

**LINGUISTIC PORTRAYAL OF ‘ OTHERNESS’ IN SELECTED
HOMOSEXUALITY-THEMED NOLLYWOOD MOVIES**

BY

ALADE BLESSING MODUPE

ENG/14/1960

**A LONG ESSAY SUBMITTED TO THE DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH
AND LITERARY STUDIES, FACULTY OF ARTS, FEDERAL
UNIVERSITY OYE-EKITI, EKITI STATE, IN PARTIAL FULFILMENT
OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE AWARD OF THE DEGREE OF
BACHELOR OF ARTS (HONS) IN ENGLISH AND LITERARY STUDIES**

September, 2018

CERTIFICATION

This is to certify that this project was submitted to and has been approved by the department of English and Literary Studies, Faculty of Arts, Federal University Oye Ekiti, Ekiti State, Nigeria.

Dr. Paul A. Onanuga
Supervisor

Date

Dr. Paul A. Onanuga
Head of Department

Date

External Supervisor

Date

DEDICATION

This project is dedicated to all that is good, all who are good, and all that stand for goodness.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

All glory to God Almighty, the creator of the universe and all that is in it. He has been so faithful, merciful and constant. To my parents – Chief and Mrs Alade – who the Lord has used so far to pilot the journey of my life in unflinching love, trust, support, directions, and prayers, I acknowledge your essence in my life. To my project supervisor and HOD, Dr P. A. Onanuga, you have been a huge blessing to me, not only in this project supervision but in other academic areas. You are the best any student could wish for. And to my other lecturers in persons of Dr Sandra Nwagboso, Dr Chinyelu Agwu, Dr Harry Olufunwa, Dr Victoria Gbadegesin, Dr Emmanuel Adeniyi, Dr Obinna Iroegbu, Mrs Adaku Amaechi and Mrs Blessing Inya who serve as role models for me, thank you for being such great lecturers and wonderful people.

I also appreciate my ‘big’ sister, ‘big’ brothers and younger ones for their love, prayers and wishes for me. I would definitely not trade the eleven of you for anything in this world because you are simply the best siblings ever. To my step mums, uncles, aunties, cousins and Jarule, Mr. Akerele, H.R.M. Oba (Justice) John Ademola Ajakaiye, you are greatly appreciated. I also recognize the prayers and fellowship of Chapel of Transformation leadership, executives, Drama Unit members, Bible Study Unit members, other workers and members. Finally but not of the least, I appreciate my friends: Faithfulness, Shile, Sola, Folakemi, Christy, Balikis, Judith, Adebimpe, Bimbo, ‘Govy’, Opeyemi, and Thony. I love and appreciate every one of you.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Title page	
Certification.....	ii
Dedication.....	iii
Acknowledgement.....	iv
Table of Contents.....	v
Abstract.....	vii
CHAPTER ONE	
1.0 Introduction.....	1
1.1 Background to the Study.....	2
1.2 Statement of the Problem.....	3
1.3 Research Questions.....	4
1.4 Research Assumptions/Hypotheses.....	4
1.5 Aim and Objectives of the Study.....	4
1.6 Methodology.....	5
1.7 Theoretical Framework.....	5
1.8 Significance of the Study.....	7
1.9 Contribution to Knowledge.....	7
1.10 Delimitation.....	7
1.11 Outline of the Study.....	8
1.12 Conclusion.....	8
CHAPTER TWO	
2.0 Introduction.....	9
2.1 A Review of Relevant Literature.....	10
2.1.1 Gender, Sexualities and the Role of Societal Constructs.....	10
2.1.2 Masculinity and the African Experience and Expectations.....	15

2.1.3 Scholarly Perspectives of Homosexuality in Movies.....	19
2.1.4 The Role of Language in the Framing of Social Realities.....	24
2.2 Theoretical Framework.....	28
2.2.1 Connell’ s Theory of Masculinity.....	28
2.2.2 Fairclough’ s Critical Discourse Analysis.....	33
2.3 Conclusion.....	39

CHAPTER THREE

3.0 Introduction.....	41
3.1 Methodological Details- Research Design, Data Collection and Analytical Techniques.....	41
3.2 Justification of Methodology.....	43
3.3 Conclusion.....	44

CHAPTER FOUR

4.0 Introduction.....	45
4.1 Systematic Presentation and Discussion of Findings.....	45
4.1.0 General Overview of Selected Movies.....	45
4.1.1 Lexis as Tool for ‘ Othering’ Homosexuality.....	50
4.1.2 Sentential Constructs and its Depiction of Homosexuality as an ‘ Other’	55
4.1.3 Graphic and Non-Verbal Linguistic Analysis of Homosexual and Heterosexual Relations.....	59
4.1.4 Effeminizing Gay Characters: A Discussion of Ideological Constructs of Language...66	
4.1.5 Implications of Identified Representations in the Nigerian Context.....	70
4.2 Conclusion.....	75

CHAPTER FIVE

5.0 Introduction.....	77
5.1 Summary of Findings.....	77
5.2 Conclusion.....	79
5.3 Recommendations.....	79

References.....	81
-----------------	----

ABSTRACT

More often than not, sexuality and appurtenant topics are publicly downplayed or avoided in the Nigerian society. The present study was hinged on the assumption that alternative sexualities, specifically homosexuality, are portrayed through the postmodernist prism of the ‘ Other’ . This study examined how language is used to express the otherness of homosexuality in selected Nollywood movies. Its specific objectives were to identify and categorize the representations of homosexuality in selected Nollywood movies; analyse the linguistic signifiers of sexual Otherness; and, discuss the implications of these signifiers to the treatment of homosexuality in the Nigerian public space. Two purposively selected movies from Nigeria’ s Nollywood constituted the data. These are *My Husband is Gay* and *Gay Pastors*. The theoretical framework was hinged on the tenets of Fairclough’ s Critical Discourse Analysis alongside Connell’ s Theory of Masculinity. These leanings afforded the examination and discussion of pervasive representations and societal views on homosexuality as identified in the movies discussed.

In achieving its aim, the analysis of lexis, sentences and non-verbal actions as explicated by the characters in the selected movies revealed that homosexuality was negatively represented, since it is constantly contrasted to heterosexuality which is widely represented as the normative sexual orientation. In addition, the study identified that homosexuality is portrayed from several perspectives. These are as: a religious transgression, a moral depravity, de-masculinizing and

effeminizing, and a sociocultural abomination. These realizations establish the acknowledgement of minority sexual orientations and the role of the mass media and creative arts in either asserting existing societal narratives or providing advocacy for social acceptance.

CHAPTER ONE

GENERAL INTRODUCTION

1.0 Introduction

Homosexuality is a common albeit hushed phenomenon evident in the chronically heterosexual and patriarchal Nigerian society. The idea of 'otherness' stems from its absolute difference from the norms and ideals people are conversant with. Commonly, being heterosexual or 'sexually straight' is widely recognised and acceptable spiritually, socially and culturally within most human societies. Seventy-four (74) countries, mostly African, consider being homosexual a

crime (*The Independent News*, 2016). In fact, homosexuality is tagged constitutionally illegal and punishable by the law. It becomes questionable in such society when a totally different sexuality is popularized and embraced. Hence, criticisms and oppositions by culture, religion and the society is highly rampant through derogatory remarks, abuses and negative gestures from people to those who belong to the Lesbian/Gay/Bisexual/Transgender/Intersex/Queer (LGBTIQ) community and who are popularly referred to as LGBT people.

The Nigerian movie industry is popularly called Nollywood, a neologism from the American equivalent, Hollywood. The industry is huge producing about fifty (50) films weekly and two thousand (2000) films per annum recently making it the second biggest film producer in the world and contributing immensely to the nation's Gross Domestic Product (GDP) (*Sahara Reporters*, 2015). Nigerian movies are not only popular and widely watched; they also constitute a platform for the enactment of contemporary happenings and events. All these are therefore seen in Nollywood movies which feature what goes on in the society. Recently, Nollywood movie productions have explored the theme of homosexuality, with the representations varying from the coming out of the closet of homosexuals and the societal perception of homosexuality. The motivation for the present focus is on the linguistic portrayal of homosexuality as a sexual 'Other' in Nollywood movies. This involves a juxtaposition of the (re)presentations of the 'normal' and 'abnormal' sexualities in selected homosexuality-themed movies towards the linguistic examination of the concept of 'Otherness' .

1.1. Background to the Study

Scholars and researchers have studied queer sexualities, paying attention to the contextual analyses of the concept -reactions and attitudes from the society, how the idea is represented and

the understanding of it. In addition, while contentions still exist on the ‘Africanness’ of queer sexuality- public discourse of such sexualities have been open to public debate in Nigeria. In fact, much of the debate was as a result of the 2015 criminalization of homosexuality by the government of Goodluck Jonathan which prescribed 14years in jail for homosexuals and people who encourage homosexuality. Some northern parts of the country even put those found as homosexuals to death by stoning. While jungle justice and violence are commonplace public punishments for subjects of homosexual acts, the role of movie productions as extending beyond providing entertainment cannot be discountenanced. This is because popular culture, to which movies belong, exists as a window through which happenings in the society are documented and it constitutes a repository through which public opinion is shaped. The present study therefore considers a linguistic analysis of the (re)presentation of homosexuality as a sexual ‘Other’ in Nigerian movies as apposite and timely.

One of the closest researches done in this area is the work of Frida Lyonga who worked on *Un-African? Representation of Homosexuality*. In this work, the author uses two Nollywood movies named *Men in Love* and *Rag Tag* to illustrate the different ways in which homosexuality is represented in Africa using concepts of trans-nationality and stereotype as analytical frameworks. The portrayal of the different representations of homosexuality is evident in the two movies. *Men in Love* represents homosexuality as a cultural taboo and an abominable act while *Rag Tag* illustrates indifference in the act by portraying the concept as equal to heterosexuality. While Lyonga’ s work was literary in approach, the present study focuses on a critical linguistic analysis of the presentation of homosexuality. Therefore, the present study is an exploration of the linguistic portrayal of ‘Otherness’ in the concept of homosexuality with the use of two Nollywood movies. This research gap is filled through the analyses and exploration of selected

homosexuality-themed Nollywood movies. Central to the study is how language is systematically harnessed to portray sexual ‘Otherness’ in homosexuality in these movies and the intended implications of the portrayals on the social perception of homosexuality.

1.2. Statement of the Problem

Discourses and studies on queer sexual orientations have witnessed an upsurge globally. Some of these studies have focused on literary depictions whether in texts or in movie productions. Within the Nigerian environment, scholarly enquiries of the representations of queer sexualities are substantial. Bethany (2012) advocates for an open discussion of homosexuality and its encouragement in the Nigerian society through liberalism. Hoad (2013) identifies that homosexuality is negatively portrayed in Nigerian movies and that homosexual orientations are adjudged as offshoots of poor mental health, witchcraft, etc. The depreatory representation and ostracization of non-hetero-normative sexuality span the Nigerian social, cultural, moral and religious contexts and these form the crux of Lyonga (2014) and Akande (2016). The present study extends existing studies. However, its distinctness lies in its linguistic examination of the framing of the narrative of ‘Otherness’, specifically with focus on gay/male homosexuality. To achieve this, it accentuates and contrasts the linguistic portrayal of homosexuality and heterosexuality in select Nollywood movies. This is expected to identify and explain the perspectives to homosexuality within the Nigerian environment.

1.3 Research Questions

The following research questions form the focus of the study:

- i. How is homosexuality represented in Nollywood movies?

- ii. How does language contribute to the framing of sexual Otherness?
- iii. What are the implications for this linguistic framing on perceptions of homosexuality?

1.4 Research Assumptions/Hypotheses

The research assumptions are:

- i. homosexuality is negatively portrayed in Nollywood movies;
- ii. language is a veritable tool used in this negative portrayal; and,
- iii. the linguistic framing of homosexuality as a sexual ‘Other’ has implications on the perceptions of homosexuality in the Nigerian society.

1.5 Aim and Objectives of the Study

This research work examines how language is used to express the ‘Otherness’ of homosexuality in selected Nollywood movies. The specific objectives are to:

- i. identify and categorize the representations of homosexuality in selected Nollywood movies;
- ii. analyse the linguistic signifiers of sexual ‘Otherness’; and,
- iii. discuss the implications of these signifiers to the treatment of homosexuality in the Nigerian public space.

1.6 Methodology

Two selected homosexuality-themed Nollywood movie (*My Husband is Gay*, 2016) and (*Gay Pastors*, 2016) are critically examined and analysed. The primary motive for their selection is their thematic focus which is believed to be relevant to the present study as well as their availability online, particularly as physical purchase may be difficult due to the regulatory

impediments. How characters and characterisation, language use, themes and other linguistic devices are used to narrate sexual otherness of homosexuality is linguistically explored. Most importantly, linguistic signifiers of the ‘Otherness’ of homosexuality are identified and examined while discussing the implications of these signifiers on the subject of homosexuality in the selected movies.

1.7 Theoretical Framework

Historically, females are expected to illustrate femininity while males are expected to illustrate masculinity, hence various theories associated to these concepts. For the purpose of this research work, the Masculinity theory by Connell (1995) is applied. The theory explores what it takes to be called 'a man'. This it achieves through the specification of the social roles and expectations of men. It looks into who and what a man should be like besides the biological establishment of that fact. Therefore, the responsibilities of men, their relation with the similar and opposite gender, and their interaction with various social institutions like education, culture, politics, work, sports, parties, media, and so on, is carefully looked into. One can therefore conclude that there are some conditions to be fulfilled by the male gender that will automatically qualify them to be regarded as men. Scholars argue here that apart from being biologically called a man, there are several other ways maleness can be constructed. It also examines the certain privileges that the male folks enjoy, like its reference as superior in patriarchal societies, and the disadvantages that some groups of men face.

However, Fairclough’s (1995) view of Critical Discourse Analysis will be instrumental in the analysis of how language is used to represent homosexuality in the selected movies. Fairclough (1995) defines Critical Discourse Analysis as:

discourse analysis which aims to systematically explore often opaque relationships of causality and determination between (a) discursive practices, events and texts, and (b) wider social and cultural structures, relations and processes; to investigate how such practices, events and texts arise out of and are ideologically shaped by relations of power and struggles over power; and to explore how the opacity of these relationships between discourse and society is itself a factor securing power and hegemony. (pp. 132-133)

This means that while doing a Critical Discourse Analysis, the analyst does not only concern himself with intra-textual analysis but also relates it with social, cultural and political contexts (inter-textual analysis). Fairclough developed a three-dimensional framework for the study of discourse. They include: analysis of spoken or written language texts, analysis of discourse practice and the analysis of discursive events as instances of socio-cultural practices. These frameworks will serve as backdrop in the linguistic analysis and identification of signifiers of sexual 'Otherness' in Nollywood movies.

1.8 Significance of the Study

The study is significant since it explores an often discriminated and castigated sexuality. While to an extent female homosexuality is not accorded much attention, the perception of male homosexuality, within a patriarchal society like Nigeria, borders on notoriety and infamy. The study is further significant to the acknowledgement of minority sexual orientations and the role of the mass media and creative arts in either asserting existing societal narratives or providing advocacy for social acceptance.

1.9 Contribution to Knowledge

The present study contributes to existing enquiries into gender studies and queer sexualities. This is particularly apposite within Nigeria, an African setting where such ‘unconventional’ and anti-normative sexualities are demonised and castigated. However, the study extends such existing studies in its adoption of a syncretic viewpoint – literary and linguistic – in its analysis of the portrayal of homosexuality in English-language based Nigerian home videos. The study also contributes to the knowledge of the nexus between society and creative endeavours, particularly as it has been established that the mass media and popular culture enjoy substantial social capital among their audience.

1.10 Delimitation

Queer sexuality broadly encompasses different categories of sexual orientations within the Lesbian/Gay/Bisexual/Transsexual/Intersex/Queer (LGBTIQ) community. In view of this, the present study is limited to the portrayal of male homosexuality in select Nollywood movies. In addition, emphasis is placed on the identification of linguistic signifiers of homosexuality and their implications as illustrated in the selected movies, and these identified signifiers and representations are juxtaposed with the accepted other heterosexuality.

1.11 Outline of the Study

This long essay is structured in five (5) chapters. Chapter One is a general introduction to the concerns of the study. It highlights the research questions, research assumptions, aim, objectives, etc. It also gives the background to the study and the statement of research problem. Chapter Two is a review of relevant literatures contiguous to the focus of the research. It also presents the theoretical framework for the study. This is reliant on Connell’s Theory of Masculinity and

Fairclough' s Critical Discourse Analysis. Chapter Three offers an in-depth detail of the methodology employed towards satisfying the objectives of the study. Chapter Four is involved with the presentation and discussion of findings. Chapter Five summarizes the study.

1.12. Conclusion

This chapter has introduced the research work by stating the research problem, giving a background to the study, highlighting the aim and objectives, research questions and research assumptions. Also, the scope of the study has been provided while also stating the significance of the study and its contribution to knowledge. Lastly, the methodology to be employed and also the theoretical frameworks have been introduced.

CHAPTER TWO

LITERATURE REVIEW AND THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

2.0. Introduction

The reality of homosexuality is not only controversial in the Nigerian society; it is a global issue. This stems from its absolute difference from the fossilised hetero-normative perspective of sexuality. Through thematic contents, Nollywood has accounted and represented events and situations predominant in the Nigerian society. The increase in the number of gays and lesbians

within the country is also another issue Nollywood has taken interest in dramatising lately, considering the fact that its openness has been restrained by the Nigerian constitution. Homosexuality has therefore been portrayed in diverse ways through such movies causing it to also yield different reactions from researchers and the Nigerian audience. Several arguments, essays and researches are preexisting in the field. This is because homosexuality can be tagged as being ‘ foreign’ to the African mentality and orientation of the people. It is also mostly regarded as culturally, morally and spiritually absurd or negative. Some of the works preexisting in this area have represented how homosexuality is portrayed has been culturally defiant, some have criticised and justified its representation in Nollywood movies, some even reacted to it by illustrating its implications on the society and some have juxtaposed between heterosexuality and homosexuality through such movies. This chapter reviews such works by analysing their relevance to the present study which is more linguistically inclined. Furthermore, theoretical frameworks which the study hinges on will be carefully accounted while explaining their importance to the present study. These theories include Connell’ s Theory of Masculinity and Fairclough’ s Critical Discourse Analysis.

2.1. A Review of Relevant Literature

The topic of homosexuality and its several representations and portrayal in Nollywood movies is such that has been discussed by some scholars. However, dramatists and film makers have not done much on homosexuality despite its topicality. Here, gender and sexuality will be examined in relation to their role in homosexuality and how they are affected by societal norms. Also, African’ s definition and expectation of masculinity will be critically examined. Finally, scholarly researches on the topic will be reviewed.

2.1.1. Gender, Sexualities and the Role of Societal Constructs

A person's gender is his sex, that is, the state of being either male or female while a person's sexuality is his sexual attraction, desire or feeling. Gender roles involve the dictation of how a man and a woman are expected to behave or act in a particular society. For example, Nigeria is a very cultured society with several organised and communal gathering of people with different rules and expected pattern of living. Things like love, sex, marriage and the institution of the family are not strange concepts to the people of the nation. In fact, the society has its own expectation in relations to how they should be run over time. Consequently, it becomes highly alarming and deviant when something different is introduced or practiced. In ancient times, relationships are built based on family relationships and for the furtherance and continuity of friendship and love in those families. For example, if two families have been friends for some times, they marry off their children to solidify the family bond. Then, children mostly accepted their parent's choice for them. Nowadays, it is rarely so. They are allowed to find love on their own terms and bring the spouse home for approval. Point to note here is that whoever is brought or chosen in the olden days or in recent times is expected to be the opposite sex or gender. This further establishes the fact that anything other than a man meeting a woman is an aberration in the Nigerian society and therefore considered abominable. The coming out of people as gay challenges established and widely accepted social patterns. With the increase in the coming out of gay people recently, 'excessive' closeness between two people of the same gender stares the interest of observers and suspicious onlookers as they raise doubting brows and glares at them and their proclaimed fondness. People are now quick to suspect each other as being gay, not because it is a common phenomenon but because it is presently socially unacceptable and a topic that gives opportunities for abuse, insults and name callings. After marriage, the society has a

stipulated construct of how a typical African home must look like. The husband is considered the breadwinner of the home while the wife is expected to be the homemaker. As the breadwinner, the man is expected to fend for his home and be the head of it. He is also expected to make decisions in the home, be a committed husband and do ‘masculine’ related jobs like repair of appliances or furniture and the likes. As the homemaker, the woman is expected to take good care of her home, her husband and children. She is expected to support her husband’s decision, be faithful in marriage and continually bow in submission to him. She is also expected to handle ‘feminine’ works like cooking, washing, cleaning, sweeping, and so on. If reverse is the case in an African home, it affords the opportunity for several discussions, criticisms and comments from observers or relations. A man who is caught feeding the baby may be advised to ‘man up’ and leave such work for the woman. A woman who is also the provider of the home might be criticized for being ‘overly ambitious’ and be advised to rather preserve her time and energy for her husband and children. The question now is if there is actually a defined set of duties for a man and a woman in the societal construct. This is more reason why Nigeria is regarded as a patriarchal society. Her justification of male dominance in every sector, particularly in the family and the subordination of women clearly shows the position of the society on gender roles. As earlier cited, the reason for the survival of this culture is the generational history attached to it and it being handed down from generation to generation. No matter the influx of women in public sectors like finance and economy, traditional roles of being the homemaker are still highly expected of them. It can therefore be sufficed to say that Nigerian typical man and woman is seen in their performance of certain expectations and the adherence to societal prescriptions of gendered behaviours. However, some people are of the opinion that their sexuality does not correlate with their biological sex and its society demands. As a result of this, some go as far as

correcting their biological sex to fit their sexuality through surgery. Complications which arise here are often as a result of societal specifications and its contradictions with individual desires. Happenings in recent times have brought to light that gender roles ascribed to males and females are not set in stone. The fluidity and flexibility of gender roles by both sexes also show how the performance of gender roles is negotiated and reformulated in various homes. This is in line with Butler' s (2004) argument that:

gender is the same apparatus by which notions of masculinity and femininity can be deconstructed and denaturalized. (p. 42)

The flexibility and division of gender roles also differ according to individuals and families. There are homes where a man sees no problem with lending his wife a helping hand in the kitchen or with home chores. Some even take it upon themselves to do the cooking if they feel they are the better cook in the relationship. At times, differences can also come as a result of location. In some rural areas, traditional styles of gender roles are followed in the homes while that may not be the case in an urban area. This leads to difference in educational and civilized status. Some outgrow traditionality with the aid of education and being exposed.

An exploration of linguistic and cultural expressions of gender and sexualities includes sexual norms and otherness, gender identity and expression, and the relationship with the society. Most people' s view of homosexuality is either shaped by religious beliefs and views or by cultural and societal constructs in the time past. These religious teachings and social norms guide and inform people on how and what to believe in with a view on how to react when the opposite is the case. For example, several arguments and discussions have proceeded in favour of and against the act of homosexuality in Christianity. Mostly, points like the creation story (the story

of Adam and Eve) and other marriages in the bible are used to establish that the Bible frowns against homosexuality. Herek (1988) agrees to this by inserting that

religiosity, adherence to traditional ideologies of family and gender, perception of friends' agreement with one's own attitudes, and past interactions with lesbians and gay men shaped people' s attitudes. (p. 451)

And like Akande (2016) later concludes:

From the aforementioned, it is safe to say that any issue that is considered anti-thesis to religion and inconsistent with the acceptable cultural norms is most likely to fail popularity contest and when such issue is up for debate; it is usually considered as ' dead on arrival'. (p. 34)

Also, the traditional family structure in Nigeria supports two sexes and their straightness without any further complications, that is, a man who is sexually attracted to the opposite sex meeting a woman whose sexual interests are in men. In addition, Butler (2004) posits that gender and sexuality can be seen as both constituted by and dependant on norms and critically linked to them. She defines gender by insisting that

gender is not exactly what one " is" nor is it precisely what one " has." Gender is the apparatus by which the production and normalization of masculine and feminine take place along with the interstitial forms of hormonal, chromosomal, psychic, and performative that gender assumes. To assume that gender always and exclusively means the matrix of the " masculine" and " feminine" is precisely to miss the critical point that the production of that coherent binary is contingent, that it comes at a cost, and that those permutations of gender which do not fit the binary are as much a part of gender as its most normative instance. (p.42)

Butler (1990) offers an extensive explanation by summarising that

gender can denote a unity of experience, of sex, gender, and desire, only when sex can be understood in some sense to necessitate gender- where gender is a psychic and/or cultural designation of the self - and desire - where desire is heterosexual and therefore differentiates itself through an oppositional relation to that other

gender it desires. The internal coherence or unity of either gender, man or woman, thereby requires both a stable and oppositional heterosexuality. (p.22)

She believes no matter the nature that is existent, gender has a means of moving beyond the naturalized binary or norm. According to her, if gender is a norm, it is not the same as models people approximate but rather the social power that produces an intelligible field of subjects and an apparatus by which the gender binary is instituted. She opines that reducing gender to sexuality has resulted to two separate but overlapping concerns within present day queer theory. Her recommendations are in two folds. Firstly, she recommends a separation of sexuality from gender so that one's gender does not presuppose that one engages his sexual practices in a particularly defined way, and to engage in a given sexual practice does not mean that one is of a given gender. Secondly, she says that gender should not be reduced so drastically to heterosexuality which when carefully examined is what traditional gender role does. Butler (2004) therefore concludes that:

The dissonance between gender and sexuality is thus affirmed from two different perspectives; the one seeks to show possibilities for sexuality that are not constrained by gender in order to break the causal reductiveness of arguments that bind them; the other seeks to show possibilities for gender that are not predetermined by forms of hegemonic heterosexuality. (p. 54)

2.1.2. Masculinity and the African Experience and Expectations

There is no attitude or behaviour that particularly distinguishes a person as an African and different from the rest of the world that cannot be subjected to historical and social change with time. The reason why people think some attitudes are typically African is because they are rampant in Africa, not that they do not exist elsewhere or that such attitude is in-born or permanent. Africa is a continent that is highly cultured. There are several experiences that can be

accounted and expectations from its people. One of these is related to the idea of masculinity, that is, how ‘ real men’ are to behave or act in the society. In Africa, several ideas are associated with masculinity and how a real man should be portrayed. Here, the African experience and expectations of masculinity will be examined.

Undoubtedly, sexuality is one of the central determinants of masculinity and male power in Africa. The attempt made by a lot of men to behave in accordance with a predominantly strong and sexualised form of masculinity explains this. Several studies have showed that in most of our so-called ‘African cultures’, the male identity tends to be strongly sexualised (Langa, 2014). To a considerable extent, this is why sexual experiences with women is considered to shape Africa’ s perception of who and what a real man should be like. Ratele (2011) agrees by saying that for men in Africa, masculinity

is closely associated with our sexual partners, their sexual appeal, the size of our penises, the claims that we make about our sexual stamina, whether we can maintain a healthy erection and how virile we are. (p.399)

From boyhood to youth and adulthood, men try to keep up with a healthy sexual life by all means in order to prove their manliness among peers and in the society at large. Sexual conquests and numerous relationships are placed ahead of tenderness and demonstration of ‘ too much emotion’ to the opposite sex. This is because he might be considered ‘ weak’ and feminine among his peers. And so, anything that will question a man’ s manhood is ultimately avoided. Rather, men seek to portray themselves as sexually active, sexually skillful and with a good sexual stamina even if it is true or not. So, as long as a man is sensed to be knowledgeable and experienced in sexual matters, his masculinity is affirmed and not questionable. To some men, there is nothing more dreadful and shameful than to be sensed as being sexually weak and

incapable. As a result of this, women are not seen as a medium of companionship or friendship, but rather as a means of obtaining sexual satisfaction and reasserting a man's manhood and masculinity. The patriarchal nature of Africa also assists this. As the subordinate, women are still expected to succumb to men even in sexual matters while the man takes the lead as the more 'experienced' side. Usually, the notion is that, as men, they recognise sex and sexuality better and so should women everything. However, the concept of sex and sexuality should not be mixed up. To a large extent, male power is therefore built on an active sexual life of a man while sexuality and manhood are generally a representation of the phallus or sexual power.

Ultimately, this has yielded several other reactions from men. One is the 'right' to have multiple sexual partners. Men see it as a norm to have more than one woman to be sexually involved with. This is more reason why in Africa, polygamy is encouraged while polyandry is greatly criticised and discouraged. Besides this, a man who is caught cheating or being unfaithful to his wife is easily forgiven while the blame is either put on his wife not sexually satisfying him or his uncontrollable need to explore his manhood's capabilities. This is not so for a woman who is found in that same situation. Rather than putting the blame on the man's inability to satisfy her or her tendency to explore her sexuality, the blame is put on her in-born adulterous nature and insatiable thirst. This does not mean she will be let off the hook easily. In some Muslim communities, she is in fact made to face the law and suffer the consequences of her actions while the man she was found cheating with is not penalized. Therefore, the issue of male engagement with multiple partners is one of the most visible consequences of the construction of masculinity in Africa. It has been widely recognised as one of the major carriers of Sexually Transmitted Diseases and other related diseases and need to be widely addressed in public policies and programmes across Africa (Langa, 2014). However, among certain groups of men, sexuality

seems to be the last representation of their masculinity. They prefer to establish their masculinity and dominance over women in several other ways like in finances and provision of basic needs in the home and in a relationship.

Traditionally, men are the breadwinners. They are expected to provide the finances and other means of enjoying a standard living in the home. When a man is not the breadwinner in a home, his masculinity is subjected to questioning. This inferably challenges the traditional concept of masculinity in Africa. This is because a country like Africa has witnessed tremendous poverty and unemployment which is not gender specific. When a man is poor or employed, it hinders him from exercising his dominance and financial authority in the home, as long as financial matters are concerned. Consequently, such a man might result to exercising his dominance and masculinity through his sexual prowess. It occurs to him that if he is lacking in finances, he is at least not lacking in his sexual power. Sex provides a means in that case to reassert who the man in the relationship still is. Another reaction to financial crisis might come in form of violence. Out of frustration, a man might develop the tendency of being short tempered and quick to react to a woman's mistakes easily. He picks fights easily and indirectly asserts domination to violence. Thus, they try to preserve their manliness through sexuality or violence. Groes-Green (2009) posits that

Violence against women is also an apparent alternative to not having economic power, particularly for young men who cannot provide their partners with gifts and money. (p.1)

In this context, it is not surprising that

54 percent of female respondents to a survey on violence against women reported having suffered some sort of male physical and/or sexual violence at some point in their lifetime. (MMAS, 2004)

Asides frustration from financial challenges, men result to being violent to women for various reason which is ultimately challenged towards pointing out who is dominant and physically stronger in the relationship. One African expectation in this context is that, at least, a man should be able to keep his woman under control no matter the condition they are faced with. To keep her under control, some result to violence. In Africa, young people grow up believing that the use of physical strength to address interpersonal relationship and its challenges, and also self-exclusion from sexual and reproductive responsibilities, is quite acceptable for a man (Langa, 2014).

Furthermore, Africa is very religious and so it has various religious attachments to different occurrences. Masculinity and femininity also have religious expectations. African femininity and masculinity pertains to roles in African racial, national, sexual and familial organization. An African proverb says:

When you teach a boy, you teach a person; but when you teach a girl, you educate a nation.

Physically and spiritually, it is believed that men and women complement each other. The spiritually incomplete man is known as masculine while the spiritually incomplete woman is known as feminine (Kumat, 2013). It is said that:

A man who will not fight for the protection of his wife and children is a coward and deserves to be ill-treated. The man who takes his life in his hand and stands up for what he knows to be right will always command the respect of his enemy (Bruce, 1922)

African masculinity expects a man to protect the female counterparts that is, the mother, wife, daughters, sisters, and so on. He further explains this thus:

The moment the men of any race permit the cheapening of their women, the pollution of their women, their Race is doomed for no Race deserves to rise in the scale of being which does not do reverence to or respect the honor and

good name of its women. Even among the lower animals, the males will fight to the death to protect the females (Bruce, 1922).

His conclusion therefore is that:

The Negro Race can never hope to rise to any great eminence in the world when the spineless cowardice of its men permits the open degradation of its girls and young women by leprous and lecherous libertines of alien Races (Bruce, 1922).

Finally, all these instances explore the African experience and its expectations from men and the assertion of their masculinity. It can therefore be inferred from the instances above that men need women to prove their masculinity or manliness. The sexuality, violence, protection and so on are all still dependent on the existence and involvement of women. This is more reason why anything other than heterosexuality is alien to the African society.

2.1.3. Scholarly Perspectives of Homosexuality in Movies

Homosexuality has been defined by various scholars and dictionaries. It is a romantic attraction, sexual attraction or sexual behavior between members of the same sex or gender (Wikipedia, 2017). Therefore, if someone, especially a man is homosexual, they are sexually attracted to people of the same sex (Longman Dictionary, 2009). People in this category basically include gays, lesbians, bisexuals and transgender, but ‘gay’ is a popular term used to refer to them all. Over the years, its otherness has resulted to open discrimination, punishments and criticisms from the people, government and leaders of cultural or religious groups in different countries. This has spurred homosexuals to result to secrecy in countries that consider it a crime – Nigeria being one of them. In Nigeria, it is considered illegal with a sentence of 14 years in prison and even punishable by death in some Northern states (Independent News, 2016).

Nigeria's film industry, dubbed Nollywood, is valued at \$5 billion and makes more films than Hollywood in the U.S, but less than the largest film industry, India's Bollywood (Sahara Reporters, 2015). The first depiction of homosexuality in Nollywood is in *Emotional Crack*, 2003 (Hoad, 2013). Ever since, homosexuality-themed movies have been on the increase in Nollywood, starting with lesbians and recently gays. Some commentators see this boldness and new direction as positive and explicit considering the fact that homosexuality is considered a crime in Nigeria, Nollywood's home-base (Hoad, 2013). Others like respondents on OAK Foundation's research think it is very negative and a bad influence on the viewers (OAK, 2016). However, as real as negative things like rape, drugs, abuse, corruption and conflicts; and positive things like love, unity and family are, so is homosexuality real and existent in the society and so also deserving of portrayal and representation in movies. The representation of this in Nollywood movies has motivated several scholars and interested viewers to comment and make relevant opinions and analysis on how it is represented. However, research in this area is yet to be fully detailed, that is not much has been done on it yet.

Bethany (2012) opines that the portrayal of gender and homosexuality in Nollywood movies should be encouraged, rather than condemned, in order to motivate an open discussion of the subject in the Nigerian society. Nollywood movies provide means of discussing burning issues in the hearts of people and matters arising in societies. Through dramatisation, people are drawn into personalising situations, making comments and resolving issues. Lyonga (2014) believes that:

representations of social identities therefore have far reaching implications in society. Representations reflect power asymmetries and socio-cultural stereotypes, and visual representations in particular “ depend on and produce social inclusions and exclusions” . How we are seen determines in part how we are

treated; how we treat others is based on how we see them; such seeing comes from representation. Cinema is a product for entertainment which has the capacity to shape and reflect thoughts and feelings. (p.785)

Homosexuality-themed movies therefore bring the subject up for discussion and can also influence people's opinions despite legal restrictions. Bethany (2012) uses the movie titled *Emotional Crack* to illustrate the condemnation and demonization of homosexuality in Nigeria.

She concludes that:

the movie was kind of disappointing because it ended by saying lesbians are evil and that hetero-normative marriage is the right and moral thing to do even if your husband beats you and you cheat on each other. (p.2)

Inferably, homosexuality is represented in the movie as the worst crime a person can commit. Domestic violence and cheating on one's spouse with the opposite gender is still pardonable as long as it is not an affair with the same sex. Akande (2016) agrees with this by saying:

the only acceptable relationship in most if not all cultures in Nigeria is the heterosexual relationship. Homosexuality is alien to African culture and is considered an aberration. (p. 3)

This is because several ridiculous and accountable reasons are attached to the act making it so abominable and unthinkable. Hoad (2013) slightly agrees with this in his depiction of LGBT's representation in Nollywood. He sums up people's comment on gay-themed movies and examines some films like *Pregnant Hawkers*, *Emotional Crack* and *Men in Love* to conclude that Nollywood portrays homosexuals as

almost always under the influence of witchcraft, mentally ill, or just plain wrong 'uns. (p.1)

This can however be blamed on the level with which Nigerians are so religiously and culturally inclined. Unnatural or unfamiliar situations are mostly attached to supernatural forces, making

the people totally forbid such things. Homosexuality is not any different. In his selected movies, Hoad (2013) shows how homosexuals are believed to be under witchcraft influence or mental illness and so in need of a deliverance session. However, he says that

the continued production of gay-themed titles shows that they're hitting a nerve of tangible prejudice, fear and even curiosity. (p. 2)

The question he poses is that

is there a Nigerian director ready to go a step further and empathise? (p.2)

This is because most of the gay-themed movies end in criticising homosexuality directly or indirectly. Nollywood movies are yet to outrightly uphold homosexuality by justifying the feelings or attractions of homosexuals. Several reasons could cause this but the probability of it being the fear of audience's (Nigerians') reaction cannot be waved aside. Nigerians have expressed different opinions -mostly negative- on the subject. These various views led to OAK Foundation's research on the thoughts of Nigerians in respect to gender and sexuality representations in Nollywood movies through Focus Group Discussions. After several sessions, it was concluded that Nigerians regard homosexuality in Nollywood movies to be negative and corruptive. Most people interviewed in the course of the research believe Nollywood movies should be educative, didactic and assessable by children. Those that are gay-themed are not an option for children because they are 'morally decadent' and are therefore considered as 'ungodly' acts and so should not be produced, considering the fact that Nollywood movies are now easily accessible by both young and old. This is why Lyonga (2014) also inserts that:

according to African stereotypes, homosexuality is a disease/sickness; a possession by evil or demonic spirits; an occult practice; or simply a despicable influence from the 'morally decadent' (p. 2)

Consequently, Lyonga (2014) sought to juxtapose between a Nollywood movie that slightly justified homosexuals titled *Rag Tag* and another titled *Men in Love* which criticised them with the intention of illustrating a distinction between the two representations through comparative analysis. He uses trans-nationality to analyse *Rag Tag* and its justification of homosexuality while he uses stereotype to illustrate how negatively homosexuality is portrayed in *Men in Love*. While *Rag Tag* illustrates a feeling of love and affection that should be fought for between the homosexuals, *Men in Love* shows an ‘initiation’ into homosexuality and a need to deliver the initiate from the ‘demonic power’ of homosexuality. *Rag Tag* ‘portrays non-straight persons as different from others, only in terms of sexual orientation and not in terms of a failed gender, or an evil or inhuman nature’ while *Men in Love* ‘challenges the stereotypical portrayal of homosexuality on solely negative terms’ (Lyonga, 2014). In the course of his research, Lyonga further distinguishes the difference(s) between homosexuality and heterosexuality using some actions or events in the movies examined. He analyses plots, dialogues, sound tracks, and characters to examine how homosexuality is an ‘Other’ with the acceptable category being heterosexuality.

Furthermore, the role of religion in demonising and discriminating against homosexuality is highlighted by Lyonga (2014) as he notes that:

it portrays homosexuality not only as abnormal and intolerable in the African culture, but also as something against which the powerful intervention of the Divine should be sought. Christianity, as portrayed in the scene, sends out a message of condemnation of homosexuality, and no room is given for homosexuality to put up a defense against the religious reproof. (p. 13)

Therefore, the interference of Christianity indicates that the male homosexual character would not have indulged in the ‘demonic’ act if he were in his ‘normal’ senses and free from any influence. With regards to the issue of gender, Lyonga shows how *Rag Tag* puts up a challenge

against the perception that gay men are different from straight or heterosexual men in terms of their masculinity. This is because, rather than being more feminine as most people expect, the characters are portrayed as more masculine. Lyonga (2014) concludes by asserting that:

Men in Love drives home the view that male homosexuals are selfish, corrupt, deceitful, unclean, or demonic without which, they are sissies. Even other filmic subjects look upon the homosexual characters with disgust and rejection... *Rag Tag*, unlike the more 'national' or African film *Men in Love*, challenges the stereotypical portrayal of homosexuality on solely negative terms. (p. 16)

2.1.4. The Role of Language in the Framing of Social Realities

Language is the employment of written or spoken words to communicate. It is fundamentally essential for communication and interpersonal interaction among individuals. In the society, language has several roles it performs. It could be a means of expressing one's feelings, emotions and thoughts. It could also be a means for the exchange of greetings and pleasantries among strangers or familiar people, thereby bringing about unification and familiarity. Language also helps in trading, and other business interactions. To ask questions, reply to them and express satisfaction, language is very essential. It is also the tool for the understanding of a person or people's speech community. For the purpose of education, telling of stories and recollection of experiences, language is also instrumental. Without language, it becomes extremely difficult to do all of these. Feelings, intentions and situations cannot be expressed. In fact, it becomes difficult to find out who a person truly is without language. For example, a deaf and dumb person who cannot express himself in signs will be difficult to understand or identify. As earlier stated, language is mainly divided into two: verbal and non-verbal language. Verbal language is the spoken medium of communication while non-verbal language includes writings, signs and

gestures used to express ideas or communicate. At this juncture, it is noteworthy that one of the major roles of language is the framing of social realities.

Social reality is different from other types of reality like biological reality or cognitive human reality. It goes beyond individual or personal actions to things established by social interactions and relationships. Social reality includes accepted social tenets in a community, thereby involving social representations and stable laws. Several philosophers and scholars have examined the topic of social reality which is/are the visible and existing structures in the society. These structures include institutions like marriage, corporations, government, colleges and universities, parliaments, revolutions and so on. It also includes harsh realities like war, divorce, firing, unemployment, poverty and so on. Searle (1996) argued that such institutional realities interact with each other in what he called ‘systematic relationships (e.g., governments, marriages, corporations, universities, armies, churches)’ to create a multi-layered social reality. For Searle (1996), language was the key to the formation of social reality because:

language is precisely designed to be a self-identifying category of institutional facts; i.e., a system of publicly and widely accepted symbols which persist through time independently of the urges and inclinations of the participants. (p.78)

His argument is that a socially constructed reality presupposes a reality independent of all social constructions. At the same time, he accepts that social realities are created by human beings and that the secret to understanding the continued existence of institutional facts is simply that the individuals directly involved and a sufficient number of members of the relevant communities must continue to recognize and accept the existence of such facts. This includes the undoubted role of language in the framing of these several social realities as it acts as guide to them. This is why Bhaskar (1979), Durkheim (1982) & Giddens (1979) think Social Reality to be:

any casually efficacious system, structure, or mechanism which can exist independently of any particular historical individual, but cannot exist independently of some group of individuals somehow linked together in sustaining or reproducing that reality from day to day.

Pateman (2017) further inserts that language is not only important for the framing of social reality alone, but that it is also a social reality. His opinion is that languages are open-ended activity-sustained practices; they are never fully conventionalized social realities or fully determinate psychological realities and that there is always scope for individuals using ‘ a language’ to create new forms which were not already implicit in social conventions or internal psychological rules - even rules with infinite generative power. He therefore posits that:

Language is, however, clearly a social reality when its resources - its symbolic powers - are used by speakers in efforts to affect other social realities. So, for example, in hypercorrection language is being used to affect perceived social status relationships and all that then follows from the estimation of those realities. Such phenomena have been studied by both linguists and sociologists, operating within very different scientific traditions. (Pateman, p. 1)

Therefore, social reality is dependent on social relations and interaction people. As justified initially, it is noteworthy that this is impossible without language.

Society and its numerous institutions are constructed through human interaction and relationships established by people. Authors have confirmed that language and words are social arte-facts and not only a mirror of reality. Words represent a convention people establish in order to understand each other and these conventions frame the social reality. For example, ‘the people’ s discourse about their organisation reflects the meanings they give to the events, for example, a simple metaphor expresses the way the organisation is structured, how it operates, how it meets the needs of its members or of its clients: Discourse concerns a set of meanings, metaphors, representations, images, stories, appreciations etc. that, together, produce particular versions of the events’ (Burr, 1995: 62). The organisation is a manifestation of the interactions

between our mental models regarding it, which are constructed socially through a relational and interactional process. The organisation is not an objective reality because it is independent of its members' individual interpretations. From this perspective, it can be agreed that the organisation is itself a reality generated by multiple interpretations (Murrell, 2001). However, Cooperrider & Whitney (2000) posits that any organisation is the result of the multiple interpretations given by people, expressed through *language*, which, in its turn, has a formative character, being a part of the constructed world. Therefore, (Cojocaru, Bragaru & Ciuchi 2012) summarise that:

language is not just an image of the world, but a genuine form of social action. Ideas, representations, images, histories, stories, metaphors, generate events, depending on their ' emotional charge' and on the way they are interpreted.
(p. 36)

In conclusion, language is a backbone upon which the society thrives. As long as men need to communicate, language continues to be highly instrumental for interaction. Social realities make up a society and a society cannot do without language. So, the role of language in the framing of these social realities cannot be over-emphasised.

2.2. Theoretical Framework

The theoretical frameworks instrumental for the analysis of how the idea of ' otherness' is linguistically portrayed in homosexuality-themed Nollywood movies are Connell' s Theory of Masculinity and Fairclough' s Critical Discourse Analysis.

2.2.1. Connell' s Theory of Masculinity

Masculinity is a term often used to refer to manhood or manliness. It is a set of attributes, behaviours, and roles associated with boys and men (Wikipedia, 2017). It deals with the qualities

that are evident in male folks that make them qualified or easily identified as men. Several expectations and obligations are associated to men based on their gender and ‘ capabilities’ . In the African society, particularly a cultured group of people like Nigeria, men have roles they are expected to play and behaviours expected from them. Naturally, masculinity is biologically defined, that is, through a child’ s sex after birth. Nowadays, masculinity is also culturally and socially defined, at the same time influenced. Cultural and environmental stipulations on who a man should be and what he should be like has both shaped people’ s orientation and also affected it- positively and negatively. Men who exhibit otherwise qualities are referred to as effeminate. Qualities expected of real men include: violence, aggression, stoicism or emotional restraint, courage, toughness and physical strength, athleticism, risk-taking, adventurous spirit, competitive nature, thrill and excitement-seeking, achievement and success.

According to Rudman (2014):

Both males and females can exhibit masculine traits and behavior. Those exhibiting both masculine and feminine characteristics are considered androgynous, and feminist philosophers have argued that gender ambiguity may blur gender classification. (p. 64)

For example, men are expected in African communities to be at the helm of affairs and to exhibit leadership traits. They are labeled the ‘ breadwinners’ while women are named as homemakers. However, this does not mean that some women are not good at leadership and organisation skills. But in many cultures, displaying characteristics that are not associated to one’ s gender may be regarded as a social problem. An instance is male homosexuality. Socially, a man is expected to be sexually attracted and involved with the opposite sex and not the other way round. As a result of this, male homosexuality is interpreted as effeminacy.

Although debates are existent on whether masculinity is more in-born than conditioned, the fact that both are strong factors that determine masculinity cannot be jettisoned and many aspects of masculinity assumed to be natural are linguistically and culturally driven. This opposes the general believe have, which is the assumption that masculinity is determined by a man' s sexual life. A man is praised to be a ' real man' when he is sexually and actively involved with the opposite sex. Therefore, it becomes confusing when some males are rather attracted and involved with their own gender sexually. They are often believed to be deviant from the masculinity norms. The burning question now remains if they can still be regarded as men or not considering the fact that this expectation has not been fulfilled. This is why Psychologist Joseph Pleck argues that a hierarchy of masculinity exists mainly as a dichotomy of homosexual and heterosexual males by saying:

Our society uses the male heterosexual-homosexual dichotomy as a central symbol for all the rankings of masculinity, for the division on any grounds between males who are ' real men' , and males who are not. (2017)

The fact remains that despite a man' s sexual preference, his biological construct does not change. His sexual construct also does not hinder him from performing other social and cultural obligations expected of him. Likewise, women who exhibit masculinity are not biologically men because of that factor. However, they are often regarded as ' tomboy' or ' butch' as a result of their deviance. They are subjected to social stigma, embarrassments, harassments and name callings. Some even associate them to lesbianism. Feminists believe female masculinity often entails a type of gender performance that challenges traditional masculinity and particularly male dominance or by extension, patriarchy. Their movement has led to a better acceptance of women expressing masculinity in recent years. Raewyn Connell named traditional roles men play and privileges they enjoy ' Hegemonic Masculinity' . His approach to social change is based on the

relational perspective of masculinity (Connell, 1992). He however believes that it is more of 'masculinities' than 'masculinity' which is a single overarching concept. This is because he believes that masculinities are configurations of practice that are constructed, unfold, and change through time (Connell & Messerschmidt, 2005). They also proposed that masculinity can be analysed on three different levels which include local, regional and global levels.

Africans particularly think that homosexuality contradicts homosexuality since Herek (1986) summed up a proposition that:

to be a man in contemporary Africa is to be homophobic- that is to be hostile towards homosexual persons in general and gay men in particular. (p. 563)

In most cultures, men who are gay are not totally disregarded as being masculine but they are rather oppressed and subjected to serious conflicts and questioning of their manliness. These conflicts also include their sexuality and their social and biological presence as men.

However, Connell (2005) defines Hegemonic Masculinity as:

the configuration of gender practice which embodies the currently accepted answer to the problem of the legitimacy of patriarchy, which guarantees the dominant position of men and the subordination of women. (p. 77)

With hegemonic masculinity, the dominant position of men in the society is legitimized while the subordination of women and their marginalization is justifiable. With its concepts, hegemonic masculinity seeks to explain the means and the reason why it is essential for men to rule over women and other gender identities that are sensed to be 'feminine' in a particular society. This means that hegemonic masculinity positions some men and all women as subordinates to others. The terminology is derived from the theory of cultural hegemony propounded by Antonio Gramsci who is widely recognised for his support of the Marxist theory.

This is why ‘ hegemonic’ is an adjective that means a situation whereby a particular group is and sustains its leadership and dominant position in the hierarchical structure of a given society. Therefore, hegemonic masculinity includes and supports gender hierarchy. Kupers (2005) gives a clear description thus:

In contemporary American and European culture, [hegemonic masculinity] serves as the standard upon which the “ real man” is defined. According to R.W. Connell, contemporary hegemonic masculinity is built on two legs, domination of women and a hierarchy of internale dominance. It is also shaped to a significant extent by the stigmatization and aspirations of young males. (p.713)

He further adds that:

Today’ s hegemonic masculinity includes a high degree of ruthless competition, an inability to express emotions other than anger, an unwillingness to admit weakness or dependency, devaluation of women and all feminine attributes in men, homophobia, and so forth. (p. 724)

Connell (1992) also believes that the discourse of homosexuality most familiar to sociologists is the sociology of deviance that is, deviance from traditional opinions on masculinity. Since it is not heterosexuality-sexual relationship between a straight man and a straight woman, then it is regarded as an ‘ Other’. Heasly (2005) also contributes to this by asserting that

the forms of masculinity represent something much more than just men who are “ nontraditional.” Rather, they suggest a masculinity and male heterosexuality that extends the reach of societal perceptions of either and one that for each of these males allows the potential for evolving a broadened definition. The result may be expanded norms and expectations for who straight men are and who they can be. (p. 319)

However, Messerschmidt (1993) accounts that

hegemonic masculinity imposes an ideal set of traits which stipulate that a man can never be unfeminine enough. Thus, fully achieving hegemonic masculinity becomes an unattainable ideal. (p. 829)

The theory is criticised for solely being framed within a hetero-normative conception of gender that has actually underemphasized male and female difference and ignored the several distinctions and exclusions within the gender categories. This is why it is believed that the theory of masculinity mostly rests on a dichotomisation of biological sex and gender in the cultural context. This led to Brod' s (1987) observation that there is a tendency in men' s studies field to proceed as if women were not a relevant part of the analysis and therefore to analyse masculinities by looking only at men and relations among men.

As gender relations continually evolve and women' s movements grow stronger and rapidly, the dynamics of masculinities may encounter a complete abolition of power differentials and a more equitable relationship between men and women and between men and the other men (Demetriou, 2001). Groes-Green (2012) however offers a recommendation to avoid this by opining that positive, alternative and less dominant masculinities may be developed even if these are always embedded in local gender power relations.

For the purpose of this research, Connell' s Theory of Masculinity is very essential. The theory helps to analyse male characters in the selected movies. Their nature, characterisation, sexuality, gender, behaviour and attitude will be appropriately identified. Most importantly, the theory will help understand their stand as men and how they portray this to show their manliness or feminine behaviour. Also, the reaction of other characters to their gayness will be identified while exploring Africa' s stand on the topic of homosexuality as portrayed by Nollywood.

2.2.2. Fairclough' s Critical Discourse Analysis

Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) is a linguistic field concerned with the analysis of texts or spoken discourse with the purpose of revealing and illustrating social elements like power, dominance, bias and inequality. The concern of critical discourse analysts is to understand, expose and oppose social inequality. This is why the concepts of discourse, genre, and style are intimately connected with each other. They are dealing with the macro and micro levels of sociological and linguistic studies. There is a dialectic relationship between social actors or individuals (micro structure) and the social practices and values (macro structure). In this background, a multiplicity of texts is in close interaction with social parameters to bring about different ideological, identities and power structures. In this respect, the voice given to the macro structures, i.e. government and institutions or the micro structures i.e. individuals is immensely affected by the theorists' ideological orientations. However, Fairclough (1995) defines Critical Discourse Analysis as follows:

By critical discourse analysis I mean discourse analysis which aims to systematically explore often opaque relationships of causality and determination between (a) discursive practices, events and texts, and (b) wider social and cultural structures, relations and processes; to investigate how such practices, events and texts arise out of and are ideologically shaped by relations of power and struggles over power; and to explore how the opacity of these relationships between discourse and society is itself a factor securing power and hegemony. (pp. 132-133)

Fairclough approaches Critical Discourse Analysis, particularly discourse as a social practice. He believes that our language, which shapes our social identities and interactions, knowledge systems, and beliefs, is also shaped by them in turn. To reach the goal of helping to raise the awareness to the question that language can influence the dominance of one group over another, Fairclough has put a great emphasis on raising the level of people's consciousness, for he assumes that in discourse, the subjects do not, strictly speaking, know what they are doing,

and they are unaware of the potential social impact of what they do or utter. His way of thinking implies some other notions. First, language is a part of the society and not somehow external to it. Second, language is a social process. Third, language is a socially conditioned process, conditioned that is by other (non-linguistic) parts of society (Fairclough, 1989). Fairclough's notion of text is exactly the same as Halliday's, and this term covers both written discourse and spoken discourse. Halliday's view of language is as a 'social act'. Fairclough believes that text is a product, not a process. Fairclough employs the term 'discourse' to refer to the complete process of social interaction. Text is merely a sector of this process, because he examines three elements for discourse, namely *text*, *interaction*, and *social context*. In addition to text itself, the process of social interaction involves the process of text production and text interpretation. Hence, text analysis is inferably a part of discourse analysis. Fairclough (1989) identifies three dimensions for CDA:

Description is the stage which is concerned with formal properties of the text. **Interpretation** is concerned with the relationship between text and interaction by seeing the text as the product of the process of production and as a resource in the process of interpretation. **Explanation** is concerned with the relationship between interaction and social context, with the social determination of the process of production and interpretation, and their social effects (pp. 26-27).

In all these stages, analysis is the main concern, but its nature is different in each stage. Analysis in the first stage limits its boundaries to labeling the formal properties of the text and regards text as an object. In the second phase, Critical Discourse Analysis goes through the analysis of the cognitive process of the participants and their interactions. When a speaker utters a word, a cognitive process occurs for the listener to decode what he said. Finally in the third stage, the aim is to explain the relationship between social events and social structures that affect these events and also are affected by them.

With regards to ideology and power, Fairclough takes a rather traditional approach towards power, and does not agree with Foucault. From Fairclough's (1995) point of view, Foucault considers power as a pervasive force and symmetrical relations that is dominant over the whole society and is not in the hands of one special group or another; whereas in Fairclough's thinking, the relations of power are asymmetrical, unequal, and empowering that belong to a special class or group (Ahmadvand, p. 86).

Several approaches have been made to the examination of Critical Discourse Analysis. Wodak (2001) has put forward some features for the historical approach to CDA as follows:

1. This approach is interdisciplinary. Like other critical linguists, Wodak acknowledges the intricacy of the relationship between language and society. As a result he believes that CDA is interdisciplinary in nature.
2. This interdisciplinary nature could be seen both in theory and practice. He combines argumentation theory and rhetoric with Halliday's Functional Linguistics.
3. This approach is problem-oriented rather than emphasizing some special language issues.
4. Methodology and theory are chosen through eclecticism.
5. In this approach the analyst is always on the move between theory and empirical data.
6. Historical context will go under investigation and will be incorporated into the analysis of discourse and texts. (pp. 69-70)

Wodak (2001) also distinguishes between discourse and text. He considers discourse as a complex set of synchronic and coherent linguistic acts that emanate in genre and text. Consequently text is regarded as the production of these linguistic acts. All of the approaches pursue one common goal which is to represent the dialectic relationship between language, power, ideology, and the influential role that language plays in emanation of power and legitimizing social inequalities. It can also be asserted from all these that power does not derive from language; rather language is used to fight against power.

The other issue put forward by Fairclough (1995b) is that while earlier contributions in Critical Linguistics (CL) were very thorough in their grammatical and lexical analysis they were less attentive to the intertextual analysis of texts

the linguistic analysis is very much focused upon clauses, with little attention to higher-level organization properties of whole texts. (p. 28)

Despite raising these issues with regards to earlier works in Critical Linguistics, Fairclough (1995b) still inserts that

the mention of these limitations is not meant to minimize the achievement of critical linguistics they largely reflect shifts of focus and developments of theory in the past twenty years or so. (p. 28)

The ‘ shifts of focus and developments of theory’ which Fairclough (1995b) referred to here have not resulted in the creation of a single theoretical framework. This is the more reason why Van Dijk (1988) further explains that:

Discourse is not simply an isolated textual or dialogic structure. Rather it is a complex communicative event that also embodies a social context, featuring participants (and their properties) as well as production and reception processes. (p. 2)

By ‘ production processes’ van Dijk (1988) means journalistic and institutional practices of news-making and the economic and social practices which not only play important roles in the creation of media discourse but which can be explicitly related to the structures of media discourse (Sheyolislami, p. 4).

Another main approach in Critical Discourse Analysis is that of Norman Fairclough whose theory has been central and essential to Critical Discourse Analysis over more than the past ten years. Fairclough (1989), in his earlier work, called his approach to language and discourse *Critical Language Study* (p. 5). He further described the objective of this approach as:

a contribution to the general raising of consciousness of exploitative social relations, through focusing upon language (p. 4).

This aim in particular remains in his later work that further develops his approach so that it is now one of the most comprehensive frameworks of Critical Discourse Analysis (Fairclough, 1992, 1993, 1995a, 1995b; Chouliaraki and Fairclough, 1999). Chouliaraki and Fairclough (1999) claim that

CDA of a communicative interaction sets out to show that the semiotic and linguistic features of the interaction are systematically connected with what is going on socially, and what is going on socially is indeed going on partly or wholly semiotically or linguistically. Put differently, CDA systematically charts relations of transformation between the symbolic and non-symbolic, between discourse and the non-discursive. (p. 113)

According to Fairclough(1995b):

linguistic analysis is descriptive in nature, whereas intertextual analysis is more interpretative. (p. 16)

Fairclough (1992) defines intertextuality mentioned here as

basically the property texts have of being full of snatches of other texts, which may be explicitly demarcated or merged in, and which the text may assimilate, contradict, ironically echo, and so forth. (p. 84)

Fairclough (1992) further identifies two types of intertextuality:

"manifest intertextuality," and "constitutive intertextuality." (p. 85)

The former refers to the heterogeneous constitution of texts by which “ specific other texts are overtly drawn upon within a text.” This kind of intertextuality is marked by explicit signs such as quotation marks, indicating the presence of other texts. Constitutive intertextuality, on the other hand, refers to the “heterogeneous constitution of texts out of elements (types of convention) of orders of discourse (interdiscursivity)” (p. 104).

This kind of intertextuality refers to the structure of discourse conventions that go into the new text's production. Fairclough (1992) provides several examples of these processes of intertextuality. Fairclough (1995) claims that intertextual properties of a text are realized in its linguistic features since it assumed that texts may be 'linguistically heterogeneous' (p. 189). Nevertheless, Fairclough (1995b) asserts that

linguistic analysis is descriptive in nature, whereas interpretative analysis is more interpretative. Linguistic features of texts provide evidence which can be used in intertextual analysis, and intertextual analysis is a particular sort of interpretation of that evidence . . . (p. 61)

Discourse analysts naturally make assumptions about how audiences read and comprehend texts. They even appear and try to interpret texts on behalf of the audiences. The issue at stake here is how a discourse analyst knows how audiences consume media discourse, how and what they comprehend or understand and what sorts of impacts these reports have. It is safe to say that all analysts, including Critical Discourse Analysis practitioners, agree that different audiences may interpret texts differently. This, however, is one of the strongest arguments that critics of Critical Discourse Analysis have brought forward against discourse analysts who base their conclusions on their own interpretations, regarding the impact of media discourse on audiences (Fairclough, 1996; Widdowson, 1995). Critical Discourse Analysis practitioners are the first to acknowledge that different readers might read similar texts differently (Fairclough, 1995b). In a similar vein, Van Dijk (1993) states that

media recipients [are] active, and up to a point independent, information users" and they may form interpretations and opinions of news reports different from those the newspaper projected or implied (p. 242).

This seems to indicate that it is not possible to say how people read and interpret a news report for instance. Fairclough (1995b) therefore concludes that:

It strikes me as self-evident that although readings may vary, any reading is a

product of an interface between the properties of the text and the interpretative resources and practices which the interpreter brings to bear upon the text. The range of potential interpretations will be constrained and delimited according to the nature of the text. (p. 16)

Fairclough' s Critical Discourse Analysis is very instrumental in approaching this research work. It will help to appropriately analyse discourses and conversations between or among characters in the selected movies. Semiotic and linguistic interpretations of these discourses will help to illustrate how homosexuality is linguistically portrayed in the movies. Most importantly, how the idea of gay homosexuality is portrayed as an ' Other' will be analysed while showing and identifying linguistic signifiers that point at this. Also, the conversations will be analysed in relation to the social context.

2.3 Conclusion

In conclusion, this chapter has been concerned with an in-depth review of relevant literature and theoretical framework employed for the purpose of the research work. While reviewing relevant literature, topical issues like sex, sexuality and masculinity was examined. African experience and perspective of masculinity was also reviewed. All these are aimed towards the understanding of homosexuality in Africa and its relationship with the theory of masculinity, particularly the traditional expectation of masculinity. Homosexuality and its representation in Africa and in Nollywood movies were also explored in consideration of its 'un-Africanness' and 'Otherness'. There was also an examination of language and its role in framing social realities. This chapter also afforded the opportunity to critically discuss Raewynn Connell' s Theory of Masculinity and Norman Fairclough' s Critical Discourse Analysis which constitute the theoretical framework on which the research hinges.

CHAPTER THREE

METHODOLOGICAL DETAILS

3.0 Introduction

This chapter explains the methodological details for the accomplishment of the present study. It also serves as a backdrop for the analyses conducted in Chapter Four as it provides essential theoretical details, that is, methods and principles, useful for such analyses. Furthermore, the data collection and analytical technique are further explained and justified in this chapter.

3.1. Methodological Details – Research Design, Data Collection and Analytical Techniques

This research centres on the exploration and discussion of the discursive portrayal and representation of queer sexuality in homosexuality-themed Nollywood movies. Consequently, the need to identify linguistic signifiers of homosexuality and how its ‘Otherness’ is constructed becomes a necessity. This research is therefore designed to carefully explore homosexuality-themed Nollywood movies and linguistic signifiers that point to homosexuality as an ‘Other’. Data for the study were from two purposively selected Nollywood movies. These are *Gay Pastors* and *My Husband is Gay*.

The significance of the study lies in its linguistic approach to the description and analysis of the portrayal of homosexuality in Nollywood productions. The major concern is the exploration of the role and implication of language in the representation of homosexuality in the selected movies. The linguistic analysis follows the dictates of the Critical Discourse Analysis. This involves the critical analysis of conversations, texts and communication in the movies as these constitute the linguistic signifiers of homosexuality. Critical Discourse Analysis involves two major levels: micro level and macro level. At the micro level, the rank scale will be

examined. Consequently, words, phrases, clauses, and sentences form the focus. However for the present study, kinesics (which is represented in the analysis through images) are identified and integrated in the analysis. These linguistic items and graphic representations are carefully examined for their roles and functions on the representation of homosexuality. The centrality of language to the study is hinged on the realisation that language and its non-linguistic signifiers are tools through which the society and its concerns can be understood and explained.

In addition, the linguistic analysis will be conducted at the macro level. Here, the ideological implications of homosexuality as portrayed by these movies are identified and discussed, particularly in relation to existing commonplace perceptions in the Nigerian society. The existing perception and belief strongly influences the behaviour of people and the way the movies are scripted, enacted and viewed. Furthermore, the macro level analysis provides a connection with the implications of the analysis conducted in the micro level. It can therefore be inferred that the macro level analyses will help understand the place of people's different ideologies in framing the idea of homosexuality being considered as an 'Other' and its implications. These representations will be identified and categorised to discern acceptance or rejection of the act as presented in the selected movies. Invariably, these will help in achieving the third objective of the research work which is to discuss the implications of the identified signifiers to the treatment of homosexuality in the Nigerian public space.

The analyses from Critical Discourse Analysis are complemented with dictates from masculinity. Consequently, instances of deviance from its norms and expectations are identified for illustration. This also means that gay characters will be evaluated in consideration with their actions, discourse, gestures and other linguistic expressions. In addition, images portraying these are analysed to aid conclusions reached from the linguistic analysis.

3.2. Justification of Methodology

Critical Discourse Analysis is a linguistic field concerned with the analysis of texts or spoken discourse with the purpose of revealing and illustrating social elements like power, dominance, bias and inequality. It also deals with the macro and micro levels of sociological and linguistic studies. One of its major proponents, Fairclough (1995) asserts that it is meant to:

systematically explore often opaque relationships of causality and determination between (a) discursive practices, events and texts, and (b) wider social and cultural structures, relations and processes; to investigate how such practices, events and texts arise out of and are ideologically shaped by relations of power and struggles over power; and to explore how the opacity of these relationships between discourse and society is itself a factor securing power and hegemony (pp. 132-133).

Therefore, when proper consideration is made to the fact that this methodology is not only concerned with the events and texts alone, but also with the society extensively, Critical Discourse Analysis becomes the most helpful method for the analysis of data. Homosexuality is not just a sexual orientation in Nigeria; it is also a touchy and controversial topic in the country. Through the tools of Critical Discourse Analysis, linguistic signifiers of the otherness of homosexuality can be identified. The examination of the micro and macro levels provides insight to the perception of homosexuality and the ideological implications of such perceptions.

Furthermore, Connell's Theory of Masculinity is used to complement the linguistic analysis. The theory is employed in the analysis of characters, characterisation, societal expectations and judgment on gay characters. The combination of these theories is expected to strengthen the analysis of data and ensure that a detailed analysis is conducted.

3.3. Conclusion

This chapter has provided information on the methodological details for subsequent analysis. It has carefully explained the data collection and data analysis techniques and also justified their adoption.

CHAPTER FOUR

PRESENTATION AND DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS

4.0 Introduction

This chapter presents, analyzes and discusses findings of the research. The tenets of Critical Discourse Analyses and Connell' s Theory of Masculinity are employed in the analysis of requisite data. More specifically, the focus will be on micro and macro analyses, kinesics, features and illustrations of masculinity, comparative discussions, etc. as represented in the videos selected for analysis. As earlier mentioned, *My Husband is Gay*, which is concluded by *My Reality* and *Gay Pastors* are the case studies. These are expected to illustrate the linguistic portrayal of ' Otherness' in selected Nigerian homosexuality-themed movies. Therefore, linguistic signifiers which contribute to this and their roles will also be examined.

4.1. Systematic Presentation and Discussion of Findings

4.1.0 General Overview of Selected Movies

The title ' My Husband is Gay' suggests two contrasting ideas. ' Husband' denotes heterosexuality and hetero-normativity. The title is given to a man whom a woman is married to, that is, the idea of a straight man forming matrimony with a straight woman in marriage. As oppose this, ' gay' is a term used to refer to a person– especially a man– who is attracted sexually to people of the same sex. This means that its very essence implies a sexual relationship between two men. Using ' husband' which connotes ' heterosexuality' and ' gay' which connotes ' homosexuality' is contrasting in the same sentence.

The title of the movie foreshadows realisations in the movie. There seems to be an established problem because there is a contradiction of ideas. Viewers already have a mindset

from the title that it appears a homosexual man is in a heterosexual relationship. How? When? What happens after this? are questions viewers subsequently expect answers to. This same thing recurs in the title ‘ Gay Pastors’ . ‘ Pastors’ are widely expected to be religious, holy and moral Christians. Because of this, pastors are expected to kick against irreligious’ acts like homosexuality and also not be one. In fact, pastors are expected to promote heterosexuality and discourage homosexuality rather than being gay themselves. It therefore becomes a ‘ shocker’ to have ‘ Gay Pastors’ .

My Husband is Gay is an inconclusive movie completed by *My Reality*. It is a story centered on the lives of three married men who are business associates and old time friends within and outside marriage. Bruno and Sly are heterosexual while Bright is homosexual. Bruno is married to Maya but is involved in extra-marital with Samantha who is bent on making him leave his wife. As a result of this, he continually pressures and maltreats his wife in an attempt to frustrate and pressure her out of the marriage, not minding the fact that they have a teenage son together. He is a typical example of a man who believes in societal expectations from a man and what a man should be. As a result of this, he controls his wife and mans over the home. Sly is married to Maya and also picks up girls from clubs for sex. However, he does not maltreat his wife or let his extramarital affairs affect his home as he knows when to stop. On the other hand, Bright is married to Valery who already has two children for him. Like his friends, he also picks up girls from clubs whenever they are out. However, it is later discovered that he keeps up appearances for public eyes and to hide the fact that he is gay from his friends and the general public. So, he picks up girls and takes them to hotel rooms to satisfy societal expectations but pays them off handsomely without touching them and later calls up his partner. For most parts of the movie, the partner he usually calls up remains anonymous to viewers who would also think is

a lady. It is therefore shocking at the end when it is discovered that it is actually a man he refers to as ‘ baby, you can come over’ whenever he calls. The idea of keeping this a secret from viewers, his friends, and the general public symbolises how the society views homosexuality. There was even a scene where he collects the girl’ s number after paying her off knowing fully well that he does not even intend to use it. Of course, the normal expectation at that point is that he should be interested in a woman and if he does not have his ways with her at first, then he should try to keep contact so as to do so another time. For the purpose of ‘ obligations’ , he fulfills this and later does what he truly fancies. Those who were cheating on their spouses with ladies did not make it so secretive. Sly even takes his lovers out on dates while Bruno makes it so obvious. Keeping his gay partner a secret therefore shows how much the society is against homosexuality. Consequently, the society seems to imply that cheating on one’ s spouse varies. If it is with an opposite sex, it is normative and would be handled as such, but if it is with the same sex, then it is totally outrageous and completely frowned at.

My Reality is a continuation and completion of *My Husband is Gay*. It is incorporated into the analysis because it completes the identifications established in *My Husband is Gay*. The movie illustrates how Bruno, Sly and Bright try to make up for their ‘ mistakes’ while trying to keep their various families intact since they consider it to be their ‘ reality’ . Sly’ s wife, Maya, makes sure to punish him and make him jealous enough while he continually pleads for her forgiveness. At the end, he is forgiven on the conditions that he would never repeat such a mistake again and he would set up a family reunion where they would start afresh. For Bruno and Andrey’ s family, things are more complex with another woman – Samantha- in the picture. Bruno promises Samantha marriage and asks her to start wedding preparations since he has stolen Andrey’ s ring in a bid to blackmail her into divorcing him. After meeting with Samantha,

Andrey still continues to beg as Bruno continually shows off his masculine prowess and ability to use and dump any lady, even his wife. However, supernatural and spiritual forces are portrayed to be at work in their marriage. Andrey, who the movie characterizes as a prayer warrior, is constantly helped by the ghost of her gateman's brother who she helped financially before his death. This ghost helps her on several occasions like fixing her car and finding her ring back, much to Bruno's shock. Also, Samantha is revealed to be under a demonic spell and in possession of a charm which she believes to be helping her with Bruno even though Bruno's actions are completely voluntary. At the end, Bruno is touched by Andrey's strives for the marriage and he suddenly realises how badly he mistreated her. He apologizes and is immediately forgiven. After this, he cuts ties with Samantha and pleads for her to leave him alone. Samantha is 'delivered' by a pastor so that she can be free to prosper independently. They also reunite in the party Sly threw. However, Bright who is supposed to be most remorseful keeps exercising masculinity over Valery and still keeps contact with his gay partner. When the situation starts affecting his children, he starts to seek for Valery's forgiveness so as to save the family. This does not change his gayness until he suddenly receives a gospel tract on his way to see his gay partner. After this, he seeks for 'help' concerning his situation and visits the church for 'deliverance'. They also reunite after this as shown in Sly's party.

Ultimately, these movies paint the picture of three typical Nigerian homes. The issue of sexuality is introduced in the description, conception and differentiation of homosexuality as an 'Other' from heterosexuality as a norm. Although all three cheat on their wives – particularly Bruno who goes far in his extra-marital affair, situation in Bright's home is still strange and different. This is in terms of his wife's reaction, his behavior towards his inactions and his medium of turning from his sexuality and gayness.

Actions in *Gay Pastors* relate to these movies in its depiction of sociological and religious perceptions about homosexuality. The movie explores the lives of two pastors; pastor Chima and pastor David. The latter is portrayed as the true pastor even though he experiences hardship financially and business-wise, while the former is a gay pastor who involves himself in shady and cultic businesses. Pastor Chima's gayness and initiation of different young men, including Ben who is eventually saved and Paul, pastor David's brother, is portrayed as destructive and demonic. Sleeping with them is what he uses to attain power and their destinies. He does not stop there. He spiritually manipulates many of them into the act thereby indicating homosexuality there as non-consensual but rather forced. Like in the case of Paul, he uses Mabel, Paul's wife, to get to him when the latter comes to tell him her problems with her brother-in-law and his constant requests for money from her husband. Even though her husband had initially explained how indebted he is to his brother, pastor David, for training him and being a parent to him, she Mabel still meets Chima for help and prayers on separating her husband from his brother because his needs became consistent and uncomfortable. Eventually, pastor Chima and Paul become gay partners after the former manipulates things spiritually. He also exploits Paul financially at regular occasions. At such, Paul begins to maltreat his wife, turns his back completely against pastor David who trained him till he became successful and is completely buried into his new found 'love'. On several occasions, Chima and David battle spiritually till David emerged victorious. Mabel finds out from Celine that her husband is with pastor Chima and she finds out that it is true. She is met with an accident where she loses her pregnancy. She turns to pastor David for forgiveness and help in delivering her husband. One of Chima's victims, Ben also meets with a divine encounter when he is given a second chance at the gate of hell. He is converted by a member of David's church and counseled by David in God's path.

At the end, Chima's 'initiates' are prayerfully delivered in vigorous prayer sessions. Their eyes are opened' and they realize how wrong they were and how Chima held them in bondage. Chima is also arrested by policemen for all his atrocities. Thus, homosexuality is symbolized as demonic, sinful and abnormal (an 'Other').

4.1.1 Lexis as Tool for 'Othering' Homosexuality

Several words are used to portray and imply the idea of homosexuality being an 'Other' in the course of the movies. Firstly, *My Husband is Gay* illustrates the character of Bright and Johnny, his gay partner. Bright is a very successful business man who has a happy home despite his homosexual extramarital affair. This of course continues till Valery, his wife, finds out about this. The following conversation ensues after Valery finds him with another man:

Bright: Valery, seriously, it's not what you think.

Valery: I don't want to think or imagine anything! What I saw in the hotel is enough!

Bright! You, **gay**? You **disgust** me! You disgust me! God!

(He tries to touch her)

Don't touch me you **pervert**. How do you feel? Tell me how do you feel when you make out with your fellow man? Tell me, how do you feel?!

Answer me!

Bright: (Bows his head and says) The feeling is **unexplainable**.

Valery: (She sits in frustration)

Bright: It was two years ago. I was **lured** into it.

Valery: Who else knows?

Bright: **No one** except my gay partner. Valery please I beg you, **don't tell** Andrea or Maya or anyone else. Please.

Valery: Why? You are now **ashamed** of what you have become? You are **gay! A fruit-juice**. That' s what you are. Come out of your **closet**, okay? That' s what you have chosen to be.

Bright: Bring it down. Bring it down. Camsy and Amma might just hear you or even the neighbours.

Valery: That' s the point! I want them to know. Not only about the **pervert** they have as a dad but I' ll also make it **public!**

Bright: Valery, please, forgive me. Don' t let this destroy our home. I still love you.

Valery: What home? What home? The same home you have done your best to destroy? There is nothing left here than **trash**, trash!

Foregrounded words which have been represented in bold forms are instrumental in the linguistic analysis of how homosexuality is viewed by Valery and also the society at large. The idea of its ' Otherness' is also established. Through these words, it is realized that there is a negative thought attributed to homosexuality by the society. Upon discovering her husband' s sexuality, Valery calls him various names, some of which people call homosexuals. She describes him as a pervert, gay and fruit-juice. A pervert is someone whose sexual interest is regarded as unnatural and unacceptable. Using this to describe Bright definitely explicates the castigation of his sexual interest which is considered as unnatural and unacceptable. Something that is unnatural is considered fake and different from what one would normally expect as the way something is supposed to be. Therefore, being a pervert which is now used to signify a homosexual is unnatural, an ' Other', which is unacceptable. Unacceptability is attributed to the society here. She also metaphorically calls him a ' fruit-juice. Just like the intercourse between homosexual men, a fruit juice is poked before drinking. Referring to their sex life in this imagery is used to relatively create a nasty picture of the intercourse between men. All these and more contribute to why she says he ' disgusts' her. A feeling of disgust is likened to that of irritation and

disapproval due to something unpleasant and that which can even make a person puke. The use of the word ‘disgust’ here in its verb form is used to describe the extremity of Valery’s view of the act. This, by extension, portrays what the society also thinks.

Furthermore, their conversation portrays how homosexuality is a thing of the closet in the society and should not be made public due to the shame it brings. Of all the questions Valery could ask, the first which came to her mind was ‘who else knows?’ Bright in turn affirms that his gay partner is the only one aware. This means that his close friends or even family members are not aware of this essential part of his life -his sexuality- because it is not acceptable in the society. Valery shouts at him to come out of his ‘closet’ even though she understands and aids him in keeping it a secret because she realizes that it must not become public. Although ‘closet’ is not repetitively realized in their exchange, actions and words surrounding its usage emphasise the categorization of homosexuality as a thing of the closet and should remain secret since the society frowns at it. Due to this, Bright further employs her not to tell anyone, not even her close friends, and to also reduce her voice so that their children or neighbours do not hear their conversation. Of course, she acts like she does not care about this but she actually does. This is shown when she already sends everyone out of the house before she converses with her husband, thereby certifying that she also feels that such conversation should be secret. Viewers know that she cannot make anything out of her threat of making it public because she already showed that she considers it a shameful act that should best be kept secret. Her level of ‘disgust’ is further established as she considers their home as ‘trash’ after his act. A trash is a garbage that is, something that should be thrown away or disposed of. Calling their home trash is a little extreme, but considering the fact that she already regards homosexuality as a thing of disgust and dirt because of its otherness, her attribution of their home as trash can be understood.

However, Bright poses as a confusing character because of his diverse contradictory utterances. After he was caught by his wife with Johnny, instead of going after her, he does not. He rather stayed back to appease his gay partner, thereby signaling his preference. This further indicates why he describes his feelings as ‘ unexplainable’ in the positive sense of expressing his satisfaction. After all this, he still blamed on being lured into the act and claimed that he still loved his wife. He further considers his home as his ‘ reality’ . While advising Bruno, he suggests him putting ‘ Samantha in her proper place and come back to your **reality**’ . From this, he considers their wives as their reality. However, the meaning of ‘ reality’ for him is subject to examination. The question becomes if his heterosexual marriage is his reality or his homosexual preference. If he claims to love his wife, then what happens to his nature and preference he has in fellow men? The seeming answer to this puzzle could be the societal expectation of what a man should be like. At some point in the lives of homosexuals, they have to fulfill societal obligations by going into a heterosexual relationship, even if they do not wish to. For Bright, his reality is who he is- a homosexual. But, the reality of the society, just like his friends, is the approval of heterosexual relationships. So, rather than being true to himself, he opts for societal demand. This could be owing to the avoidance of shame, discrimination and even legal actions in such a country that legally forbids the act and attributes punishments to it.

The act of ‘ Othering’ homosexuality through words still comes into the picture in *My Reality*. After Valery’ s realisation of her husband’ s sexuality, she begins to stay out often. On one of such occasions after Bright enquires about her movements, she says:

what are you doing at home at this time of the night? Are you not supposed to be out with your “ **G-Partner**” ?

The use of **G-Partner** here symbolises ‘ Othering’ . She encodes the hidden meaning of the word than call it in full because it is considered to be despicable and should be unheard of. If it were to be another lady in the picture, she would easily have mentioned it as such. After this she regards her husband as a **shameless** and **disgusting fool**. These choices of words are symbolic. Attributing Bright as ‘ shameless’ means homosexuality is a thing of shame according to her. This is probably a major reason why gay men try as much as possible to hide their sexuality from others since they consider it to be shameful while homosexuality is not and a normal thing. Her referral to him as ‘ disgusting’ also symbolises how irritatingly she considers homosexuality. She feels that it is irritating and disgusting unlike homosexuality. Hence, he is tagged a fool because only a fool chooses a wrong option out of ignorance or any other factor. These views are extensively societal views because through the character of Valery, viewers are made the see and understand societal perspectives.

In *Gay Pastors*, Mabel’ s words are symbolic also. She says this upon losing her baby after discovering her husband’ s affair with pastor Chima:

Mabel: If I should go the police and report, my husband will be **implicated**. I still love him despite all that has **afflicted** us. You see, he is not the one doing the things that he has been doing. I think that all that is needed now is prayers and I believe that God will turn things around for my good.

From her statement, homosexuality is discovered to be a form of ‘ implication’ . It is something that should be hidden from the law because it is not accepted. If her husband had been with a woman, she would not have regarded it has an implicative’ act. This shows how the law ‘ Others’ homosexuality and supports heterosexuality alone, either it is an affair or not. Also, she regards homosexuality as an affliction’ here. Affliction is something which causes pain, suffering and agony. Judging from her lexis, it can therefore be implied that with homosexuality

comes pain and agony. It causes bitterness and pain that cannot be compared with heterosexuality which could have probably only caused jealousy, fights and annoyance, and not the level of pain regarded as affliction by her.

4.1.2 Sentential Constructs and its Depiction of Homosexuality as an ‘ Other’

Sentences are essential parts of a discourse since they make up the diction of an actor. Sentences are constructed in ways that suit and represent the exact feeling or innate emotions of a speaker. In critical instances like that of sexuality, sentences are made up of words carefully chosen by a speaker to portray feelings ranging from positive to negative and assert the speaker’ s stand on the matter. In this part of the essay, sentential constructs of actors in the selected movies will be examined to depict how homosexuality is viewed and eventually ‘ Othered’ in the movies.

After he was caught, Bright seems to already know what Valery was thinking and so tries to correct it by saying: ‘ **It’ s not what you think’** . Although this line is a popular line people caught in the act first utter, he later tries to justify his feeling as he describes it as ‘ unexplainable’ ; he says it in the positive light of the satisfaction he derives from it which of course cannot be understood by his wife who stands in condemnation of the act. He therefore begs her to ‘ bring it down’ so that people do not hear her talk. Begging her to bring her voice down here means people should not hear such a private and ‘ secret’ conversation, therefore implying the place of such conversation in the society. If they were to be arguing about an affair with a woman, he might not have begged her to talk gently, but considering the fact that the subject for argument here is a gay figure, it should be quietly mentioned because it is unheard of in the society.

On the other hand, Johnny, his gay partner, is portrayed in the typical homosexual sense. He is a young man who has an average job as an attendant in a hotel and also schools. Unlike Bright, he is not in any committed relationship other than that which he has with Bright. At first, he was portrayed as a fun-loving type of person like Samantha, Bruno's lover, who was with Bruno for his money and for the adventure of dating a married man and breaking up a home. He wore expensive clothes and jewelries and also drove a fancy car. With this, viewers are first made to believe that he was in the relationship for the benefits since Bright was a very successful man who promised to take very good care of him. But, his reaction upon discovering that Bright had a wife made viewers understand that he is a typical homosexual who has feelings just like when a man and a woman are in a relationship. He also gets hurt and is jealous. He ignores even luxury because of this. As oppose this, Samantha's love for Bruno was described as 'sick, destructive and despicable'. It therefore appears that Johnny's feelings for Bright was genuine unlike the normal heterosexual relationship of Bruno where Samantha's feelings were a complete pretence. However, the society still accepts this than that of Johnny simply because it is an 'Other'. After Valery storms out, Bright returns to Johnny and the following conversation ensues between them:

Bright: Babes, it's something I can handle.

Johnny: Wait wait wait, don't tell me you have someone else.

Bright: It's something I can handle, alright? The most important thing is that I am here to take good care of you...

Johnny: You have not answered my question.

Bright: I can handle it, like I said before, I want to take you to Dubai, you know, buy you clothes...

Johnny: You know what? I think it' s time for me to go.

Bright: Babe, why? Do you want to drink?

Johnny: No, I' m okay.

From the conversation above, it is evident that Johnny is not in the relationship for me money and other benefits, but rather, he is being true to his feelings. Despite Bright' s cajoling, he still stands his ground. From his utterances like: **don' t tell me you have someone else'** , viewers understand that he is jealous and does not like to share. His hurt is further expressed as he leaves unhappily.

Furthermore, he also keeps their relationship a secret despite his complete gayness. When his friends discovered the exotic and expensive life he was living, they continually probe him on where he gets all the money he spends from. His excuse was that ' e get one of my bros wey dey Yankee, na him dey send me all these money wey I dey use tush myself' . This lie is better told because the truth is something that would raise different negative opinions from people. So, the lie is accepted by people rather the shameful truth which would cause criticisms and discrimination.

In Valery' s grief about her husband' s sexuality in *My Reality*, she has the following to say to him:

You destroyed me and my self-esteem... you ruined the chances of us having a wonderful marriage. You hurt me in the worst possible way...do you know what you made me feel? You made me lose my self-confidence. Of all people, gay! What happened to all the several ladies out there? Ah! You decide to go after men?!

Through her sentences, the way she others homosexuality are clearly illustrated. She first highlights how badly her husband' s sexuality makes her feel about herself. Being a woman

initially made her feel loved and sexually wanted and needed by her husband. Unfortunately, the realization of his sexuality makes her know that she has never been as sexually appealing to her husband as she thought she was. He however must have just objectified her as a means of fulfilling societal expectations and responsibilities and also have kids of his own. These make her feel less confident in herself and her esteem. ‘ **You hurt me in the worst possible way** indicates homosexuality to be the very worst a man can do to hurt a woman. It is like saying having a husband cheat on you is enough, but the rival been a man is simply preposterous. Her hurt thrives in the fact that her husband considers something shameless and unimaginable more appealing than her. Valery reasons out that nothing could be worse than homosexuality because it is not even an option- an ‘ Other’ . This is confirmed when she says: **Of all people, gay! What happened to all the several girls out there? Ah! You decide to go after men?!** These statements ultimately stamp the ‘ Otherness’ of homosexuality. Having her husband cheat on her with a fellow lady is understandable, approachable and forgivable, but an opposite sex is not just it. She even implies that homosexuals are not part of the normal group of people by saying ‘Of all people, gay!’ It is like gays are sub-group and not listed on the normal group. Suggesting ‘ all the several girls out there’ shows that heterosexuality is the normal thing even if it is extra-marital and hurtful. However, to her, the hurt from her husband’ s homosexuality is deeper than if he had been discovered with a fellow woman. So, her actions lacked direction because it was strange to her and she did not know how to handle it. This is unlike Maya who sets out to punish her husband and also deny him the sexual activities she knows he is into, or Andrey who seeks to plead with Samantha to leave her husband alone.

These reactions are the same when Mabel finds out from her sister that her husband is gay in *Gay Pastors*. She finds it very difficult to believe unlike she would have if the latter had

reported him cheating on her with another lady. She finds it more difficult to imagine this because the person who is allegedly sleeping with her husband is her male pastor who she confides in regularly. And as expected, a pastor should not be of such ‘ misbehavior’ . This is shown in the discourse below:

Celine: Pastor Chima and your husband are gay.

Rose: What! Sister Celine, how could you accuse my husband and pastor Chima **in such a manner?**

Celine: I know what I saw.

Rose: No! despite the fact that you are my elder sister, it does not warrant you to say **such a thing** about my husband. Mabel, I am a psychologist and I predict what I see...

In the discourse above, the expressions in bold are used to emphasize the ‘ Otherness’ of homosexuality. Realisations like ‘ such a thing’ and ‘ such a manner’ indicate the act of homosexuality as unspeakable, unthinkable and awful to hear or mention.

4.1.3 Graphic and Non-Verbal Linguistic Analysis of Homosexual and Heterosexual Relations

Graphic and non-verbal linguistic analysis deals with the examination of non-vocal features in the communication. Broadly, there are two categories of communication which include verbal and non-verbal means of communication. Graphic and non-verbal analysis looks into ways through which actors pass or emphasize messages to the audience without necessarily speaking. This can be done through their countenance in pictures, their gesticulations and other non-verbal expressions. There is usually a message behind all of these actions. And so, these messages are examined in this part of the essay.

As a result of the laid down regulations for film makers and broadcasters which prohibit them from enacting any homosexual or any other related LGBT scenes on stage, viewers are not shown the act of sexual relations between two gay partners but are rather presented with imageries and gestures that suggest such between the two only to be further imagined by the viewer. However, heterosexual relations between men and women are popularly shown in movies without criticisms even though they are not any less immoral. The only difference here is the fact that homosexuality is portrayed as an ‘ Other’ which is discouraged as much as possible and therefore often acted to further detail the evils of the act. Several images, figures and body languages are captured below to further explicate the way homosexuality is practically portrayed as an ‘ Other’ in the movie.



Figure 1. Taken from *My Husband is Gay*



Figure 2. Taken from *My Husband is Gay*

Figures 1 and 2 show how Bright views ladies. Figure 1 shows him with an indifferent look on face while addressing his own wife. Normally, it is expected that if a man is addressing a wife who he is supposed to love, his eyes would speak of his admiration and love for her. However, Bright’ s outlook here seems indifferent and devoid of any emotion. Figure 2 however is

somewhat different. The scene captured here is where he is out with his friends in a club and Samantha walks in. Bruno has been expressive about her ‘ physical features and endowment’ and so when she walks in, he puts on a pretentious look of lust for her backside for the purpose of public eyes and his friends. It is obvious to viewers that this look is pretentious when it differs from that which he puts up with his gay partner, Johnny in the images below:



Figure 3. Taken from *My Husband is Gay*



Figure 4. Taken from *My Husband is Gay*

Figure 3 shows Bright’ s joyful look while speaking to Johnny on phone. Even without seeing his gay partner, he appears like a lovestruck teenage boy speaking to a just-found love. This look was never seen on him even when he was with his wife or close friends. However, the thought of having Johnny over as he called him filled him with so much joy, such that it was evident on his face. A similar look is captured in figure 4 while he was with Johnny in bed. He wore a look of love and admiration even as they conversed. These emotions were only portrayed by Bright only when they were in the confines of their hotel room due to the otherness of such emotions in the public. Although Sly was also engaged in extramarital affairs, he does not hesitate to make it public even as he goes on a date with his love in a public area in the image below:



Figure 5. Taken from *My Husband is Gay*

Therefore, the only reason which stops Bright from making his extramarital affair with Johnny public like Sly is because of its deviation from societal norm and tradition. Such would have been discriminated against in public and would have caused several problems which they thought were best avoided.

Furthermore, the observation of female reactions to the knowledge of the bi/homosexual orientations of their spouses revealed interesting/noteworthy findings. For example, valery expressed varied reactions emanating from the discovery of her husband' s extra-marital affair.. Originally, when she heard of her husband' s frivolities, she assumed she would be dealing with a woman and so faced her first victim as such, but her reactions were very minimal when compared to when she discovered she was being replaced by a man.



Figure 6. Taken from *My Husband is Gay*



Figure 7. Taken from *My Husband is Gay*

Figure 6 shows Maya regarding her ‘ rival’ in a moderate manner. She starts to insult her at first, but later proceeds inside to face her husband. Upon seeing another man in his bed, she is entirely shocked and short of words in Figure 7. Knowing what to say and not knowing what to in the two figures portray normativity of heterosexuality from the ‘ Otherness’ of homosexuality. If it were to be a lady she met, she already knew how to treat such since many men already cheated on their wives with other women. This asserts the inherent normality of heterosexuality even in the face of serial marital infidelities in the Nigerian society. However, when Maya catches a man with her husband, she goes through quite a number of mixed feelings, indicative of her unpreparedness to mentally accept and believe that her man could engage in such sexual relations.



Figure 8. Taken from *My Husband is Gay*

Figure 9. Taken from *My Husband is Gay*

After gathering her thoughts at home, she faces Bright with a look of utter disgust and irritation as she calls him names and insults his personality and sexuality. Her portrayal here symbolises the extent to which the society frowns at homosexuality. When compared to the time she thought it was a woman, she did not appear so disgusted and irritated. She only looked hurt and annoyed. The extremity in her looks signals the kinds of words that came out of her mouth. Even though they had been married for some years and she claims to love him, these do not hinder the fact she thought of him in the worst sense after discovering his sexuality. This indicates how much more discrimination Bright would have faced if it were to be public who judged him, considering the fact that they do not know him or hardly know like his wife does. Mabel's reaction in *Gay Pastors* is also similar as shown below:



Figure 10: From *Gay Pastors*



Figure 11: From *Gay Pastors*

This image shows her shock and hurt feelings. She takes it so badly, such that she leaves lightheaded till she is hit by a car outside with her heavy pregnancy. This emphasises the destructive nature of homosexuality which the movie portrays.

In *My Reality*, it takes a longer time for Valery to forgive her homosexual husband. She continually expresses disdain and irritation towards him as shown in the image below:



Figure 12: From *My Reality*

Here, she still expresses wonder at his acts as her husband also does not know how to approach or plead with her. He is still also turn between his sexuality and his reality which he considers as his family. At this time, he is yet to ‘meet with Christ’ or ‘receive deliverance from homosexuality’ . He stills calls his gay partner and exchanges love messages with him as shown in their countenances below:



Figure 13: From *My Reality*

Figure 14: From *My Reality*

Figure 15: From *My Reality*

4.1.4 Effeminizing Gay Characters: A Discussion of Ideological Constructs of Language

In discussing the relationship between language use and gender, Cameron (1997) asserts that:

Traditionally, it was believed that one's way of speaking is a result of one's identity, but postmodernist approach reversed this theory to suggest that the way we talk is a part of identity formation, specifically suggesting that gender identity is variable and not fixed. (p. 47)

While Cameron (2003) further explicates that there was a movement from language being a result of identity to it being a reflection of shared identity and also to create sexual or gender identities. Gay speech has stereotypically been thought of as a copy or imitation of women's speech traits. Kulick (2000) opines also that it is not often portrayed as positive or indicative of a neutral identification of gay with women rather imitating women's speech has often been judged as derogatory and as trivializing women folk. He further considers the role of sexuality in sexual identity, unlike some lavender linguists who neglect sexuality because of linguistic features that might legitimize gay identity than sexuality. Several speech pathologists and lavender linguists have tried to identify specific ways in which gay men speak. This is the more reason why Travis (1975) concludes that gay speech has:

a consistently high-pitched voice in the late adolescent and adult male is one of the most distressing of voice defects. The resemblance to the female voice suggests a lack of masculinity. (p. 67)

My Husband is Gay and *My Reality* only portray Bright and Johnny as gay partners. Their relationship is however structured owing to various reasons. Bright is the man in the relationship probably because he is older and more experienced. He provides Johnny money for upkeep and

lavishes him with frivolities so that he can be a ‘ man’ in the society. He also controls their relationship affairs. This is similar to the heterosexual setting which comprises a man and a woman. Most often, the man heads the relationship and proves his masculinity by taking care of his woman. This role is adequately fulfilled by Bright. The difference is just that Johnny cannot speak out the truth about the source of his money and luxury whereas a lady can still brag about her man providing her needs. All through the movies, he is no way effeminate as he expresses masculinity both in his homosexual and heterosexual affairs. Once, he broke his wife’ s phone in a bid to demonstrate his masculinity and ‘ remind her who calls the shots’ . He demanded the password to her phone when he never let know his own password for once. Her refusal earns her a broken phone. At first, he claimed to have been ‘ lured’ into the act but then again, traces of this claim are not seen all through the movies. He seems to be totally in control of his actions as he acts upon his own volition. He is even in the man in the relationship. Initially, as he was begging his wife, he was also promising his gay partner at the same time:

I’ m trying to settle the situation in my home. But, I promise you I’ ll come around soon. Okay?

This shows clearly that Johnny is not influencing, manipulating or forcing him into the act. He is the one who calls the shot in the relationship.

On the other hand, Johnny is like the lady in the relationship. He subjects and submits to Bright in the relationship. However, he does not physically act effeminate but his actions and diction implies his effeminacy. This physical factor contradicts Travis and Cameron’ s views on gays because of the situational and physical context of the movie. Nigeria, as earlier mentioned, frowns at and ‘ Others’ homosexuality. This is to the extent that it attracts legally punishable penalties. As a result of this, gay men keep to their closets and so, they mask masculinity to keep

up with the façade. This is the characterization of Johnny in the movies. His physical composition like manner of speaking, dressing, walking, and so on, expresses masculinity. However, he expresses behaviours that are typical of women in the society. Firstly, he is the jealous type. Upon discovering that Bright is married, he is jealous and angry towards Bright, thereby refusing any attention or gift from the latter. However, he is also sensitive and understanding. During his period of estrangement from Bright, he calls to let Bright know he misses him and will love to see him. When the latter responds by saying he wanted to settle family issues first, he understands with him and does not argue. This sense of ‘selflessness’ is opposite to Samantha’s selfish and wicked ways of trying to get Bruno to marry her despite Andrey’s pleas to her. She is less feminine in her disposition and behaves contrary to Johnny’s ways. It is like a behavioural swap. Samantha who was supposed to express care, true love, selflessness, understanding and feelings was the complete opposite as Johnny seemed to display all of these feminine attributes. On the long run, the main reason for Johnny’s sexuality is not known. Viewers do not know if it is for the money or for the feelings. But, it is obvious and certain that his actions are voluntary and not forced or manipulated even though he pretends and lies to his friends about his belongings and sexuality. In order to save their ‘image’, all through till the end of the movies, only Valery knew about them.

Ben, Chima’s gay partner, is also effeminized in *Gay Pastors*. He grows emotional attached to Chima and so becomes really angry when he finds him with another partner just like a lady is expected to do. He leaves the room hurt and angry. Pastor Chima also controls his relationship with Paul as the latter stands as the ‘lady’ in the relationship. He listens and succumbs to Chima’s dictates. He even acts love-stricken while they converse on phone or are together. All these portray ways through which movies effeminise gay characters. When their

physical features do not portray their gayness, their actions will. As a psychologist, Celine in *Gay Pastors* immediately interprets the connection between pastor Chima and Paul even though she did not catch them in the act.

Furthermore, it has been discovered that these ideological constructs are not applicable to all gay men. In cases where they have to keep their identities a secret just like the case of *My Husband is Gay* and *My Reality* they often maintain masculine voice and speech pattern which have widely been regarded as more forceful and authoritative in sound. Therefore, Rudolf Gaudio's social perception experiment analyzed the acoustics of what a male's speech should be like and a listener's perception of it. Though the experiment did not really point out what exactly makes up gay male speech, it however showed variations in intonation and pitch which affect the judgment of men's speech as either 'gay' or 'straight'. For example, Johnny's intonation and pitch while speaking to friends differed from when he was with his gay partner. The following was the way he spoke while with friends:

Johnny: So you feel say na the money wey them dey pay us I dey use tush myself?
Wey I use buy this phone? Shuuu u nadey joke o. Oya feel am, feel am.
Broz e don do you...

Here, he uses a high pitch and intonation while speaking to his friends. This traditionally fulfills a masculine role and speech pattern expectation by the society. Talking with authority and force is a commonplace perception of a typical male speech in the society. Though gay, Johnny speaks in this pattern while with friends to keep up the act and pretense. This opposes the manner with which he speaks while with Bright, his gay partner:

Bright: I'm thinking of taking you to Dubai for shopping. I hope you will go with me?
Johnny: Are you serious?

Bright: Yea, I want to change your wardrobe and give you some money for your education.

Johnny: Thank you.

In the conversation above, Bright seemingly assumes the traditional masculine role while Johnny assumes the feminine role as oppose his initial manner of speech. His utterances are made in low intonation without any raise in his voice.

Apart from a particular speech pattern, there are several other traditional expectations from the society when it comes to sexuality and sex roles which in turn forge people's utterances. As a man who is expected to be straight, married and in charge of a home, he is expected to man over his wife and any situation that may arise in the home. When Maya found out that Sly cheats on her, Bright advises him to ' put everything in order. You are the man' . This provides an insight into what the society expects of a man and the ideologies that are used to qualify what a man should be like. Being a man means the head of a woman and the home. Therefore, he is expected to control any situation that arises in the home no matter how serious it is or how much fault can be attributed to him in that situation. A woman also is expected to be submissive to a man and endure situations in the home. If she is a mother, she is expected to pay more consideration to her children. This is the more reason why Maya says ' I should worry about my kids, not Sly' . The use of the modal ' should' in this sentence asserts or indicates an expectation from the society.

4.1.5 Implications of Identified Representations in the Nigerian Context

The following are ideological constructs which serve as platforms under which homosexuals or homosexuality is ' Othered' in the Nigerian public space as portrayed in the movies: Homosexuality as Religious Transgression, Homosexuality as Moral Depravity, Homosexuality

as De-masculinising or Effeminising, and Homosexuality as Sociocultural Abomination. These constructs will be further explained.

A. Homosexuality as Religious Transgression:

Most times, in the Nigerian society, homosexuals are regarded as terrible sinners. Upon mentioning homosexuality, the mind of an average Nigerian is tuned to its sinful nature. It is at this point biblical allusions are made to identify how God established sexual intercourse for a man and a woman and not the other way round, or how God destroyed Sodom and Gomorrah because of such similar actions. All these are religious ideologies already rooted in the minds of people, thereby leading to an instinctive and immediate rejection of homosexuality. Such instance is portrayed in *Gay Pastors* when Ben, Chima's gay partner, is rejected from entering heaven but cast into hell because of the singular 'sin' of homosexuality identified in his life. Relatively, it is generally believed that homosexuality is a terrible religious transgression because it is tagged as a sin against God, one's rightful partner, and one's body as evident in *My Husband is Gay*. After Bright is 'outed', Valery laments on how much he needs the help and forgiveness of God. In turn, he seeks his wife's forgiveness and a spiritual cleansing from transgressions made against himself. This is more reason why Pastor Chima's sexuality is more shocking in *Gay Pastors* because his religious title paints a picture of holiness to people while homosexuality is generally regarded as the opposite.

B. Homosexuality as Moral Depravity:

Homosexuality is also regarded as pollution, defilement and contamination of what is right in the Nigerian public space. People who are not religiously inclined still regard it as wrong and below the standard of what is right. There seems to be a natural ideological construct formed in the

human mind that makes an ‘ Othered’ sexuality seem unnatural and morally wrong. More reason why homosexuals refuse to publicise their sexuality is because it is considered as a moral decadence that should not be spread or encouraged among the public at the most possible way. Johnny in *My Husband is Gay* finds it difficult to open up to his colleagues about his sexuality because he understands that it will be questioned and he would be discouraged from such ‘ wrong’ behaviour.

C. Homosexuality as De-masculinizing and Effeminizing:

In an average African society like Nigeria where the structure of the society is patriarchal, men are accorded more importance and respect. At such, men try as much as possible to meet up to the demands, responsibilities and expectations attached to their gender. The subject of sexuality is a major area where men tend to express their prowess. Gay men are subsequently faced with people challenging or questioning their masculinity. The ideology behind this is that real men go after women. A reversed situation where a man is like a woman to a fellow man in a homosexual relationship presents the opportunity of effeminizing such a man. His ability to relate with women physically and sexually becomes a debatable subject matter. At such, de-masculinizing and effeminizing gay men are major reasons why they prefer to keep up the pretence in their everyday life. As much as possible, they try not to behave or act in any way that will raise people’ s curiosity. In *My Husband is Gay*, Bright mans up to his responsibilities and expectations in front of his friends so as to mingle and fulfil societal obligations attached to being a man. In *Gay Pastors* also, Paul only expresses feminine tendencies when alone or with his gay partner. He acts all manly and in control when he is in public. All these are deviant reactions to people’ s set ideologies that gay men act and behave like men.

D. Homosexuality as Sociocultural Abomination:

Homosexuality is regarded as a despicable and shameful act in the society and its cultural practices. It is a taboo capable of stigmatizing homosexuals in the worst possible and most shameful way. Homosexuality is therefore considered as a disorder to the norm people within the society are accustomed to. Cultural beliefs and practices only support heterosexuality and at such, deviant sexual acts are considered abominable. Even the marital rites in the sociocultural setting make provision for only heterosexual unions and marriages. Even legalities guiding the society mark homosexuality as a punishable offence. In the movies considered, after homosexuals are ‘outed’, as much as possible, relatives try to keep it a secret rather than spreading it because they know how shameful and ‘implicative’ it can be for the individual and the family.

From the above, the identified representations discussed in this study imply homosexuality to be a deviation from societal definitions of masculinity and a demonic act which should be battled spiritually. Expectation from the society is that a man should be straight. In Bright’s case, he is homosexual and therefore an abomination to the society. He confirms to his wife after he is discovered that he and his gay partner are the only ones aware of his sexuality. This fact confirms how abominable the act is in the eyes of the society. Bruno’s ignorance of this secret about Bright’s life causes him to address both Sly and Bright in the same light after their wives find out about their extra-marital affairs.

Bruno: Why are you guys panicking like little babies? Don’t tell me you can’t control your wives at home because I can control mine. Okay? What is wrong with you guys?

Bruno’s consistent use of the word ‘control’ highlights that it is expected of a man to be in control of his wife and that he should not feel threatened or scared by any act put up by her. The major problem here is in Bright’s case where he is obviously a different issue entirely. This is

the more reason why he appears more angry and violent when venting his anger on Bruno. Also, Andrea considers Maya's actions 'a little bit over the top' thinking she caught Bright with a woman. Maya does not divulge Bright's secret but rather goes along with the lie that she met him with a woman and reacted 'so out of proportion' which could only emerge as a result of the truth of Bright's sexuality. She says 'it is really hard to see your man with someone else in a hotel room' without specifying the sex of the 'someone else' which her friends automatically believe to be a lady. Their assumption here shows the norm expected of a man in the society. Maya clearly knows what to do with Sly as she vows to 'punish him for what he has done' but Valery is at a confused end since her husband's case is an 'Other' which normally does not just happen every day and so she finds it difficult handling the situation.

It is discovered at the end of the movies that homosexuality is condemned and invariably demonized. To resolve matters, Bright visits the church for the deliverance because he believes in needing help considering the fact that he had gone very deep into it. He begs Valery by saying:

Help me please...please help me. I couldn't do it/ I was about going to see my gay partner. But I changed my mind. Please help me. You and my kids are my entire world. My reality. Please...as I wanted to go see my gay partner, along the road, I met some church people. They gave me the tract...when I keyed into it, it was as if I received a fresh spirit...go with me to the church service.

From these sentences, it is discovered that Bright suddenly takes a spiritual turn while feigning ignorance for his actions and helplessness in the situation. He therefore portrays homosexuality as an evil or demon that he needs deliverance from. The same is not the case with Bruno who cheated and even maltreated his wife. Bruno only apologized for his inactions without a deliverance session because it was heterosexual. Cheating homosexually however requires deliverance and cleansing because of its disapproval till the end of the movies. The movies treated therefore confirm the general belief about homosexuality in the country. Nigerians have

always sided with heterosexuality no matter the circumstances, just like Bruno, while maintaining homophobic culture. It demonises the act and advocates for cleansing from the spirit. This it does by portraying the gay characters to be under demonic influence and a need for God' s interferences. It ends by delivering Bright from gayness and making him come back to reality as if he had always been under delusion or manipulation. It does not advocate for acceptance, accommodation or understanding for queer sexualities.

This same idea is implied in *Gay Pastors* and its depiction of homosexuality as a demonic bondage which steals people' s destinies, destroys homes and keeps them in bondage. All Chima' s partners undergo deliverance sessions and reconciliation processes at the end of the movie. This consistent recurrence in Nollywood movies shows the perception of homosexuality as a religious and social aberration and differs from the way Westerners view it as a medical or psychological issue. This can be blamed on the impact of culture in Africans' way of life since it patterns their sense of behavior and judgment, while it opposes the way Westerners are allowed to think freely and make choices at will without subjection to societal and religious critique. This implies that homosexuality is deeper and wider than it is portrayed in Nollywood movies. Allowing religious and societal dictates cloud one' s sense of scripting is too shallow as there are other sides to the act that can be explored.

4.2. Conclusion

This chapter has analyzed systematically and in details the two selected movies. Attention was paid to the linguistic and multimodal representations and portrayals of homosexuality in the movies. Lexis and sentences were examined in accordance to their roles in ' Othering' homosexuality. Images from these movies were also analyzed to examine how characters' gesticulations, countenance and expressions ' Othered' or represented homosexuality.

Masculinity and effeminacy of gay characters were carefully examined to determine their characterization. Lastly, the societal ideological constructs of homosexuality was determined as portrayed in the movies.

CHAPTER FIVE

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS AND CONCLUSION

5.0 Introduction

This is the last chapter of this project. It provides a summary of significant findings in the previous chapter. It also presents the conclusion and recommendations for the study.

5.1 Summary of Findings

This study examined the role of language in portraying homosexuality as an ‘ Other’ . As presented in the Chapter One of this study, the objectives of this study are: to identify and categorize the representations of homosexuality in selected Nollywood movies; to analyse the linguistic signifiers of sexual Otherness; and to discuss the implications of these signifiers to the treatment of homosexuality in the Nigerian public space. Therefore, the linguistic representations of homosexuality in the Nigerian movie industry were examined while using *My Husband is Gay*, *My Reality* and *Gay Pastors* as case studies. We observed that Nollywood ‘ Others’ homosexuality while using language as a vital tool. One major finding in this research is that language is used to indicate and express the rejection of homosexuality by actors and the society at large. Consequently, this research studied and identified linguistic signifiers of ‘ Otherness’ in these selected movies.

In achieving the set objectives, this research systematically examined the dialogue and discourse of actors to determine how homosexuality is ‘ Othered’ . Words, phrases, clauses and sentences were identified and analysed. These linguistic categories were identified to be contributory to forming opinions about and emphasizing people’ s rejection of homosexuality. Besides these, graphic representations were analysed. Looks, countenances and gesticulations were analysed to still reiterate how much non-verbal language can be used to ‘ Other’

homosexuality in the movie. These multimodal representations were also found complicit in the negative portrayal of homosexuality and homosexuals.

Furthermore, we determined that the portrayals in the movies leaned on and asserted the pervasive societal perspectives on homosexuality as demonic and unnatural. Using the theory of masculinity, this research observed that homosexuals are regarded as lesser men within the Nigerian sociocultural landscape because of their sexual orientation which is viewed as deviant from the normative. Their levels of masculinity and effeminacy were examined linguistically also. The negativity that surrounds homosexuality in the Nigerian environment is hinged on two central beliefs – the religious and the moral. Consequently, the demonisation of homosexuality employs religion as a willing tool. Through language, homosexuals are portrayed as evil, demonic, destructive, sinful, and unintentional. This further adjudicates the normality and acceptance of heterosexuality. In addition, the morality of homosexuality was explored. The sexual orientation was presented as unnatural and dirty. In fact, in the movies, the gay characters faced social ostracism once they were ‘outed’.

The societal viewpoints and reactions to homosexuality were also discussed. For one, we see the societal complicity in denigrating homosexuality and foisting the hypocritical and imperfect ideals of heterosexuality. For instance, heterosexual extramarital affairs are presented as easily forgiven since it regarded as a norm for men to cheat on their wives whereas homosexual affairs were presented to be more difficult to fathom and handle unless through the interference of a supernatural force since having a homosexual orientation is perceived as a spiritual defect. The vaunted viewpoint against homosexuality cuts across both gender. The only difference is in the way the women handled it. Their expressions are strongly emotional in condemning the act. We

thus draw conclusions that the Nigerian society's view on homosexual orientations is one entrenched in religious and cultural ethos and mores and these are sustained through the movie productions by *Nollywood*.

5.2 Conclusion

Language, both verbal and non-verbal, is essential in the portrayal of the 'Otherness' of homosexuality. As much as possible, it explicates the innate feelings of people about the sexual act. At such, this premise has been the thrust of this study. Linguistic signifiers of 'Otherness' used in actors' discourses were identified, analysed and found to determine that the Nigerian socio-sexuality landscape is strictly in support of heterosexuality and strictly against homosexuality while drawing from religion and morality. Findings in this research therefore indicate the perception of homosexuality is generally negative and oppositional. Hence, movie producers try to achieve a portrayal of this same perception in their movies. In conclusion, we submit that language is the major tool for the portrayal of 'Otherness' in these movies.

5.3 Recommendations

People's sexuality is a private, individual, delicate and yet critical subject matter. Consequently, the privacy and individuality of sexual orientations should be respected. However, more studies on the representations and portrayal of alternative sexualities are encouraged. This is expected to provide fresh insight to long-denied and largely ignored marginal sexual orientations. In addition, these studies should explore other explanations for engagement in these queer sexualities. While the present study identified cultural ethos and religious beliefs as central to the demonisation and deprecation of homosexuality, we believe that there are other causatives which should be explored. This is because the repetitive review of homosexuality in the religious sense is too

narrow, shallow and streamlined. There are several reasons people go into homosexuality which could range from psychological to environmental factors. Further studies are also encouraged in the study of language use among homosexuals in line with the pursuit of Lavender Linguistics. Through this, it is expected that more knowledge of queer sexualities will be diffused.

Finally, the Nigerian policy on the media which forbids a display of homosexual acts on screen and allows only heterosexual ones should be reviewed. As expected, recent movies have challenged this by enacting homosexual and erotic scenes on screen, as identifiable in *Gay Pastors*. Therefore, it is necessary to consider banning both heterosexual and homosexual sexual actions from the screen. Since the decision is based on the questionable morality of homosexuality, it suffices to say that both are still immoral if the diverse age-groups of their audience or viewers are put into consideration.

REFERENCES

- Ahmadvand, M. (2011). Critical discourse analysis: An introduction of major approaches. *Advanced Writing Course*, 5(1), 89.
- Akande, B. L. (2016). Ice in the desert: Homosexuality in Nigerian drama and films. *Philippine Social Sciences and Humanities Review*, 05(02), 33-40.
- Brod, H. (1987). *The making of masculinities: The new men' s studies*. Boston, USA: Allen and Unwin.
- Bhaskar, R. (1989). *A realist theory of science*. Hempstead, USA: Harvester Wheatsheaf.
- Burr, V. (1995). *An introduction to social constructionism*. London, UK: Routledge.
- Butler, J. (1990). *Gender trouble*. New York, USA & London, UK: Routledge.
- Butler, J. (2004). *Undoing gender*. New York, USA & London, UK: Routledge.
- Bruce, J. E. (1922). *The making of a race*. New York, USA: Hunt Printing Company.
- Cameron, D. (1997). Performing gender identity: Young men' s talk and the construction of heterosexual masculinity. In S, Johnson, U. H. Meinhof (Eds.), *Language and Masculinity* (pp. 47-64). Malden, USA: Blackwell Publishers Ltd.
- Cameron, D., & Kulick, D. (2003). *Language and sexuality*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge Press.

- Chouliaraki, L., & Fairclough, N. (1999). Discourse in late modernity: Rethinking critical discourse analysis. *Journal of English Linguistics*, 29(2), 168.
- Cojocaru, S., Bragaru, C., & Ciuchi, M. (2012). The role of language in constructing social realities. *Econ Papers*, 36(2), 31-43).
- Connell, R. W. (1992). A very straight gay: Masculinity, homosexual experience, and the dynamics of gender. *American Sociological Review*, 57(6), 735-751.
- Connell, R. W. (2005). Globalization, imperialism and masculinities. In M. S. Kimmel, J. Hearn, R. W. Connell (Eds.), *Handbook of Studies on Men and Masculinities* (p. 77). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Connell, R. W., & Messerschmidt, J. W. (2005). Hegemonic masculinity: Rethinking the concept. *Sage Journals*, 19, 829-859. doi:10.1177/0891243205278639
- Cooperrider, D., David, L., & Whitney, D. (2000). The appreciative inquiry summit: An emerging methodology for whole system positive change. *OD Practitioner*, 32(2), 13-26.
- Demetriou, D. Z. (2001). Connell's concept of hegemonic masculinity: A critique. *Theory and Society*, 30(3), 337-361.
- Durkheim, E. (1995). *The elementary forms of religious life*. New York, USA: Free Press.
- Fairclough, N. (1989). *Language and power*. London, UK: Longman.
- Fairclough, N. (1992). *Discourse and social change*. London, UK: Polity Press.

Fairclough, N. (1995a). *Critical discourse analysis: The critical study of language*. London, UK: Longman.

Fairclough, N. (1995b). *Media Discourse*. London, UK: Edward Arnold.

Fairclough, N. (1996). A reply to Henry Widdowson's 'Discourse analysis: A critical view'. *Language and Literature*, 5(1), 49-56.

Fenton, S. (2016, May 17). LGBT relationships are illegal in 74 countries, research finds. *Independent News*. Retrieved from <https://www.independent.co.uk/news/world/gay-lesbian-bisexual-relationships-illegal-in-74-countries-a7033666.html>

Gaudio, R. P. (1994). Sounding gay: Pitch properties in the speech of gay and straight men. *American Speech*, 69, 30-57. doi:10.2307/455948.JSTOR455948

Groes-Green, C. (2009). Hegemonic and subordinated masculinities: Class, violence and sexual performance among young Mozambican men. *Nordic Journal of African Studies*, 18(4), 286-304.

Groes-Green, C. (2012). Philogynous masculinities: Contextualizing alternative manhood in Mozambique. *Men and Masculinities*, 15, 91-111. doi: 10.1177/1097184X11427021

Heasley, R. (2005). Queer masculinities of straight men: A typology. *Men and masculinities*, 7, 310-320. doi:10.1177/1097184X04272118

Herek, G. M. (1986). On heterosexual masculinity: Some physical consequences of the social

- construction of gender and sexuality. *American Behavioural Scientist*, 29(5), 563-577.
- Herek, G. M. (1988). Heterosexuals' attitudes toward lesbians and gay men: Correlates and gender differences. *Journal of Research*, 25(4), 451-477.
- Hoad, P. (2013, August 1). How does Nollywood picture its LGBT community?. *Guardian News*. Retrieved from <https://www.theguardian.com/film/filmblog/2013/aug/01/nollywood-lgbt-community>
- Kulick, D. (2000). Gay and lesbian language. *Anthropology Annual Review*, 29, 243-285.
doi:10.1146/annurev.anthro.29.1.243
- Kumat, O. (2013). African femininity and masculinity. [Web log post]. Retrieved from <https://africanbloodsiblings.wordpress.com/2013/01/24/african-femininity-and-masculinity/>
- Kupers, T. A. (2005). Toxic masculinity as a barrier to mental health treatment in prison. *Jclin Psychol*, 61(6), 713-724.
- Langa, M. (2014). Meaning making in growing up without a father: Narratives of young adolescent boys. *The Open Family Studies*, 6(1), 56-61.
- Lyonga, F. (2014). Un-African? Representations of homosexuality in two contemporary Nigerian films. *Journal of Alternative Perspectives in the Social Sciences*, 5(4), 783-801.
- Messerschmidt, J. W. (1993). Men, masculinities and crime. In M. S. Kimmel, J. Hearn, & R. W. Connell (Eds.), *Handbook of Studies on Men and Masculinities* (p. 829). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

MMAS (Ministry of Women and Social Actions). 2004. *Violence against women survey* [Data file]. Maputo, Mozambique: MMAS.

Morrell, R. (2001). *Changing men in Southern Africa*. London, UK: Zed Books.

OAK Foundation. 2016. *Investigation on the impact of gender representation in Nigerian films* [Data file]. California, USA: OAK Foundation.

Pateman, J. (2017). *Leninism, scientific socialism, and democracy*. Nottingham, UK: The University of Nottingham Press.

Pleck, J. (2017, August 30). Is feminism for men?. [Web log post]. Retrieved from <http://www.thenopebook.com/activism/men-feminism/>

Ratele, K. (2011). Male sexualities and masculinities. In S. Tamale (Ed.), *African Sexualities: A Reader* (pp. 399-419). Nairobi, Kenya: Pambazuka Press.

Rudman, L. (2014). When men break the central rules: Status incongruity and backlash against modest men. *Psychology of Men and Masculinity*, 11, 140-151. doi: 10.1037/a0018093

Sahara Reporters. (2015, July 30). Nollywood now the second biggest producer of films in the world. *Sahara News*. Retrieved from saharareporters.com/2015/07/30/nollywood-now-second-biggest-films-world

Searle, R. J. (1996). *The construction of social reality*. London, UK: Penguin Adult.

Sheyholislami, J. (2002). *Critical discourse analysis*. Ottawa, Canada: Carleton University Press.

Travis, E. L. (1957). *Handbook of speech pathology*. New York, USA: Appleton.

Van Dijk, T. A. (1988). *News analysis: Case studies of international and national news in the press*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Van Dijk, T. A. (1993). Principles of critical discourse analysis. *Discourse and Society*, 4(2), 242-256.

Widdowson, H. G. (1995). Discourse analysis: A critical view. *Language and Literature*, 4(3), 157-172.

Wodak, R. (2001). The discourse of historical approach. In R. Wodak, & M. Meyers (Eds.), *Methods of CDA* (pp. 69-70). London, UK: Polity Press.