hate stereotype speech (Umati, 2013)

Further, some text seemed to reinforce the stereotype that Kikuyu are quite enterprising. Perhaps this could be the reason why they attract economic envy as it can be inferred from example (8) above.

The next example that may exhibit a similar prejudice towards the kikuyu community is the ones discussed below:

9. Athiefist just got killed in my neighborhood what made the killing even sweeter was that the poor thing was a Kikuyu. Kikuyus are thieves anyway.

Example 9 serves to reinforce a stereotype that the whole Kikuyu community is peopled with thieves. The author of the text seems to scornfully celebrate that the victim was from the Kikuyu community. Further, the author of the text calls the so-called thief a poor thing. In Benesch terms, this comparison demeans the members of the Kikuyu community, thereby, it bears the hallmarks of hate speech.

The example 9 elicited hateful feelings towards the Kikuyu community in general. The next example presents a different mode of stereotype unlike the previous texts.

10. Anyone you see supporting Jubilee is either stupid or corrupt.

The author of the example (10) seems to harbor a scornful attitude towards supporters of Jubilee, a political party in Kenya. This example reinforces the stereotype that the then ruling party supporters are corrupt. This is because the Kenyan media had highlighted scandalous dealings that had engulfed some of the Jubilee supporters. Therefore; the example may imply that followers of Jubilee party are sub-human. This is implied by use the subject compliments with negative connotations such as stupid and corrupt. This also creates division of “we” verses “them” in society, a divisive language that may lead to political anarchy. Unlike other texts, in the example below, the author portrays a different scene altogether (West, 2012).

11. It is wabara who made pwani what its today, wenyewe are lazy, indolent, semi-literate and sly. They do drugs and fornicate at pwani si Kenya.

The example shows prejudicial feelings for people who come from other places or regions. The example 11 was written to react to another example where the author had urged the coastal region to secede from Kenya. The 'wabara' (up country people) seems to speak from superior view that it is them who have developed the coastal region; the example also seems to imply the natives cannot manage themselves economically without the “wabara”, which could be propaganda based on feeling of condescension. This example shows ethnocentric view of some up country people harbors towards the coastal people. The author may not want to admit that the coastal region has opportunities that have favored the up-country people excel hence resolve to collectively term the coastal natives as 'lazy, 'indolent' 'drug addict' and 'incessant fornicators' probably because of misconceived thoughts or stereotypes that a few people harbor due to prejudice. In Benesch terms, the epithets like “lazy”, “indolent” and “drug addict” demeans the coastal people, hence it falls under the language of hate speech.

Finally; the following demeaning text was found to be ironical as it showed condemnation of the author's ethnic community:

12. Wajaluo sisi wote ni MAUBWA!!That is why we are the MOST HATED tribe on the earth. Reason UJINGA WA AKILI...! I wish I was kyuk or kale. BULLISH!!(All of us Luis are dogs! That is why we are the most hated tribe in the earth. Reason we are foolish in mind...I wish I was born a Kikuyu or kalenjini. Bullshit.

Example (12) just like example (11) demeans the Luo people by comparing them to dogs and even further terms them as foolish. This example is stereotype that depicts members of one's community as inadequate. The example also exhibits prejudicial feelings towards members of the Luo community. This serves as a rallying call to members of the Luo ethnic group to act aggressively to defend their political interests,

may be to avoid being dominated by either, the Kales and the Kikuyu communities. In this case, the reason for stereotyping is social. The author may also want the community to reform so as to be more likeable; It does not imply that he or she has real love for either the Kikuyu or the Kalenjin ethnic group.

According to Benesch (2012), a speech which asserts that the audience faced serious danger from the victim group as in example (12) also suffices as hate speech stereotype. The examples numbered 13-20 were found to be of this nature.

13. *I want all Kikuyu's to be re-circumcised and be told the real meaning of circumcision.*

This example calls for physical harm of the victim group. Given a polarized political environment, which has limited or lack rule of law, the mentioned community above in the text may experience physical harm depending on who is saying such texts. It can be argued that to belong, the members of the Agikuyu have to stand up against some unperceived threat.

Some examples vilified other ethnic groups for example the texts below:

14. *Kikuyus are land grabbers*

15. *Kikuyus are shrewd*

16. *Kikuyus are selfish*

These three examples, 14, 15 and 16 also bear the hallmarks of language of stereotype due to the negative attribution the Kikuyu community receives from authors of the texts. The texts vilify the Kikuyu community thereby portraying them as evil. They reinforce the stereotypical belief that members of Kikuyu ethnic group are 'land grabbers'. This may be because they own most business in Kenya. The other epithets like 'shrewd' and 'selfish' and land grabbers used to refer to the Kikuyu ethnic group

are stereotypes that may elicit fear in the audience. The aim of the writers of these examples could be, to incite a certain audience to develop prejudicial feelings towards the victim group who in this case may be the Kikuyu. These are demeaning epithets in line with the second tenet of (Benesch, 2012). The next example below portrays the audience faces an economic threat from the victim as below:

17. In central: Uhuru wa Kenyatta write off 2B coffee debt; tells central Kenya farmers to collect title deeds they had offered as security... In Mombasa Uhuru orders squatters each to pay 210,000 for title deeds since they did not vote for jubilee government.

This example could be a well packaged propaganda by sympathizers of Mombasa Republic Council, a secessionist movement. This could imply that Uhuru government is a threat to the coastal region economic existence going by the contrasting way the two regions have been treated as propagated by Mombasa Republic council, the secessionist movement.

According to Benesch model of identifying hate speech, the author of the text may incite sympathizers of Mombasa Republican Movement to harm ethnic groups from central Kenya given a politically incited context. This is in line with Benesch (2012) third tenet. The tenet outlines that, if a text or speech act asserts that the stereotyping group (Mombasa Republic Council) could encounter some imminent harm from the target, they hence should have some self-defense to avert the situation.

Similarly, the example below may imply that the audience faces real danger from the 'Raila' presidency hence urges some faction of the electorate to outvote him:

18. Last election there was a campaign trail going around that Raila will poses our land and make our men to wear shorts in around in Gatanga telling us how Raila would recircumcise us

Just like the previous examples, the above example has a feature of language of stereotype. To belong, the audience has to reject the 'Raila' presidency since it is seemingly a threat to their economic and political existence as well. The example may also imply that Raila, and those who are politically inclined to him, once elected president, may want to forcefully 'repossess their land' and change their "dress code". The example shows that the audience faces existential danger from the victim group and perhaps they should take some caution for self- preservation.

In conclusion, chapter four has dealt with data presentation and analysis as per the study objectives. The analysis of data was done by use of two theories namely: Halliday Systemic Functional Linguistics and Speech Act Theory. Further, analysis was done using Benesch Model of identifying hate speech. The model was also used to draw categories of stereotype texts before the theoretical analysis and discussion were applied on the examples collected.

4.6 Summary of chapter four

This chapter has used theories such as Halliday Linguistic Systemic Functional Grammar Theory, Speech Act Theory and Benesch Model to analyze data per the study objective. The next chapter shows Summary of findings, conclusion and recommendations of the study.

CHAPTER FIVE

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.0 Introduction

This chapter discusses the summary of findings, conclusions of this study and recommendations for further study. The discussion was guided by three objectives namely; to describe selected stereotype texts by use of Systemic Functional Linguistic Grammar Theory; to analyze stereotype texts by use of the Speech Act Theory so as to bring out their language features and to establish how the stereotype texts can be accounted for by the Benesch (2012) model of categorizing dangerous speech.

5.1 Summary of Findings

From a group of text collected from various pages of facebook, thirty texts were identified as stereotype texts. They had features of language of dangerous speech as shown by the Benesch (1202) model of identifying dangerous speech. This selection of texts was based on how the target victim was portrayed in the text using the Benesch model.

5.1.1 Identification and description of selected Stereotype texts

After the stereotype texts were identified and selected using the Benesch model of identifying hate speech, the Systemic Functional Linguistic Grammar Theory was employed to describe the examples. Out of the thirty examples selected on the basis of how the sender of the texts negatively portrayed the target victim, 16 expressions were selected for analysis by the Systemic Functional Linguistic Grammar Theory. The examples were put in Hallidayan categories such as: material, mental and relation processes (Halliday, 1985).

5.1.2 Summary of findings of material process types

Under Material process, 9 examples were described as material processes. The examples were analyzed using thematic roles like ‘Actor’ to denote the doer of actions and verbs that show the material process to imply the act of ‘doing’ or happening. Most ‘Actors’ in the texts were proper nouns like ‘Jaluos; The Kikuyu; Raila as would be perpetrators of heinous actions as denoted by the verbs. Most verbs were in active voice for example, ‘throw’ reposes and one was in the passive voice, for example ‘Got killed.’

5.1.3 Summary of findings of Relation process types

In this category, texts were selected and analyzed under the label of of relation process types. The texts were described by use of labels like ‘carrier, ‘token’ which were the grammatical subjects in this sense. The ‘token’ or ‘carrier’ were identified as nominal groups. The verbs indicated the relation process and were mostly the verbs of the form of ‘be’. The ‘attributes were mostly adjectives save for the case of the Relational process of identifying. The carriers were nominal groups which were followed by verbs that denoted the relation process. Eight of the verbs were in the form of be – specifically ‘are’ and one text had the verb ‘have’. The verbs of the form ‘be’ denoted intensive identification of the ‘carrier’ as possessors of negative attributes or traits which is a key feature in the language of stereotype (Halliday and Mattiesen, 2004). Most attributes had a negative adjectival phrases for example; “ungrateful idiot”. The Carrier all Kikuyus are said to possess the trait of ‘ungrateful idiot’ and the Carrier ‘Jaluo’ possess the trait of ‘stone throwers,’ a noun phrases used in the negative sense. Only the relational process of identifying type had the label ‘Value’ as a compliment in the

grammatical sense. Unlike the texts with the Relational process of attribution which had the attributive, compliment as adjectives, the label 'Value' or compliment consisted of a nominal group.

5.1.4 Summary of findings of mental process

Under the mental process three texts were selected. These texts were described using labels such as sensor mental verbs and phenomenon. All sensors consist of nominal groups for example 'Any one you; I and the verbs consisted of mental verbs such as see, want, hate. The mental verbs assist the researcher to conjure up the intentions of the sensor to the phenomenon. The phenomenon, what is perceived by the sensor, either consisted of a nominal group or were clauses for example 'Kikuyus and Kalenjins (nominal groups) and 'All Kikuyu to be circumcised (clauses).

5.1.5 Summary of findings of Stereotype Texts

Further, analysis was done by use of the Speech Act Theory under speech Acts Theory. The texts were discussed under categories: Assertives, Commissive, Expressives, Declaratives and Directives. The categories were drawn based on the illocutionary forces exhibited by the texts (Austin, 1965).

For instance, 15 texts were analyzed as Assertive. Some of the Assertives had the illocutionary forces of demeaning and belittling their target victims. For example; some victims were described as 'foolish' ungrateful idiots 'violent' and 'land grabbers' while some had the illocutionary forces of persuading or suggesting for example 'kikuyus are selfish. This represents a negative state of affair concerning the target victim (Kikuyu).

Furthermore, three texts were analyzed as further examples of Assertive due to their difference in themes. The texts were found to have the illocutionary forces demonstrating resolve and some implied swearing for example “Jaluo will never rule this land.” The modal auxiliary ‘will’ imply the act of ‘ruling’ may never be fulfilled. Besides the Assertives, seven texts were analyzed as Expressives. This is because some texts had the illocutionary forces of: one was criticizing; three were taunting; one undermining and two expressing anger or annoyance by use of swear words aimed at the victim. The text showed or expressed what the author of the texts feels towards the targeted victim.

In the analysis of stereotype texts 4 declaratives were analyzed. Most of them were coined from the common interethnic stereotypes commonly used by Kenyans of diverse ethnic background to slander other ethnic groups. For example, ‘Kikuyus are thieves.’ Such stereotypes make the texts appear to be passing a factual assertion as so as to blame others for their woes.

Also, from the findings six texts were analyzed as directives. They used verbs that calls for some actions. Most of the actions being called for were realized to be those that may lead to harm on the victim. The texts had illocutionary forces of challenging, commanding, admonishing, ordering and dismissing. For example, ‘Blood must be shed’ implies call for violence since it sounds as an order to act wrongly or harm.

5.2 Conclusion

In conclusion, it was evident that stereotypes texts can be described by use of Halliday’s Systemic Functional Linguistics tenets. The texts were put in the category of material,

mental and relation process. Before the description, the texts were selected by use of the Benesch model (2012). The model had a criterion that assists to sieve texts that bear language of stereotype based on whether an action is aimed at demeaning or belittling or even having intentions of harming the target victim. SFL can indeed be used to describe the language of the texts that stereotype communities or individuals. This is especially with regard to verbs that assist draw categories of the text as either material, mental or relational processes.

It was also noted that stereotype texts can be analyzed by use of categories in speech Act Theory. The texts were successfully analyzed using categories: Expressives, Directives, Commissive and Assertives. This was in regard to the illocutionary forces exhibited in the stereotype texts.

For successful analysis of stereotype texts to take place, it was concluded that the Benesch model (2012) tenets were first used to sieve the relevant texts from a blast of texts obtained from Facebook. Then, the language theories like speech Act Theory and Halliday's Systemic Functional Linguistic Grammar were applied to unearth various language features peculiar to language of stereotypes.

5.3 Recommendation for Further Research

It is recommended that a study be done to ascertain the perlocutionary effects of stereotype texts as a tenet in speech Act theory. This study only accounted for the locutionary and illocutionary forces of the text as shown in SAT. Further research may help in building the corpus of hate speech and its eventual management as a barrier to inter-ethnic communication.

REFERENCES


- Alloport, A. (1954). *The nature of prejudice*. Reading, MA. Addison-Wesley.
- Anderson and Lepore. (2011). *Slurring words*. New York: Wiley.
- Austin, L. (1965). *How To Do Things With Words*. Oxford University press.
- Borgadus, E. (1980). *The effects of contact on the prejudice between Hispanic and non-Hispanic whites in the United States*. Berlin: Springer.
- Brotseme, R. (2004). *A queer Revolution: Reconceptualizing the Debate on Linguistic Reclamation*. Colorado Research in Linguistics.
- Bryant, M. & Flinn, F. (eds). (1989). *Interreligious dialogue: Voices from a new frontier*. New York. CA: Wadsworth.
- Butler, J. (1997). *Excitable Speech: A politics of the performative*. New York: Routledge.
- Castiglion, J.P (2004) *Sexual Prejudice, group Friendship and Hegemonic Beliefs in university students*. San Francisco: Harper San Francisco.
- Chung, G. (1988). Cultural Identity and Cultural Policy in South Korea. *The International Journal of Cultural policy*, 8 (20) pp. 37-48.
- Dodd, A. (1998). *Dynamics of Intercultural communication*. Boston: McGraw-Hill.
- Dong et al. (2001). *Overcoming Ethnocentrism through Developing Intercultural Communication Sensitivity and Multiculturalism*. Pacific and Asian Publication Association.
- Erzsebet, R. (2012). *Discussion on Hate Speech and the limits of Free Speech in a university community*. Chicago: University of Chicago press.
- Fishman (1956). *Stereotypes and Stereotyping*. New York: The Guilford Press.
- Grice, P. (1989). *Studies in the way of words*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Gudykunst, W.B. (2004). *Bridging differences: Effective intergroup communication* (4th ed) Thousand Oaks.
- Halliday, A (1985). *Functional Grammar*. New York: Routledge.
- Halliday and Mattiesen, (2004) *Systemic Functional Linguistic Grammar*. New York: Routledge.

- Hanania and Akhtar. (1985). *Verb from rhetoric function in science writing: A study of Master of sciences theses in Biology, Chemistry and Physics*. The ESP Journal, 4 pp 49-58.
- Harvey, J. (2010). "Resistance, and Civilized Oppression" *Journal of Social Philosophy*.
- Hornsby, J. (2001). "Meaning and uselessness: how to think about derogatory words." *Midwest Studies in Philosophy*.
- Hyland, L. (2000). *Metadiscourse*. John Wiles & Sons.
- Jandt, F.E. (2004). *An introduction to intercultural communication: Identities in global community* (4th ed). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Kodracki and Wellonan. (2002). Content Analysis: review of methods and their applications in nutrition education. *Journal of nutrition and behavior*, 34 (4) 224-230.
- Kuperman, S. (2001). *The Limit of Humanitarian Intervention: Genocide in Rwanda*. Washington DC: Brookings Institution Press.
- Labov (1972). *Sociolinguistic Patterns* (No.4). University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Lakoff, R. (2000). *The Language war*. University of California Press.
- Langton (2012). *Beyond Belief: Pragmatics in Hate speech and Pornography, Speech and Harm: Controversies over Free speech*. Ed. Oxford University Press.
- Levinson, S. (1983) *Pragmatics*. England: Cambridge University Press.
- Macknon, W. (1985) `` *Feminist Response to the Exon Bill*`` New York: Routledge.
- Mahony and Schamber. (2004). Exploring the application of a developmental model of intercultural sensibility. *The Journal of General Education* vol 3.
- Matsuda et al. (1996). `` *Public Response to Racist Speech*`` *Words that wound*. Binder and Co: West View Press.
- Mayring, S (2000). The Impact of teachers instructional strategies and students' anxiety and achievement in eighth grade German and US. *Journal of research and development in education*, 33 (4) 252-240.
- Meddaugh et al. (2004). *Hate Speech or 'reasonable racism?'* *The other in Stormfort*. *Journal of mass media Ethics* 24 (4)51-68.
- Media Act of Kenya (2007) *National Council for Reporting with authority of the attorney general*.

- Mengistu, M. (2012). *Radio and the Propagation of Anti- and Pro Ethiopia Narratives in Amharic Regional, Integration, identity and Citizenship in the Greater Horn of Africa*. Nairobi: Pauline Publication Africa.
- National Cohesion and Integration (2008) *Council of Laws in Kenya*.
- Neuliep and Mcrosky (1979). *Intercultural Communication: A Contextual Approach*. St. Norbert College.
- Neustupny V. (1994). "A theory of contact situations and the study of Academic interaction" *Journal of Asian Pacific Communication* (141)pp 13-31.
- Newcomb and Charter (1950). *Effects upon Individuals or membership in Groups*. Ft Worth, Us: Dryden Press.
- Ozarlan (1997). *Introducing Two new terms into Literature of Hate Speech: Hate Discourse and Hate*. Retrieved from: <http://www.alternet.org/15414>.
- Pettigrove (1997). *Generalized Intergroup Contact Effects on prejudice*. Westport: In Press.
- Samovar, L. & Porter. (2000). *Intercultural communication: A reader*. Belmont CA: Wadsworth.
- Singer, F. (1998). *The Study of Stereotyping Prejudice and Discrimination within Social Psychology*. University of Maryland.
- Tajfel, P. (1981). Stereotype and Prejudice: their automatic and controlled components. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* volume 56 pp1-5.
- Taylor and Simard. (1975). Cross-cultural communication in Montreal. *International Journal of Sociology of Bilanguage*, 1984 (46).
- Tsesis, M. *The Hate Speech Law: A philosophical examination*. Routledge: Amazon Press.
- Umati (2013). *The Many Faces of Online Hate Speech in Kenya*. Nairobi: IHUB Research.
- Urlin, R, (2002). *Understanding cultures: Perspectives in anthology and social theory* (2nd ed). Malden MA: Thesis.
- West, C. (2012). *Freedom of expression and racist hate speech*. Mary KatecGowan. Oxford University Press.

APPENDICES

Appendix I: Letter of Introduction



**KENYATTA UNIVERSITY
GRADUATE SCHOOL**

E-mail: dean-graduate@ku.ac.ke

Website: www.ku.ac.ke

**P.O. Box 43844, 00100
NAIROBI, KENYA
Tel. 810901 Ext. 4150**

Internal Memo

FROM: Dean, Graduate School	DATE: 3 rd October, 2019
TO: Meraba Charles Okwemwa C/o Literature, Linguistics & Foreign Languages Dept.	REF: C50/CE/23434/2010


SUBJECT: APPROVAL OF RESEARCH PROPOSAL

We acknowledge receipt of your revised Research Proposal as per our recommendations raised by the Graduate School Board of 7th August, 2018 entitled “**Linguistic Analysis of Language of Stereotype in the Kenyan Social Media of Facebook**”.

You may now proceed with your Data Collection, Subject to Clearance with Director General, National Commission for Science, Technology and Innovation.

As you embark on your data collection, please note that you will be required to submit to Graduate School completed Supervision Tracking Forms per semester. The form has been developed to replace the Progress Report Forms. The Supervision Tracking Forms are available at the University’s Website under Graduate School webpage downloads.

Thank you.



ELIJAH MUTUA
FOR: DEAN, GRADUATE SCHOOL

C.c. Chairman, Department of Literature, Linguistics & Foreign Languages.

Supervisors:

1. Dr. Ogutu Emily
C/o Department of Literature, Linguistics & Foreign Languages
Kenyatta University
2. Dr. Maroko Geoffrey
C/o Department of Literature, Linguistics & Foreign Languages
Kenyatta University

EM/nn

Appendix II: NACOSTI Research License

 REPUBLIC OF KENYA	 NATIONAL COMMISSION FOR SCIENCE, TECHNOLOGY & INNOVATION
Ref No: 478719	Date of Issue: 25/May/2022
RESEARCH LICENSE	
	
This is to Certify that Mr., Charles Okemwa Meraba of Kenyatta University, has been licensed to conduct research in Kisii on the topic: Linguistic Analysis of the Language of Stereotype in the Kenyan Social Media of Facebook for the period ending : 25/May/2023.	
License No: NACOSTI/P/22/17870	
478719 Applicant Identification Number	 Director General NATIONAL COMMISSION FOR SCIENCE, TECHNOLOGY & INNOVATION
	Verification QR Code 
NOTE: This is a computer generated License. To verify the authenticity of this document, Scan the QR Code using QR scanner application.	

The Grant of Research Licenses is Guided by the Science, Technology and Innovation (Research Licensing) Regulations, 2014

CONDITIONS

1. The License is valid for the proposed research, location and specified period
2. The License any rights thereunder are non-transferable
3. The Licensee shall inform the relevant County Director of Education, County Commissioner and County Governor before commencement of the research
4. Excavation, filming and collection of specimens are subject to further necessary clearance from relevant Government Agencies
5. The License does not give authority to transfer research materials
6. NACOSTI may monitor and evaluate the licensed research project
7. The Licensee shall submit one hard copy and upload a soft copy of their final report (thesis) within one year of completion of the research
8. NACOSTI reserves the right to modify the conditions of the License including cancellation without prior notice

National Commission for Science, Technology and Innovation off Waiyaki Way, Upper Kabete,

P. O. Box 30623, 00100 Nairobi, KENYA

Land line: 020 4007000, 020 2241349, 020 3310571, 020 8001077

Mobile: 0713 788 787 / 0735 404 245

E-mail: dg@nacosti.go.ke / registry@nacosti.go.ke

Website: www.nacosti.go.ke

Appendix III

Https://m.facebook.com.>Cord Effect September 23, 2013