

Face threatening Acts and Politeness Strategies in a Nigerian Quasi-Judicial Public Hearing

Foluke Olayinka Unuabonah

Department of English, Redeemer's University, Ede, Osun State, Nigeria

Abstract

Previous studies have addressed negative politeness strategies in investigative hearings without addressing other types of politeness strategies used in the hearings. Using Brown and Levinson's model of politeness strategies, this paper focused on the different types of politeness strategies used by participants in the 2008 quasi-judicial public hearing on Federal Capital Territory administration in Nigeria. The data comprised forty purposively sampled video recordings of the hearing, obtained from the African Independent Television, Nigeria. Three politeness strategies were deployed at different stages of the interaction, face-threatening acts on record without redress, face threatening-acts on record using positive politeness, face-threatening acts using off-record politeness. The paper argues that the interactants' goals, relationship between the interactants, as well as the structure and context of the quasi-judicial public hearing affects the language used in the hearing.

Keywords: *Face threatening acts, Nigeria, Politeness strategies, Quasi-judicial public hearing*

Introduction

Quasi-judicial public hearings are public meetings organised in order to obtain public comments or testimonies on matters that violate the legal rights of citizens (Unuabonah, 2012a). They are sometimes called investigative public hearings, public inquiries or parliamentary inquiries in countries such as the United Kingdom and Ireland. Quasi-judicial public hearings lie at the intersection between political and legal discourses, which include interactions between a hearing panel and complainants or defendants. Due to the aim of the hearings, the interactions are filled with face threatening acts (FTAs) such as complaints, orders, requests, promises, warnings, accusations and disagreements (Unuabonah, 2012a; Unuabonah, 2016a) which threaten the face of the participants. As such, interactants find different ways to mitigate the effect of these FTAs on the faces of both the speaker (S) and hearer (H).

Despite the significant roles that politeness strategies play in investigative hearings, researchers have not paid adequate attention to these strategies in the hearings. Rather, scholars working on investigative public hearings have explored other issues such as extreme case formulations and evasive language (Sidnell, 2004; Berlin, 2007), translation (Bock et al, 2006), narrative inequality (Blommaert, Bock and McCormick, 2006), tense and code switching (Anthonissen, 2006; Bock 2008, 2011) and discourse structure (Bock, 2007; Unuabonah, 2012a, 2012b, 2015). Others have addressed reformulation (Cavaliere, 2009), critical discourse features (Bernard, 2009), participation framework (Verdoolaege, 2009), redundancy and markers of beliefs (Berlin, 2011; Unuabonah 2016b), pragmatic functions

(Unuabonah, 2012a; Odebunmi & Unuabonah, 2014; Unuabonah, 2016a), stance (Marín-Arrese, 2015; Unuabonah, 2017a), apologies (Murphy, 2016), framing and dialogicality (Tovares, 2016), metapragmatic comments (Unuabonah, 2017b), quotations (Unuabonah, 2018) and appraisal choices (Unuabonah, in press) than the politeness strategies used in mitigating FTAs in the hearings. For example, Unuabonah (2016a) examines negative politeness strategies which only address how the negative face of hearers are attended to without examining other types of strategies such as positive politeness and performing FTAs off-record. This creates a limitation in the understanding of politeness strategies used in quasi-judicial hearings, which are significant in establishing and maintaining interpersonal relationships in the hearings. As such, it would be important to give attention to these other strategies in the hearings. This paper, therefore, extends previous research by exploring other politeness strategies utilised by participants in the 2008 quasi-judicial public hearing in the Nigerian Federal Capital Territory, Abuja.

The structure of the paper is as follows: section one provides the background for the present research, section two explains the theory used while section three presents the research methodology. Section four analyses and discusses the findings while section five concludes the paper.

A brief background to the Investigative hearings on FCT Administration

In the past few years in Nigeria, there has been a rise in the number of quasi-judicial public hearings, such as the Human Rights Violations Investigation Commission of 1999, Osun Truth and Reconciliation Commission of 2011, the Fuel Subsidy Probe of 2012, among others. In March 2008, the Nigerian Senate set up a hearing panel made up of Senators, both from the Senate Committees on FCT and Housing, led by Senator Abubakar Sodangi, to investigate cases of ejection, demolition of property and revocation of titles of lands and property in the FCT, from 1999 to 2007. The hearing, which was held at the Hearing Room of the Senate began on the 9th of April, 2008 and ended on the 14th of May, 2008. The panel received numerous reports from different persons who felt ill-treated by the previous FCT administrations and some of these persons appeared before the panel in order to present their cases, as well as officials of the FCT, who had to defend their actions during the period. The interactions were held in English (see Unuabonah, 2016a, 16b for a fuller discussion).

Politeness in Human Interactions

Politeness is described as a set of social and linguistic resources which are used to minimise the risk of confrontation in discourse (Lakoff, 1989). Brown and Levinson (1987) consider the concept of politeness in relation to face which they describe as the public self image that every member wants to claim for him/herself and this involves positive and negative face. Positive face is the positive self-image of a person which includes the desire to be appreciated or approved of, while negative face is the basic claim to territories, personal preserves freedom of action and imposition. They suggest that there are acts that threaten both the positive and negative face of both the speaker and the hearer and suggest that any rational

human being would want to avoid such FTAs or at least deploy some strategies to minimise the threat. Thus, a rational human being would have to consider the power, social distance and ranking of the imposition to get the weightiness of the act which would determine the strategy to be used.

Brown and Levinson (1987) opine that a speaker can mitigate an FTA by going on record or off record. When a speaker goes on record, s/he states his intention unambiguously in such a way that there is only one interpretation of the speaker's intention. A speaker can go on record in three ways. The speaker can perform an act on record without redress when it is direct, clear, unambiguous and concise. The FTA is performed if the speaker does not fear retribution from the hearer in cases where there is a matter of urgency or efficiency; where danger to the hearer's face is small; and where the speaker is vastly higher than the hearer. Imperatives are typical examples of such acts. The speaker may also perform the FTA on record with redressive action by making use of positive politeness strategies that mitigate the FTA. Here, the speaker indicates that the face threat is not intended or desired and that the speaker recognises the hearer's face. Brown and Levinson (1987) present fifteen sub-strategies of positive politeness and these include notice and attend to the hearer's interests, exaggerate the hearer's interests, intensify interest to the hearer, use-in group identity markers, seek agreement, avoid disagreement, presuppose/assert common ground, joke, assert or presuppose the speaker's knowledge of and concern for the hearer's wants, offer/promise, be optimistic, include both the speaker and hearer in the activity, give or ask for reasons, assume or assert reciprocity, and give gifts to the hearer.

The speaker may also mitigate the FTA with redressive action by making use of negative politeness strategies which focus on the hearer's negative face: 'the want to have his freedom of action unhindered and attention unimpeded' (Brown and Levinson, 1987:129). The speaker may go off record 'when more than one unambiguously attributable intention so that the actor cannot be held to have committed himself to one particular intent' (Brown and Levinson, 1987:69). Brown and Levinson (1987) give fifteen linguistic realisations of off-record strategy which include the use of metaphors, rhetorical questions, hints, irony, understatement, overstatement, presuppositions, association clues, contradictions, incomplete statement/ellipsis, ambiguity, vagueness, overgeneralisation, displacement of H, and tautologies.

Brown and Levinson's politeness theory has been criticised on the basis that it is Western-based and cannot account for all politeness strategies in different cultures such as the Japanese society (Ide, 1989). However, other scholars have shown that the theory can in fact account for politeness and facework in non-Western societies (Fukada and Asato, 2004; Kiyama, Tamaoka and Takiura, 2012). Likewise, the theory can be applied to the present data which is carried out in English in a non-western society, particularly as it considers how face threatening acts, which abound in the public hearing interaction, are mitigated. It is also useful in the present data, considering the power differential between the hearing panel and the complainants/defendants (see also Unuabonah, 2016a).

Methodology

The data for this study consist of forty purposively sampled oral presentations of complainants/defendants in the 2008 investigative public hearing on FCT administration in Nigeria, the first fully televised investigative public hearing in Nigeria. The data were collected from the African Independent Television (AIT), Alagbado, Lagos and Abuja because it was the only television station that had full coverage of the hearing. The oral data were later transferred to digital video disc (DVD) and were transcribed for the purpose of analysis. The data were subjected to qualitative analysis using Brown and Levinson's (1987) politeness strategies.

As earlier discussed in Unuabonah (2015, 2016a), there are different stages in the investigative hearings. It is within these different stages that the different politeness strategies are discussed. The stages include Affirmation Order, a stage in which the chairman or the vice-chairman of the hearing panel directs the secretary or clerk of the hearing panel to lead the complainant or the defendant into affirming or swearing that s/he would speak the truth; Affirmation, a section in which the complainant/defendant affirms or swears to speak the truth; and Invitation of Perspectives in which the panel chair introduces the case at hand and invites the complainant or defendant to present his/her case. The hearing also includes Presentation, an aspect where complainants state their complaints and defendants state their activities in relation to complaints that were raised; Interrogation which covers a series of questions posed by members of the hearing panel including comments and orders they make in relation to responses given by the presenters; and Interrogation Compliance which focuses on the complainant/defendant's responses. The rest include Prayer Demand which focuses on the order or request made by the chairman in stating their prayer; Prayer, which is the request made by complainants to the HP; and Admission which covers the request for written documents as well as the admission of the documents as exhibits. Finally, Finis signals the end of the interaction where interactants may sometimes appreciate other interactants, make last minute comments, promises, requests or ask last minute questions (see Unuabonah, 2015).

Politeness Strategies in the Nigerian Quasi-Judicial Public Hearing on FCT Administration

The data reveal that the three politeness strategies are performed at different stages of the interaction and they include FTA performed on record without redress (Affirmation Order, Invitation of Perspectives, Presentation, Interrogation, Interrogation Compliance, Prayer Demand, Admission and Finis), performing FTA on record using positive politeness (Invitation of Perspectives, Presentation, Interrogation, Interrogation Compliance, Prayer and Finis), and performing the FTA using off-record politeness (Presentation, Interrogation and Interrogation Compliance).

Performing FTA on record without redress in the hearing

Interactants in the FCT hearings perform FTA on record without redress at different stages of the interaction. Although most of the FTAs performed on record without redress are performed by the HP, a few are employed by complainants and defendants. In Affirmation Order, the chairman performs the FTA of ordering without redress as shown in extract (1):

(1) Chair¹: Affirm him.

In the hearing, it is expected that the chairman would order the clerk to lead the C/D in the affirmation. In this case, the face threat is not minimised as it is known both to the S and H that face redress is not necessary. This is because of the nature of the interaction; it is a ritual. Also, non-redress occurs here because the chairman's want to satisfy the clerk's face is small, due to the fact that the chairman is powerful and does not fear retaliation and non-cooperation from the clerk. This is also the case during Invitation of Perspectives where the chairman orders the C/D to present or defend his/her case. Extract (2) illustrates this:

(2) Chair: Yes, sit down and tell us your full particulars and state your complaint.

Ordering is an FTA; however, it is performed in the complainant's interest in this case. In ordering the complainant to state his complaint, the chairman indicates that he cares about the complainant's positive face. Indeed, it is in the interest of the complainant to state his name and make his complaint since that is the reason why he is attending the public hearing.

During Presentation, complainants may also perform FTAs without redress. Extract (3) illustrates this:

(3) Comp.²: Do not be impressed by them telling people that they have revoked their land.

In extract (3), the complainant performs the FTA of advising the hearing panel members not to believe the defendants when the defendants say that they informed the people before evicting them or demolishing their properties. He may have performed the FTA without mitigating the threat because of his high economic status as a chairman of a construction company, and as such, he is used to performing such acts. On few occasions, defendants also performed FTA on record without redress as seen in extract (4):

(4) Chair.: You have the list here...?
Def.³: *Check in the office.* Of course, we have so many of them.

¹Chairperson of the panel

²Complainant

³Defendant

The FTA in extract (4) was performed by a defendant during Interrogation Compliance. It is not a usual occurrence since C/D has a lower status in the context of the interaction. However, such FTAs are made by defendants who sometimes may be top government functionaries and who do that under the pressure of questioning. In excerpt 4, the defendant responds to the question of the chairman by asking him to get his answers from the office.

The performance of FTA on record without redress is also carried during Prayer Demand (extract 5) and Admission (extract 6).

- (5) Chair: Go to your prayers.
 (6) Chair: Give us your submission

In extracts (5) and (6), the FTAs are performed baldly as they are performed in the interest of the complainant. It is in the interest of the complainants to state their prayers because this is the reason why they have attended the hearing. Without the submission also, the HP would not have the documents that are essential in making recommendations in favour on the case at hand. This is also the case in Finis, where the chairman/vice chairman performs an FTA on record without redress as seen in extract (7):

- (7) Vice⁴: You say are paying through your nose for the guards?
 Comp.: Yes sir...
 Vice: *Go and send them home.*

In extract (7), the vice-chairman, as an afterthought, gives a piece of advice which, if carried out, is in the interest of the complainant.

Table 1 shows the different stages in which FTAs were performed baldly.

Table 1.A table showing FTAs performed on record without redress in the hearing.

Stages	Sub-strategy	Example
Affirmation Order	Imperatives	Affirm him
Invitation of perspectives		Yes, sit down and tell us your full particulars and state your complaint.
Presentation		Do not be impressed by them telling people that they have revoked their land.
Interrogation Compliance		Check in the office
Prayer Demand		Go to your prayers.
Admission		Give us your submission
Finis		Go and send them home.

⁴Vice-Chairperson of the panel

Performing FTA on record using positive politeness in the hearing

Interactants perform FTA on record using positive politeness during Invitation of Perspectives, Presentation, Interrogation, Interrogation Compliance, and Finis. An example of a performance of FTA on record using positive politeness during IP is cited in extract (8):

- (8) Def.: We want to thank you and welcome you to this public hearing eh former IG. Eh Last week, when family of Bashir Sambo were testifying, they mentioned the fact *that you were so kind* to the Late Bashir Sambo... That is why as true Nigerians, we want you to come and shed light on these...

In extract (8), the chairman invites the defendant to defend himself. Perhaps, because of the political status of the defendant, the chairman makes use of positive politeness strategies in mitigating the effect of the FTA. When the chairman says 'they mentioned the fact that you were so kind,' he makes use of the positive redress strategy of exaggerating interests and approval which is part of the strategy of claiming common ground. Here, he makes use of the intensifier 'so' with the adjective 'kind' which enhances the defendant's positive face. The chairman also makes use of the strategy of claiming in-group membership by using an in-group identity marker, 'true Nigerian'. The term indicates that the chairman(S) and the defendant (H) belong to the same country. The speaker also makes use of the strategy, presupposes H's knowledge, which is one of the strategies of conveying that S and H are co-operators. In excerpt (8), the chairman presupposes that the defendant knows who Bashir Sambo is. The chairman also makes use of the strategy of claiming reflexivity by giving reasons why he is inviting the defendant to defend himself.

During Presentation, the complaints made by the complainant are acts that threaten the positive face of the hearer, i.e. the HP. One of the positive politeness strategies that complainants use in redressing the act is asserting HP's knowledge. An example is given in extract (9):

- (9) Comp.: So ok *you may recall* that this property was created in November 1982 by the then Minister Major General Nasko who constituted a committee for the for the relocation of Garki village artisans...

The clause 'you may recall' and the reference to Major General Nasko indicate that the speaker and hearer have shared knowledge and are co-operators in the discourse. This is closely linked to the strategy of claiming common knowledge. Also, since complainants and defendants perform FTAs such as complaints, requests and disagreements, they mitigate the effect of these acts by giving gifts to the HP as shown in extract (10):

- (10) Comp.: Thank you. *I will not bother you* with the legal interpretation of that section but we have taken steps.

On some occasions, complainants and defendants place on record that they will be brief in their presentations as presented in extract (10). This is the gift of understanding the wants of the members of the HP, who also place on record that they have many cases to take within a

limited period and would want the presenters to be brief. It also implies the gift of cooperation as the presenters indicate that they are cooperating with the HP in ensuring that they are brief in their presentation. Giving gifts shows that the presenters are fulfilling the wants of the HP.

During Interrogation, the chairman also performs FTA on record using positive politeness by being optimistic. Extract (11) illustrates this:

- (11) Chair.: Thank you very much. *That was a bitter pill of advice which I believe Dr has taken it.*

Being optimistic is one of the strategies of showing that S and H are co-operators in the interaction. In example (11), the chairman, in order to mitigate the effect of a piece of advice earlier given, makes a statement that shows that he is optimistic that the hearer, that is the defendant, will accept his advice. Also, the chairman can also save the complainant's positive face wants by making promises. Extract (12) illustrates this:

- (12) Chair: Ok we will visit the place and we'll hear from them too.

In this situation, the chairman indicates that whatever the complainant wants, he also desires and would help obtain them. This shows also that they are co-operators in the interaction. This is also the case in Interrogation Compliance (13) and Finis (14):

- (13) Def.: *I will wholeheartedly accept your advice.*
(14) Chair: and the ministry has taken note. The two executive chairmen are here. *They will not forcefully eject you.* Thank you.

In extract (13), the defendant promises to accept the advice of the chairman while in extract(14), the chairman also promises the complainant that she will not be ejected from her house as officials of the FCT were already in the hearing venue and had heard all that had transpired. This took place in Finis.

In Prayer, complainants make requests which amounts to an FTA. Thus, they sometimes use the positive strategy of giving reasons to justify why they are making such requests. Extract (15) exemplifies this:

- (15) Comp.: In the light of the above, we want the committee to use its good office to intervene and prevail on the honourable minister of the FCT to review the revocation notice in the overriding public interest *so that NNRA can commence construction work.*

In extract (15), the complainant gives the reason why he believes that his prayer should be granted. By giving reasons, the complainant conveys the idea that both the HP members and the complainant are co-operators in ensuring that the right thing is done. This appeals to the positive face of the HP members as it shows that their desire to do the right thing (which is the desire of the complainant to commence construction work) is desirable by others.

Table 2 presents the different stages where positive politeness were used by the interactants:

Table 2 A table showing the mitigation of FTAs on record using positive politeness in the hearing

Stages	Sub-strategy	Example
Invitation of perspectives	Exaggerate interest of H	they mentioned the fact <i>that you were so kind</i>
	Use in-group identity marker	That is why as <i>true Nigerians</i>
	Give reasons any example?	
Presentation	Claim common knowledge	<i>you may recall...</i>
	Give gifts to H	I will not bother you with the legal interpretation of that section ...
	Give reasons	Perhaps, to put more light on how the police is organised, because it is only then that you will see how the functions are shared.
Interrogation	Be optimistic	That was a bitter pill of advice <i>which I believe Dr has taken it.</i>
	Offer, promise	we will visit the place and we'll hear from them too.
	Give reasons	We didn't want to believe him. That's why we called you.
	Give gifts	..., so that we don't waste too much of your time and our time, ...
Interrogation Compliance	Offer, promise	I will wholeheartedly accept your advice.
	Give reasons	I claim it because it was allocated to me.
	Use in-group identity markers i.e. address forms	A comment for <i>my brother</i> , Dr Abdul
Prayer	Give reasons	We want the committee to use its good office...so that NNRA can commence construction work.
Finis	Offer, promise	They will not forcefully eject you

Performing FTA off-record in the hearing

Interactants in the FCT scarcely perform FTA off-record. This may be because they are compelled to make explicit their complaints and defence since these are the reasons why they are attending the hearing.

As Brown and Levinson (1987) point out, a communicative act is done off-record if it is done in such a way that several interpretations of the act can be made and the speaker cannot be held responsible for just one particular act. Presupposition and rhetorical questions are the off-record strategies used in the hearing. One off-record strategy commonly used by

participants is the use of rhetorical question which is used by all the participants during Presentation, Interrogation and Interrogation Compliance. Extract (16) exemplifies this:

- (16) Comp.: How did the Federal offices, I mean government quarters purchase the houses in this place, if it is true that this place is illegal layout?

In excerpt (16), the speaker complains of the FCT illegal revocation of a landed property owned by a government agency. Here, he wonders how the FCT minister revoked the land given to the agency while other government ministries purchased houses in the same area. The implication is that the basis of the revocation is faulty. Such an implication is a criticism of the Minister and rhetorical questions can be used indirectly to criticise, which is an FTA. A similar example is found during Interrogation.

- (17) Sen.: A normal person cannot hand something over to you and then go to court to challenge you and refrain you from taking it. *What are you telling us?*

In extract (17), the rhetorical question indicates that an earlier statement made by the defendant is wrong. In Interrogation Compliance, participants also use rhetorical question which is an off-record strategy as shown in (18):

- (18) Def.: If somebody said El-Rufai phoned me and told me to provide policemen, that is hearsay...Let him come and say here that he phoned me. *What are we arguing about?*

The rhetorical question is an indirect way of saying that it is not necessary for the interactants to argue over something that is untrue. An example of presupposition can be found in the extract (19):

- (19) Def.: Hitherto, I was embarrassed when ...when the Punch newspaper had in the front page caption with my picture in uniform: Senate summons Ehindero over the death of Justice Sambo. *Now, such a headline is unhelpful and to the well-known ethical practice of journalism for which reputable newspapers are known for.*

In extract (19), the defendant reports some comments made about him in a national daily, the *Punch*. Rather than accuse the writers of the comments of libel directly, the defendant subtly refers to the ethics of journalism. The presupposition is that the *Punch* newspaper is not a reputable one for writing unhelpful headlines. The FTA here is that of accusation which has been done off-record. Thus, the speaker cannot be held responsible for the accusation and can deny that he did not accuse the *Punch* of libel.

Table 3 shows the different strategies of mitigating an FTA by using off-record politeness by the interactants in the hearing.

Table 3.A table showing FTAs performed off-record in the hearing

Stages	Sub-strategy	Example
Presentation	Rhetorical question	How can a minister give you a piece of land, a parcel of that kind of calibre, to give him a land that is double allocation?

	Presupposition	I was embarrassed when ...when the Punch newspaper had in the front page caption with my picture... Now, such a headline is unhelpful and to the well-known ethical practice of journalism for which reputable newspapers are known for.
Interrogation	Rhetorical question	A normal person cannot hand something over to you and then go to court to challenge you and refrain you from taking it. <i>What are you telling us?</i>
Interrogation Compliance	Rhetorical question	Let him come and say here that he phoned me. <i>What are we arguing about?</i>

Conclusion

In this paper, politeness strategies have been examined in the 2008 quasi-judicial public hearing on FCT administration in Nigeria. From the foregoing, it has been established that the quasi-judicial public hearing is replete with a number of FTAs which threaten the negative and positive face of both the speakers and the hearers. Apart from negative politeness strategies that have been identified in an earlier study, three other politeness strategies have been used to mitigate the effect of these FTAs: performing FTA on record without redress, performing FTA on record using positive politeness, and performing FTA using off-record politeness. The analysis shows that out of the three strategies, performing FTA using off-record politeness was rarely used. This may be due to the need to be explicit in the hearing. Thus, out of the fifteen given by Brown and Levinson, just two are used by the interactants.

Hearing panel members perform FTA on record without redress because of the power differential and because of the genre of the hearing, in which case, the face of the hearers are not threatened. Thus, they are performed in almost all the stages of the interaction except Affirmation where the witnesses affirm to speak the truth and during Prayers made by complainants. Also, out of fifteen positive politeness strategies postulated by Brown and Levinson (1987), seven were utilised in the hearing. During presentations, witnesses claimed common knowledge with the hearing panel members in order to gain their support, gave reasons for accusing the defendants and gave gifts to the hearing panel which came in the form of telling them that they would save their time. The hearing panel members used in-group markers to mitigate the degree of their FTAs, particularly when interrogating defendants. It is evident then that interactants use these in order to show that they are cooperating with the hearers even when they are making requests. FTAs that threaten positive face include criticism, complaints, accusations, and disagreements (Brown and Levinson, 1987) and as such, positive politeness strategies are used to mitigate them. In all this study has addressed politeness strategies used in a Nigerian investigative hearing. There is a need to compare the kinds of politeness strategies used in the hearing with the strategies used in other investigative hearings in Africa or beyond in order to explore similarities and differences in their use of politeness strategies. Such findings may further reveal the cultural basis for the use of politeness strategies in investigative hearings.

References

- Anthonissen, C.(2006). Critical discourse analysis as an analytic tool in considering selected prominent features of TRC testimonies. *Journal of Language and Politics*, 5 (1), 171-96.
- Berlin, L. N. (2007). Cooperative conflict and evasive language: The case of the 9–11 Commission Hearings. In A. Fetza (ed.), *Context and Appropriateness* (pp.167–199). Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Berlin, L. N. (2011). Redundancy and markers of belief in the discourse of political hearings. *Language Sciences*, 33, 268–279.
- Bernard, T. (2009). *Justificatory Discourse of the Perpetrator in TRC Testimonies: A discourse-historical Analysis*. Unpublished MA Thesis. Stellenbosch University.
- Blommaert, J., Bock, M.& McCormick, K. (2006). Narrative inequality in the TRC hearings: On the hearability of hidden transcripts. *Journal of Language and Politics*, 5 (1), 37-70.
- Bock, Z. (2007). *A Discourse Analysis of Selected Truth and Reconciliation Commission Testimonies: Appraisal and Genre*. Unpublished PhD thesis. University of the Western Cape.
- Bock, Z. (2008). ‘Language has a heart’: Linguistic markers of evaluation in selected TRC testimonies. *Language of Multicultural Discourses*, 3 (3), 189-203.
- Bock, Z. (2011). Code-switching: An appraisal resource in TRC testimonies. *Functions of Language*, 18 (2), 183-209.
- Bock, Z., Mazwi, N., Metula, S.& Mpolweni-Zantsi, N.(2006). An analysis of what has been "lost" in the interpretation and transcription process of selected TRC testimonies. *Stellenbosch Papers in Linguistics PLUS*, 33, 1-26.
- Brown, P. & Levinson, S.(1987). *Politeness: Some universals in language usage*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Cavalieri, S. (2009). Reformulation and conflict in the witness examination: The case of public inquiries. *International Journal for the Semiotics of Law*, 22 (2), 209-221.
- Fukada, A. & Asato, N.(2004). Universal politeness theory: Application to the use of Japanese honorifics. *Journal of Pragmatics*,36, 1991–2002.
- Ide, S. (1989). Formal forms and discernment: Two neglected aspects of universals of linguistic politeness. *Multilingua*, 8 (2/3), 223–248.
- Kiyama, S., Tamaoka, K. & Takiura, M.(2012). Applicability of Brown and Levinson's politeness theory to a non-western culture: Evidence from Japanese Facework behaviour. *Sage Open* 2, 1-15.
- Lakoff, R. T. (1989). The limits of politeness: Therapeutic and courtroom discourse. *Multilingua Journal of Cross-Cultural and Interlanguage Communication*, 8(2-3), 101-130.

Murphy, J. (2016). Apologies Made at the Leveson Inquiry: Triggers and Responses. *Pragmatics and Society*, 7 (4), 595-617.

Odebunmi, A. & Unuabonah, F. (2014). Defensive acts in Nigerian quasi-judicial hearings. *Ibadan Journal of English Studies*, 10, 105-128.

Sidnell, J. (2004). "There's risks in everything": Extreme-case formulations and accountability in inquiry testimony. *Discourse and Society*, 15(6), 745–766.

Tovares, A. V. (2016). Going off-script and reframing the frame: The dialogic intertwining of the centripetal and centrifugal voices in the Truth and Reconciliation Commission hearings. *Discourse and Society*, 27(5), 554 – 573.

Unuabonah, F.(2011). Event models: A socio-cognitive study of selected interrogations in 2008 quasi-judicial public hearing on Federal Capital Territory (FCT) administration in Nigeria. *Studies in Literature and Language*, 3 (1), 37-44.

Unuabonah, F.(2012a). *Interaction structure and pragmatic features in the 2008 national quasi-judicial public hearing on Federal Capital Territory administration in Nigeria*. Unpublished PhD Thesis. Ibadan: University of Ibadan.

Unuabonah, F.(2012b).The generic structure of presentations in quasi-judicial public hearings on the FCT Administration in Nigeria in 2008. *California Linguistic Notes*, 37 (2), 1-23.

Unuabonah, F. (2015). The generic structure of a public hearing. In A. Odebunmi & J. T. Mathangwane (eds.), *Essays on Language, Communication and Literature in Africa* (pp. 105-130). New Castle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.

Unuabonah, F. (2016a). Negative politeness strategies in a Nigerian quasi-judicial public hearing. *Papers in Language and Linguistics*, 17 (3&4), 315-330.

Unuabonah, F. (2016b). Contextual beliefs in a Nigerian quasi-judicial public hearing. *Journal of Asian and African Studies*, 51(5), 619-633.

Unuabonah, F. (2017a). *But* as a stance marker in Nigerian investigative public hearings. *Pragmatics and Society*, 8 (3), 400-420.

Unuabonah, F. (2017b). "Are you saying ...?" Metapragmatic comments in Nigerian quasi-judicial public hearings. *Pragmatics*, 27(1), 115-143.

Unuabonah, F. (2018). Direct quotations in Nigerian investigative public hearings. *Text & Talk*, 38(4), 503-524.

Unuabonah, F. (in press). Appraisal Choices in Nigerian investigative public hearings. In A. Osunbade, F. Unuabonah, A. Osisanwo, F. Oni & A. Adetunji (eds.), *Discourse, Pragmatics & Society: A Festschrift for Akin Odebunmi*. New Castle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.

Verdoolaege, A. (2009).The audience as actor: the participation status of the audience at the victim hearings of the South African TRC. *Discourse Studies*, 11(4), 441-463.