

English Usage and Implicit Audience Alignment in Digitally Mediated Sermons: The Case of Odumeje

Chukwuma Livinus Ndububa ^a

^a The National Open University of Nigeria - Nigeria

Keywords: English, Influence, Variation, Alignment, Acceptance, TikTok

Article Information			
Received	5 th Mar 2026	Accepted	10 th Jun 2026
Published	30 th Jun 2026		

Abstract

Our words are largely influenced by the people and things we listen to most. Thus, repeated exposure to specific language models often results in followers' adoption of similar words and speech patterns. This influence extends to influential religious figures whose word choices shape the speech patterns of their followers. Accordingly, this study investigates the phonological, lexical, and grammatical features of Prophet Odumeje's English and his virtual followers' responses in selected sermons on TikTok to infer implicit sociolinguistic alignment and tacit acceptance of this English use. In a qualitative-dominant mixed-method design, based on William Labov's (1966, 1972) variationist framework and Henri Tajfel and John Turner's (1979) Social Identity Theory (SIT), 8,202 identifiable linguistic occurrences from 32 recent clips with a total duration of 52 minutes and 41 seconds are purposively sampled. Findings reveal that Odumeje's English exhibits patterned variation owing to social identity, communicative contexts, and stylistic choices. The study also found that most comments on Odumeje's sermons are positive and exceed those in other categories, implying followers' alignment and acceptance. Given the implications of these findings, the researcher recommends that English language learners understand that many influential figures may use substandard English forms that gain social acceptance, but this does not mean that such forms are grammatically standard.

Introduction

Influence is a pervasive phenomenon. It is widely believed that individuals are influenced by their surroundings. Thus, people tend to resemble those with whom they mostly live, converse, or admire. Zorell (2026, p. 20) observes, "Partners, friends, and children emerge as the social ties most frequently perceived as influential." A public figure's character often transfers to followers or admirers. While people consciously emulate others, they also do so unconsciously. Influential figures in society largely influence the behavioural disposition of the populace. As Omphile (2025, p. 71) argues, "Charismatic leadership is crucial in enhancing organizational innovation." In further support of this position, Bansag and Manigo (2025, p. 8) note, "The level of charismatic leadership is high for strategic vision and articulation, sensitivity to the environment, sensitivity to members, personal risks, and unconventional behavior." Similarly, influencers are employed to publicize or promote products and increase demand. However, these influencers do not merely enhance the popularity of products or services but also shape consumers' decisions to patronize producers or service providers. Therefore, the capacity of public figures to influence lifestyles or decisions cannot be ignored. This is evident in the influence of the media on English learning. Nandhita et al. (2025, p. 200) note, "English-language film media has a significant influence on improving students' English language skills, particularly in speaking." While popular actors and movie stations favour American English, viewers are correspondingly disposed to this variety. For instance, in many countries where British English is the official standard, individuals still consciously or unconsciously use American English because it is the variety to which they are most exposed.

Preachers are also public figures with sociolinguistic authority and influence over followers, such that their locution is commonly emulated. As Scheller et al. (2021, p. 65) found, “Megachurch pastors used many of the communication practices commercial SMIs employ, including self-branding through personal promotion and the construction of an approachable and ever-present online persona.” Although preachers are often educated to address congregations of diverse intelligences and backgrounds, their use of English remains worthy of examination. Before attending school, many Christians attend church first. Thus, according to Kabybayeva and Begalinova (2025, p. 132), these “young people not only consume religious content frequently but also rely on it in forming their ethical values, personal behavior, and general worldview.” This early exposure is increasingly mediated through digital platforms; as Kiruja et al. (2025, p. 104) note, “Young people are open to connecting with the church online, especially when there are additional options and institutional support.” Moreover, many Christians who do not attend school still attend church or are exposed to religious content and thus engage with the preacher’s thoughts, words, and wording. Children without formal language coaching are disposed to the preacher’s linguistic styles, while adult non-language specialists often accept the preacher’s linguistic output. Consequently, the preacher’s authority and aura may imply linguistic infallibility. Against this backdrop, Kabybayeva and Begalinova (2025, p. 133), confirm that “the absence of standardized verification mechanisms creates challenges for ensuring the accuracy and safety of digital religious discourse.” In second- or foreign-language contexts, public figures may be either linguistically supportive or unsupportive. Religion contributes many lexical items to a language that adherents may not encounter elsewhere. In Nigeria, an L2 English setting, the prominence of Prophet Odumeje, whose English appears marked, renders followers susceptible to influence, directly or indirectly. Prophet Odumeje has a sizable following across different parts of the country. While some followers are drawn by his prophetic and healing claims, others are attracted by his humour. According to Le Page and Tabouret-Keller, (1985, p. 182), “We can only behave according to the behavioural patterns of groups we find it desirable to identify with” Thus, whatever draws individuals to Odumeje predisposes them to his linguistic styles and choices, which are liable to be emulated.

Review of the Literature

❖ Speaker Adaptation and Audience Alignment

Communication entails formulating a message and effectively conveying it to a listener. This often requires mutual understanding between the speaker and listener and of the topic under discussion. Saglam et al. (2025, p. 323) acknowledge mutual intelligibility as “a focus of linguistic research globally in various language pairs.” When adjustment is crucial for a smooth flow of conversation, participants may enhance their language use. Speakers adapt to listeners and determine how to address them by selecting appropriate diction and tone. “Well-calibrated convergences decrease perceived distance and improve rapport, thereby increasing satisfaction and mutual understanding” (Giles et al., 2025, p. 2). Thus, adaptation may be explicit or implicit. Failure to consider such alignment may cost effective communication.

In contemporary contexts, the situation differs for public speakers whose audiences extend beyond immediate listeners. Speeches delivered in churches and public settings often reach audiences beyond those directly addressed, including distant and dispersed listeners. Moreover, “Contemporary social media affords new and historically coherent possibilities for pastoral amplification through digital channels” (Scheller et al., 2021, p. 54). Thus, speakers consider the possible impact of their words on such audiences. This condition of addressing multiple audiences, real, imagined, and overhearing, requires careful preparation and execution.

In mediated settings, before and during speech-making, speakers consider various factors such as the possibility of audiences from different socio-cultural backgrounds in remote or unfamiliar locations; limitations or distortions of gestures, eye contact, and posture despite the continued communicative value of

gesticulation, silence, tone, and facial cues; platform-specific etiquette and audience characteristics; limited or delayed feedback that may lead to misinterpretation of cues; and the likelihood that sessions may be recorded or redistributed without consent. Thus, Kabylbayeva and Begalinova (2025, p. 132) confirm, “The digital environment facilitates the rapid dissemination of religious messages, shaping a new norm of religious engagement that is more personalized, flexible, and interactive.”

While convergence with the audience may occur consciously or unconsciously, divergence may occur when speakers fail to recognise that they are linguistically or otherwise distancing themselves from their audience. However, Giles et al. (2025, p. 2) note that “the nature of people’s adjustments is a result of their motivations for, and abilities in, adjusting to others.” Convergence involves adapting features such as accent or dialect, level of formality, vocabulary choice, and speech style or rate. Failure to adjust these features may result in divergence from the audience.

Although not uniform across contexts, speakers often seek acceptance as well as alignment from their interlocutors. The essence of communication, however, “lies in adapting to the speaker, the situation, and other contextual factors of the conversation” (Ndububa & Ugoala, 2025c, p. 2). Such acceptance may be conveyed through listeners’ approval, silence, laughter, emojis, repetition, mimicry, and similar interactional cues. Approval may occur in the form of nodding or positive verbal responses that endorse the speaker’s contribution and initiate social harmony. In some contexts, silence may suggest acceptance where no objection is expressed. Laughter may sometimes imply audience alignment and satisfaction, given that what bores an audience may not elicit laughter. In digitally mediated contexts, emojis are commonly used to mark acceptance. Repetition may also signal acceptance, as individuals are less likely to repeat expressions they disapprove of. When listeners find an expression appealing or catchy, they may reuse it, thereby signalling acceptance. This is similar to mimicry, in which listeners or followers emulate a speaker’s linguistic behaviour. In fact, within influencer–audience dynamics, such alignment can rapidly crystallise into parasocial attachment; as Richter et al. (2025, p. 9) observe, “Influencers quickly forge parasocial bonds that foster deeper engagement and trust, challenging the gradual, reciprocal self-disclosure assumed in traditional interpersonal models.”

❖ **Preachers as Language Influencers in Digitally Mediated Religious Discourse**

In the digital age, many services and activities meant for the public are increasingly considered for digital conveyance (Ndububa and Ugoala, 2025, p. 167). Thus, it has become easier to reach members and draw new ones. While some of these activities are still held offline, others are simultaneously live-streamed to online and distant members, and further recorded for online redistribution and offline use. According to Hasanah and Baharun (2025, p. 126), “Digital technology has brought significant changes to the way society understands and practices religion.” Consequently, social interactive platforms such as TikTok have become active and effective hosts for sermons and evangelization.

Exposure to another person’s language or dialect can foster linguistic adaptation (Dunn & Wong, 2025, p. 3). Thus, there may be acquisition of language properties through repeated consumption of content from print, broadcast, digital, audio, audio-visual, and outdoor media. Even without formal language learning, imitation of the linguistic content conveyed through these media can contribute to individual language development at both individual and societal levels (Shihan and Tulukder, 2025, p. 53). Preachers may function as language influencers, such that audiences may gradually and passively adopt some of their linguistic features. Since religion contributes to linguistic practices, it can also influence linguistic input alongside other sources. Preachers often command respect and emulation and, as such, may contribute to listeners’ language use or adjustment.

❖ **Religious Language, Charismatic Authority, and Linguistic Immunity**

Religious language is considered sacrosanct, just as other aspects of religion. Errors, ambiguities, and seeming contradictions are deemed beyond human comprehension or treated as divine wisdom. Mohammad (2024, p. 64) confirms “the potential for religious language to mislead individuals or present an erroneous representation of reality.” This seeming immunity to criticism enjoyed by religious language compels obedience among members and maintains the hierarchical status of the register among other languages used by them. Thus, a preacher’s ambiguous proclamation may be perceived as unclear but accepted as spiritual. Such unconventional language uses may gain acceptance among listeners and the wider language community, either as religious or in currency.

Charismatic authority is another form of influence on followers that significantly reduces criticism of the leader’s utterances. Charismatic authority, according to Luo (2024, p. 66), “derives from the extraordinary qualities of the individual and is able to inspire and mobilize the masses.” The individual is regarded as special and therefore not readily perceived as culpable or is pardoned for linguistic slips and imperfections. Wid igdo (2017, p. 267) notes that this charisma lingers even after death. However, language is an efficient tool of charisma. Thus, charismatic individuals appeal to followers through expressed authority, confidence, power, strategic use of language, emotional intensity, storytelling, and absolute claims that discourage criticism.

Specific rules and ideas guide language usage. Importantly, language users should prioritise clarity and coherence (Yule, 2023, p. 283). This entails adhering to grammatical rules and, in the spoken medium, producing sounds correctly, stressing syllables appropriately, and patterning intonation suitably; while in the written medium, observing mechanical accuracies such as spelling, punctuation, capitalisation, paragraphing, and sentence structure. In Nigeria, for example, where English, according to Akoko (2024, p. 12) is “a common language, the country’s official language, and the language of communication between and among people of different linguistic background”, people are generally expected to communicate in English in a reasonably simple and intelligible way without confounding listeners. However, there are expectations for specific societies, professions, and vocations (Phineas et al., 2025). University graduates are expected to speak fluently; religious leaders are expected to speak in a purified manner; professors are expected to speak competently; English scholars are expected to demonstrate extensive knowledge of English; younger people may speak according to a basic level of English, and so on.

While there is the notion of correctness, there is also acceptability (Tsucana, 2024, p. 1205). Certain forms of language use may not totally adhere to grammatical rules but are somewhat deemed acceptable as long as they are understandable. For instance, “I don’t want nothing” to imply “I don’t want anything” is not correct but may be acceptable. Acceptability is context-based. Thus, language use by a person or through a medium may be unacceptable in one context but acceptable in another. This equally applies to digitally mediated preachers whose charismatic authority affords linguistic immunity.

❖ **Markedness, Salience, and Enregisterment in Public Speech**

Unusual syntactic choices and phonological patterns appear in the speeches of specific public figures (Carlos et al., 2025, p. 31). These non-default linguistic (marked) forms distinguish a speaker’s language from neutral (unmarked) usage and often contribute to an identifiable idiolect shaped by patterned use of marked and unmarked forms. While marked forms may foster emphasis and listener engagement, excessive markedness may affect intelligibility. At a syntactic level, markedness may include an expression like “There I went” instead of the neutral or default “I went there”. A socially marked phonological output may include “gonna” or “wanna” in place of “going to” or “want to”. At the lexical level, markedness may entail using “offspring” instead of “child” or self-made neologisms that deliberately replace existing conventional forms.

Saliency is a major feature of public figures' speeches and may be drawn from marked expressions, emphasized language use, or an idiolect, with strong implications for listener engagement, perception, and audience alignment. As saliency may not be deliberate, some speakers become salient without conscious effort. Saliency may commonly occur through increased stress on sounds, the apt application of intonation patterns, brief pauses before or within speeches, repetition, or unusual restructuring of words. Giora and Gur (2011, p. 307) also note that the "meaning of a word or an expression is salient if it is coded in the mental lexicon." However, mispronunciation, grammatical misuse, malapropism, inappropriate diction or register choice, excessive or misplaced emphasis, or code mixing or switching in inappropriate contexts may also foster saliency, as these are not always the errors but may function strategically, or as identity markers.

While Rafi'i (2024, p. 3114) advises that public figures master English "to meet the challenges of globalization and the digital era," a public speaker's language use can become meaningful to followers, thereby functioning as a register of identity within a fellowship. Although such language use may not be widely acceptable, it may gradually become enregistered as followers accept and reuse it. The style may acquire a name, either after the user or the followers within the social circle, with repeated features being the most readily enregistered. For instance, many Christians mispronounce Christian (realising the letter t as /t/ rather than /tʃ/) and covenant (inserting /n/ between c and o). This style has become associated with worshippers but not within formal English language scholarship.

❖ **Localisation and Sociolinguistic Shaping of English in Nigeria**

As English remains a lingua franca, most language communities adjust their policies to adapt to the norms of the ever-changing English. Thus, Mendoza et al., (2025 p. 207) advise, "We must continue to promote equity in knowledge production across...diverse contexts of language use". Nigeria is not left out among the places where English is constantly shaped and expanded, as English in Nigeria assumes a unique form adapted to its sociolinguistic environment (Taiwo 2009). Thus, the phonological, syntactic, lexical and grammatical aspects of the English variety reflect local realities and mother-tongue interference, although it remains somewhat intelligible to foreign counterparts. Amadi et al., (2022, p. 29) thus note that "a number of students frequently use Nigerian English in their writing." As a multilingual setting, native Nigerian languages simultaneously shape English, resulting in the Nigerian variety and its regional manifestations (Shuiabu & Maikanti, 2025, p. 54). For instance, as certain Igbo dialects exhibit variation or weakening in the realisation of /r/ in their phonological systems, the English associated with some Igbo natives consequently exhibits omission. In northern Nigeria, some indigenous languages lack the /p/ sound or replace /f/ with /p/. As such, English in this area captures the native phonological reality. Mother tongues chiefly influence semantic extension and calquing. Thus, in many parts of the country, "let me use my hand and go there" is commonly heard for "let me go there (by) myself". People say "My body is scratching me" when they imply "my body itches"; "I'm coming" to mean "I'll be right back"; "off the light" to mean "switch/turn off the light"; and "borrow me some money" for "lend me some money", etc.

This localisation of English elicits different reactions from individuals and institutions. Sharifian (2016, p. 1), however, maintains that it serves to "encode the communication needs of various speech communities." Many English tutors in ESL contexts, however, endorse mutual intelligibility, welcoming localisation as a creative and functional variety while deprioritising prescriptive conformity. Some localised forms become widely acceptable and enter lexicographic records as newly introduced lexis (Ndububa, 2025d, p. 8). Some religious leaders who openly reject global norms as culturally alien or spiritually irrelevant contribute to the localisation of words which soon become consciously or subconsciously acceptable among members. These religious figures who use localised forms in sermons may switch to more standard English in formal writing. Localisation occurs in the forms of using words to suit the local language or dialect. As Ugoala (2020, p. 36) explains, "The inability of the English language to perfectly capture aspects of Nigerian cultural experience has led to the conscious and unconscious intrusion of lexical items from the indigenous languages to reflect the Nigerian experience both in offline and online communication." There therefore arises tension between

global (alleged standard or prestigious) English norms and local religious speech where accuracy is often less important than spiritual effect and authority. A form may be incorrect globally but effective locally, resulting in criticism of religious speech as “bad English”, the continued spread of localised forms despite criticism, and perceived linguistic insecurity among speakers educated in or inclined to standard norms.

Theoretical Framework

This study is grounded in William Labov’s (1966, 1972) variationist framework, which accounts for how and why language varies and changes in patterned, socially meaningful ways, how social factors such as age, social class, ethnicity, and style influence linguistic behaviour, and how language change unfolds over time. In contrast to earlier models that treated variation as erroneous, the variationist framework demonstrates that language variation is not error but behaviour governed by systematic constraints. Thus, Labov (2006, p. 4) argues that “the most consistent and coherent system is that of an idiolect”. The present study extends the quantitative analysis of linguistic variables to digitally mediated discourse. The variationist model enables the identification of phonological, lexical, and grammatical variables, facilitates the measurement of frequency, and supports the examination of patterned distribution. It is adopted here to address the study’s objectives.

The study is also framed within Henri Tajfel and John Turner’s (1979) Social Identity Theory (SIT), which explains how individuals identify with social groups that in turn shape their thoughts and behaviours. SIT posits that individuals view their own social group or identity more positively. According to Oliveira (2025, p. 1), “This theory explains how being part of a sports team, workplace, family, or community helps people form a sense of identity and influences behaviour”. Consequently, Setiadi et al. (2026, p. 9), focusing on online community members, note that “The development of social media in recent years has significantly shaped the way teens interact, express themselves, and build social identities”. Harwood (2020, p. 2) notes that “According to SIT, categorization of our social world is a natural and inevitable human instinct, serving to simplify our environment.” This theory provides an appropriate framework for analysing identity in both offline and online communities, group loyalty, organisational behaviour, media and digital discourse studies, religious identity studies, and intergroup relations research, and therefore supports the objectives of this study.

Methodology

This study adopts a qualitative-dominant mixed-method design which supports the theoretical frameworks for variationist sociolinguistic and digital audience reception analyses of 8,202 identifiable linguistic occurrences in the dataset, including 1,242 phonological tokens (focusing on word-final consonant deletions, substitution patterns, d3-variation, r-realisation, and v-devoicing), 782 lexical occurrences, 817 occurrences of grammatical errors, and 5,367 followers’ responses. The primary and sole source of data is Prophet Odumeje’s TikTok sermons, of which 32 clips with a total duration of 52 minutes and 41 seconds were purposively selected according to the study’s objectives. Sermons made in English with clear audio quality, from the end of 2025 to February 2026, were sampled to ensure that Odumeje’s current language use is captured. Followers’ publicly accessible comments on the videos, categorised as imitative, positive, comic, and critical responses, were also purposively analysed. Engagement markers such as ‘likes’ were also considered in determining acceptance and audience alignment. The sermons were obtained, transcribed, labelled, counted, and presented in tabular form for analysis and interpretation by the researcher. Coding and counting were repeated to ascertain accuracy.

Data Analysis

Data are presented in the following order: tables showing phonological variables are presented first, followed by tables of lexical features and then grammatical patterns, in line with the components of the first objective

of the study. A final table presenting audience comment types addresses the second objective. The final table provides details of all clips from which the information in the preceding tables is derived.

Table 1. Word-final Consonant Deletion

Consonant	Total tokens	Deleted Consonants	Deletion Rate %
/t/	70	62	88.57%
/z/	27	6	22.22%
/d/	190	32	16.84%

T-deletion is a regular pattern in the dataset. Thus, Odumeje almost always deletes the final /t/ sound, especially when the letter ‘t’ follows a consonant or when producing the allomorph of the past-tense marker -ed, making a word like ‘against’ sound like /əgens/, ‘must’ pronounced /mʌs/, ‘passed’ realized as /pɑ:s/, and ‘pushed’ as /pʊʃ/.

The /z/ sound is usually retained but sometimes deleted in words like ‘because’ and ‘realise’, such that they are rendered as /bɪˈkɔ:/ and /ˈri:əlɪz/, respectively.

Although the /d/ sound appears more frequently in the dataset, it has the lowest occurrence of deletion at the word-final position, affecting endings such as ‘-ed’, ‘-ld’ and ‘-ord’, etc.

These occurrences are more frequent when such words are followed by another in a lexical string. Also, consonant deletion is not general in the dataset; it affects some consonants but not others. For instance, while the /t/ sound at the word-final position is most often prone to deletion, /d/ in the same position is less likely to be deleted.

Table 2. Substitution Patterns

Variable	Variant	Tokens	Percentage
R	[r]	288	81.82%
R	[l]	64	18.18%
dʒ	[dʒ]	139	98.58%
dʒ	[ʒ]	2	1.42%
ʃ	[ʃ]	133	88.67%
ʃ	[dʒ]	17	11.33%

tʃ	[tʃ]	82	95.35%
tʃ	[t]	4	4.65%
v	[v]	313	68.04%
v	[f]	147	31.96%

Given the similar articulation of the liquids [r] and [l], substituting one for the other is relatively easy. Idiolectal variation and phonological influences from other local languages may also foster this pattern. However, in the dataset, rhotic realization dominates despite the presence of, although noticeable, [l]-substitution, occurring in words like ‘Romans’, ‘authority’, and ‘dangerous’.

Although minor and with the lowest distribution, the ‘joy-consonant’, [dʒ], was also found to be substituted or simplified as [ʒ] twice during the pronunciation of ‘joke’ in one of the clips, C₃₁. Although in another clip, C₂₅, ‘joker’ was mentioned twice and pronounced correctly, implying that the substitution is not systematic.

Some cases of the ‘shoe-consonant’ [ʃ] are also found to be substituted with [dʒ], and all occurrences appear during the rendition of ‘pressure’, suggesting that other [ʃ] sounds have a high rate of correct production except in a few specific words.

The dataset also reveals that Prophet Odumeje substitutes [tʃ] with [t], especially in the word ‘Christian’, as in clip C₁₄, where all four occurrences are realized this way.

There is also a considerable record of the substitution of [v] with [f], especially in ‘of’. This devoicing pattern is widely distributed, manifesting in nearly every instance of the word ‘of’, which should be pronounced /əv/.

Table 3. Self-Referential Identity Labels (Self-Stylisation)

Lexical Item	Frequency	Clip IDs	Primary Function
Indaboski Bahose	14	C03, C05, C14, C15, C17, C23, C25, C26, C27, C30, C31, C32	A repeated name that confirms his power and identity
Lion (Himself)	13	C02, C04, C05, C11, C13, C15, C23, C28, C32	Describing himself as a symbol of power and dominance
Liquid Metal	11	C02, C03, C04, C05, C11, C13, C15, C25, C26, C28, C31	Presenting himself as flexible and impossible to destroy.

The War (Himself)	7	C11, C13, C15, C26, C30, C31	Calling himself an idea or force, not just a person
Taboosh Kabash	5	C02, C11, C13, C15, C17	A repeated phrase used to invoke power

Odumeje uses the epithet, “Indabosky Bahose”, most frequently to reinforce or conclude his assertion of authority and to stamp his prophetic persona. Thus, the epithet appears immediately after a series of identity markers such as “lion”, “war”, “battle”, “finisher”, etc., serving consolidation. The accompanying tone of the epithet is reassuring to supporters, as in:

Extract 1 [C27, 16 December 2025, 0:11 - 0:18]

“I have never done fake miracle. Am a major prophet. Am indaboski Bahose,”

Extract 2 [C14, 8 January 2026, 0:30 - 0:47]

“2026 is your year, anything you desire this year, you shall receive them all. Amen. Am Indaboski Bahose.”

Having concluded martial identity metaphors and explicit assertions of invulnerability, aggression, or destruction, the epithet also assumes a threatening tone directed at perceived enemies, as in:

Extract 3 [C23, 18 December 2025, 0:29 - 0:36]

“You just see me but I am more dangerous than the person you see. Am Indaboski Bahose,”

Extract 4 [C03, 13 February 2026]

“I die many years ago; I born for war; I born for fight; I born for spiritually battles; am Indaboski Bahose.”

While creating the imagery of a field of combat and setting the tone for escalation, Odumeje likens himself to a lion and variously assumes ‘a lion,’ ‘the lion’ or ‘the lion himself’, an emphatic identity epithet reinforcing charismatic authority, especially evident in C28, where the epithet occurs four times in one hundred seconds. While ‘lion’ occurs 21 times across 14 clips, ‘the lion (himself)’ to assert his strength, fearlessness, dominance, predatory power, and leadership, as in the following extracts:

Extract 5 [C10, 20 January 2026, 0:01 - 0:27]

“I am sorry for you when they send you for a battle with a lion and you step into my battlefield,”

Extract 6 [C30, 6 December 2025, 0:51 - 0:53]

“Am a dead man; am the lion”

Extract 7 [C23, 18 December 2025, 0:05 - 0:11]

“I am a man of war. If you want to know more about the lion himself...”

Referring to himself as a lion, Odumeje describes his followers as the lion family or lion families, as in C11, twice in C14, and twice in C18.

“Liquid metal” is one of Odumeje's self-ascribed identity epithets establishing his charismatic authority and indestructible status. The epithet metaphorically represents an invincible force, combining two contrasting qualities: ‘liquid: fluidity, adaptability’ and ‘metal: strength, hardness, durability’. Thus, by declaring himself ‘a liquid metal’, Odumeje insinuates that he is strong and adaptable. The phrase appears frequently alongside ‘the lion himself’, denoting aggression and dominance as in Co2, Co3, Co4, Co5, C13, C15, and C28, and also alongside ‘war,’ ‘battle,’ ‘finisher,’ reinforcing dramatic build-up as in C11, C25, C26, and C31. In contexts where Odumeje discusses healing, prosperity, and new month declarations, the use of ‘liquid metal’ extends the constructed power identity to the ability to produce outcomes, as in:

Extract 8 [Co4, 9 February 2026, 1:04 - 1:12]

“This year will put smile in your face, in Jesus name. Am the lion himself; am the liquid metal”

Extract 9 [Co5, 2 February 2026, 0:01 - 0:10]

“This is the lion himself...and this is the month the lord have made for you. a new month. is a month to blessing”

Extract 10 [C28, 5 December 2025, 0:01 - 0:06]

“Am the liquid metal and the hour have come is going to be great is going to be wonderful on 31st night”

‘The war himself’, also rendered as ‘the war’, appears in a sequence of martial self-identifying epithets that invoke an abstract construct. Odumeje does not seek to depict participation in a physical war but to embody war itself. This epithet reinforces his constructed persona of extreme combativeness, as seen in:

Extract 11 [C11, 19 January 2026, 01:48 - 01:51]

“And don't forget: am the lion himself, the war himself”

Given Odumeje's recurrent thematic emphasis on war and his frequent allusions to it, he personalizes war through the reflexive intensifier ‘himself’, implying that he alone embodies war, as evident in:

Extract 12 [Co3, 13 February 2026, 0:15 - 0:18]

“Life is all about fight and war”

Extract 13 [Co6, 31 January 2026, 0:04 - 0:09]

“I am for war and forever I remain for battles”

Extract 14 [C11, 19 January 2026, 0:44 - 0:46]

“Our war never stop”

Extract 15 [C14, 8 January 2026, 0:07 - 0:09]

“I am a warlord”

Thus, his identity is equated with war.

Odumeje's creativity with words strongly manifests itself in ‘Taboosh Kabaash’ and in its use. The epithet appears across various contexts, each with a unique implication. In one context, it functions as a mythicized self-epithet that heightens destructive capacity and overwhelming dominance, as in

Extract 16 [C17, 2 January 2026, 0:31 - 0:39]

“Am Indaboski Bahose; alias Taboosh Kabaash”

Extract 17 [C15, 7 January 2026, 0:26 - 0:29]

“The Taboosh Kabash is out for war”

Extract 18 [C13, 11 January 2026, 0:11 - 0:24]

“And his name is call the lion himself, the war himself, the battle himself, the liquid metal himself, the Taboosh Kabaash”

In another context, it functions not merely as a name but as an invoked source of supernatural force, as in:

Extract 19 [C11, 19 January 2026, 1:59 - 2:08]

“Get ready this is your year of prosperity and back it up with the power of Taboosh Kabaash”

Extract 20 [C02, 19 February 2026, 0:02 - 0:07]

“2026 is a year of Taboosh Kabaash”

Table 4. Recurrent Power Lexis

Word	Frequenc y	Clip IDs	Dominant Function
Battle(s)	33	C03, C06, C07, C10, C11, C13, C14, C17, C25, C26, C27, C29, C30, C31	Showing himself as a warrior
Fight	25	C03, C06, C11, C14, C15, C18, C25, C26, C29, C30, C31	Presenting himself as active aggression
Power(s)	25	C01, C11, C12, C14, C19, C21, C27, C28, C29, C30	Claiming supernatural strength
War	23	C03, C06, C08, C11, C13, C15, C18, C23, C25, C26, C27, C30, C31	Framing life as constant conflict
Authority (ies)	13	C11, C19, C21, C29	Claiming the right to command, control, or dominate
Fire	6	C02, C19, C21	Representing destructive spiritual force

Odumeje shows a marked tendency to create militant identities and spiritual warfare metaphors through which he equates life with battle, in his adoption and frequent repetition of ‘battle’. The word commonly

occurs in triadic clusters: ‘war – fight – battle’, and in identity chains: ‘Am a war...am a fight...am a battle, used to issue threats, as in:

Extract 21 [Co6, 31 January 2025, 0:08 - 0:10]

“I remain for battles”

Extract 22 [C25, 17 December 2025, 0:05 - 0:08]

“Am a force; am a fight; am a battle”

It also appears in reassurance statements, as in:

Extract 23 [C29, 10 December 2025, 4:17 - 4:24]

“Jesus have the capability the ability or facility to fight all your battle”

Extract 24 [Co7, 27 January 2026, 1:00 - 1:05]

“That you are in Christ...don't mean that you cannot have battles”

The distribution pattern of the word, according to the table above, indicates wide dispersion.

Odumeje disperses ‘fight’ moderately highly and concentrates it slightly more than ‘battle(s)’ to reinforce threats and mark endless conflicts, as in:

Extract 25 [C14, 8 January 2026, 0:09 - 0:14]

“I have never lose a fight and I can never lose a fight”

Extract 26 [C30, 6 December 2025, 0:53 - 0:56]

“Am the fight; am the war; am the battle”

‘Fight’ commonly occurs in ‘war – fight – battle’ sequencing and in contrastive declarations, as in:

Extract 27 [C25, 17 December 2025, 0:09 - 0:21]

“That is not a statement of a joker... am a war; am a fight; am a battle.”

Extract 28 [C30, 6 December 2025, 0:15 - 0:18]

“Am not a man of preacher of love...am a fight.”

Unlike ‘war’ and ‘fight,’ which are more closely tied to threats, ‘power’ aligns with blessing pronouncements, depicting supernatural empowerment, prophetic assurance, and charismatic authority, as in:

Extract 29 [C11, 19 January 2026, 0:03 - 0:10]

“This is the 2026 and the year the Lord has already prepared a full power for you”

Extract 30 [C19, 1 January 2026, 0:01 - 0:02]

“Wherever you are, I speak with the power”

Extract 31 [C27, 16 December 2025, 0:03 - 0:08]

“When it come for practical power, I am the one”

Extract 32 [Co1, 17 February 2026, 0:52 - 1:04]

“When you are coming out, you come out like a bulldozer...because your step is a step walking with power.”

‘War’ has a very high occurrence, almost like ‘battle’, appearing in announcements and identity metaphors to establish militant theology. The frequent mentions and allusions to ‘war’ make it a recurring theme. It often comes first in triplet clusters: ‘war - fight - battle’, intensifying confrontation. As a watchword to which Odumeje commonly adapts his persona, he attaches ‘himself’ to ‘war’ to equate himself with the characteristics of warfare. Its occurrence in 13 clips suggests a wide distribution, evinced in themes that depict life as a conflict-laden affair, as in:

Extract 33 [C03, 13 February 2026, 0:15 - 0:18]

“Life is all about fight and war”

Extract 34 [C06, 31 January 2026, 0:01 - 0:06]

“Between light and darkness, I am for war”

Extract 35 [C11, 19 January 2026, 1:48 - 1:51]

“And don't forget am...the war himself”

In his idiolectal use, Odumeje also shows a contrast between perceived non-aggressive counterparts and himself, as in:

Extract 36 [C23, 18 December 2025, 0:02 - 0:07]

“I am not a man of stories; I am a man of war”

Extract 37 [C30, 6 December 2025, 0:14 - 0:16]

“Am not a man of preacher of love; am a war”

Odumeje’s words are power-laden, evident in the recurring mentions of war, fight, and battle. He consistently insinuates aggression and presents himself as war-ready and war-embodied; yet through his use of “authority,” he self-endorses his spiritual position, dominance, and claim to spiritual power. The term appears in specific teaching and prophetic contexts and is not peculiar to his idiolect, given its function of validating, legitimising, and justifying claims, as in:

Extract 38 [C21, 22 December 2025, 3:15 - 3:30]

“The name of Jesus have authority over all authorities. Every authority...bow by the authority”

Extract 39 [C11, 19 January 2026, 1:03 - 1:09]

“I speak to you by the name above other name, by the power and authority”

Extract 40 [C19, 1 January 2026, 0:48 - 0:50]

“I speak with authority in the name of Jesus”

‘Authority’ has low dispersion in the examined transcript; Clip C21 alone records nine of the thirteen occurrences, showing its concentration in specific sermons.

Odumeje exudes a fiery prophetic persona, which manifests through the frequent mentions of ‘fire’: a Pentecostal energiser which creates imageries of destructive forces. The word is delivered through exclamations and occurs more in high-intensity deliverance segments (for spiritual purification), thus resulting in very low frequency.

Extract 41 [C19, January 1, 2026, 0:58 – 1:01]

“Let the fire of God begin to touch you”

Extract 42 [C19, January 1, 2026, 1:14 – 1:17]

“I command that altar to catch fire”

Table 5. Second-Person Address Forms

Word	Frequency	Range
You	235	26
Your	84	22
Yourself	5	4
Yours	1	1

Odumeje’s common use of second-person pronouns and the second-person possessive determiner shows his likelihood to confront or address specific audiences directly. Among the 32 reviewed clips, only three lack these forms: C15, a 42-second clip addressing perceived enemies; C25, a 47-second clip marked by militant self-glorification and the construction of an aggressive warrior identity; and C26, a 39-second video featuring celebratory self-glorification from a third-person perspective. The brevity of these clips may explain the absence of second-person forms, which function as digital performance cues through which Odumeje directs attention and manages interaction. In the approximately 6,200-word transcript, 325 words (5.2%) consist of second-person pronouns and the second-person possessive determiner, showing strong interpersonal engagement and possible confrontation or persuasion.

Table 6. First-person Pronominal Form

Word	Frequency	Range
I	208	30
Me	45	16
My	28	13
Myself	1	1

Odumeje is an assertive speaker, as reflected in his recurring use of first-person pronominals. There are frequent self-references, positioning him as the subject and centre of many explosive declarations. All 32 clips

under study demonstrate speaker foregrounding, identity amplification, charismatic authority performance, and militant self-framing, except C15, a 42-second clip, where he refers to himself indirectly from a third-person perspective. Thus, in a transcript of about 6,200 words, 279 words refer to the speaker, representing 4.5% of the total words, that is, one in every 22 words. This pattern is not accidental but a deliberate rhetorical technique.

Code-Switching and Ethnolinguistic Alignment

Given Odumeje's church location and audience profile, he occasionally inserts Igbo words and sentences into his speeches to establish intimacy, ensure clarity, establish intimacy, generate humour, provide ethnolinguistic emphasis, and reinforce claims, as in:

Extract 43 [C01, 17 February 2026, 0:52 - 1:01]

“When you're coming out, you come like a bulldozer. I na aga etu a, Ekwensu a na-gu step gi onu, ka O malu mgbe I ga eru because egwu gi na atu ya”

[When you are coming out, come like a bulldozer. As you are moving like this, the devil is counting your steps so that he will know when you will arrive, because he is afraid of you]

Extract 44 [C17, 2 January 2026, 0:47 - 0:53]

“Onye si na ike adiro, step into the battlefield”

[Whoever says there is no power, step into the battlefield.]

Extract 45 [C24, 17 December 2025, 2:58 - 3:03]

“He don't know that he will call honey; kama O kpo ghu Papa Okechukwu”

[She does not know that she should call you 'honey'; instead, she would call you Okechukwu's father]

Menacing Words

Odumeje's bluntness, assertiveness, and confrontational approach sometimes result in hyperbolic remarks with threatening effects on the audience. While such assertions are made to warn or ridicule, they are also meant to generate humour, as in:

Extract 46 [C01, 17 February 2026, 0:26 - 1:38]

“When you're coming out, don't move like Mungo Park...I choo ofu rag gbaa n'aru gi piao. Sometimes, ufodu, problem fa ya eme ya, O ma madi n'oyi azu akwa. Onwelu ike brassiere oyi n'ime, nwanyi, oburu no azu brassiere ka oyi...unu abiazina ebe a di ka ndi Ochanja...Omagho kwa na ebe I si we biaba ebe a bu Okpoko”

[When you're coming out, don't move like Mungo Park...you get one rag and put on your body. Sometimes, some people's problems make them unaware that they are wearing their clothes inside out. It is possible that even the brassiere a woman wears underneath might also be worn inside out...You people should stop dressing and coming to this place like Ochanja traders...He does not know that you come to this place from Okpoko]

Extract 47 [C08, 25 January 2026, 0:51 - 0:55]

“I die many years ago on this altar”

Extract 48 [C32, 26 November 2025, 0:21 - 0:24]

“The way you walk like a homosexual”

Extract 49 [C30, 6 December 2025, 0:50 - 0:51]

“Am a dead man”

Extract 50 [C10, 20 January 2026, 0:01 - 0:06]

“I die many years ago; I feel no pain”

Extract 51 [C30, 6 December 2025, 0:28 - 0:31]

“I will destroy you and I will destroy your generation”

Extract 52 [Co8, 25 January 2026, 0:10 - 0:17]

“I swear with my blood and I swear with my life. I will clear your family”

Table 7. Frequency and Percentage Distribution of Grammatical Error Categories

Word	Frequency	Distribution	Percentage
Subject–Verb Agreement	125	30	15.31%
Word Order Deviations	121	29	14.81%
Article Misuse (a/an/the)	121	32	14.81%
Prepositional Errors	106	29	12.97%
Omission of Copula (“be”)	82	29	10.04%
Pluralisation	75	26	9.18%
Auxiliary Errors	74	30	9.06%
Redundancy and Double Marking	73	26	8.93%
Tense Inconsistency	33	17	4.04%
Pronoun Case	7	7	0.86%

A total of 817 grammatical errors were found in the 32 reviewed clips, with subject–verb agreement occurring most, appearing in all but two clips. This pattern suggests a common grammatical weakness rather than occasional slips. Since subject–verb agreement is a core component of English grammar, violating it indicates

instability in grammatical concord. As it appears in nearly all the clips, regardless of topic or the speaker's emotional state, it is reasonable to deem this a distinctive feature of Odumeje's English usage, as evinced in:

Extract 53 [C21, 22 December 2025, 0:09 - 0:20]

“There is a lot of names...there’s a lot of idols...there’s a lot of people”

Extract 54 [C12, 12 January 2026, 1:07 - 1:09]

“He know if he give you car now”

Extract 55 [Co7, 27 January 2026, 1:00 - 1:05]

“That you are in Christ don't mean that you cannot face challenges; don't mean that you cannot have battles”

Extract 56 [C24, 17 December 2025, 3:29 - 3:32]

“...a man have already have from the beginning of life”

Word-order deviations are as frequent as subject–verb agreement errors in the dataset. While the latter is morphological, word-order deviations are syntactic. The high frequency of both categories suggests weak performance at certain structural levels of English grammar. Given the absence of this error type in just three clips, it is right to conclude that these word-order deviations are not random slips but a systematic idiolectal feature. The deviations include needless inversions, wrong ordering of modifiers and auxiliaries, and distortion of semantic structures, which may result from mother-tongue interferences, attempts to create emphasis, spontaneous speech without prior preparation, and the use of certain patterns where they are unnecessary, as in:

Extract 57 [C32, 26 November 2025, 0:12 - 0:16]

“What prove to you is the practical proof that Jesus called you?”

Extract 58 [C20, 25 December 2025, 0:01 - 0:05]

“All the peoples that have market, don't leave their market to go anyhow.”

Extract 59 [C23, 18 December 2025, 1:25 - 1:32]

“Everyone forgets a hard works and to go and do business and have a jobs.”

The occurrence of article misuse, the same as that of word-order deviations, is slightly lower than that of subject–verb agreement. Given this small difference, the first three error categories are the three most frequent. Because article misuse appears in all clips, its distribution is the widest among the major categories; thus, this error is systematic regardless of topic or context. The high occurrence and wide distribution may result from the fact that article use is strictly governed by rules and proves difficult for speakers whose native languages lack articles or apply them differently. In the reviewed transcript, the misuse manifests as omission, wrong positioning, and substitution of one for another, as in:

Extract 60 [Co4, 9 February 2026, 1:04 - 1:07]

“This year will put smile in your face”

Extract 61 [C20, 25 December 2025, 0:12 - 0:15]

“...in a market in a Lagos”

Extract 62 [Co8, 25 January 2026, 1:17 - 1:19]

“I will slap native doctor hell out of them.”

Given their non-occurrence in only three clips, prepositional errors are among the most recurring and therefore a prominent feature in the dataset. English prepositions are highly idiomatic, rarely predictable, and not strictly governed by fixed grammatical rules. Given their often irregular logical patterns, prepositions are particularly prone to misuse when speakers ad-lib, manifesting as omissions, wrong choices, or redundancies, as in:

Extract 63 [C29, 10 December 2025, 1:25 - 1:27]

“...talking nonsense for you to listen in.”

Extract 64 [Co1, 17 February 2026, 0:10 - 0:15]

“Look for a nice perfume; flash to your body”

Extract 65 [Co7, 27 January 2026, 1:07 - 1:08]

“You are the apple in the eyes of God.”

Extract 66 [C11, 19 January 2026, 0:46 - 1:19]

“We will fight to generation to generation...stand on the name of Jesus”

Copula omission, absent in only three clips, is another dominant feature in the dataset, like prepositional errors. Omitting the copula not only weakens the predicate but also disconnects the subject from the complement, thus affecting the completeness of the clause. Although this omission may result from swift emotional ad-libbing, its wide dispersion across contexts implies systematic deviation rather than accidental or occasional slips, as manifested in:

Extract 67 [Co6, 31 January 2026, 0:35 - 0:39]

“No one guides me; I guide by almighty.”

Extract 68 [Co3, 13 February 2026, 1:00 - 1:06]

“I born for war; I born for fight; I born for spiritually battles”

Extract 69 [C19 1 January 2026, 0:26 - 0:32]

“Many are already programmed how many lives shall be wasted...”

Pluralisation errors occur when number markers like ‘s’, ‘es’, or ‘ies’ are omitted or wrongly placed. The misuse appears in uncountable nouns and nominal forms with irregular plurality systems. This error is more common among speakers with limited exposure to English or lower levels of formal education. The realization of these errors in over 80% of the reviewed clips shows frequent problems with number marking, although in nominal environments, as in:

Extract 70 [C21, 22 December 2025, 03:35 - 3:39]

“Any authority of a demons, any evil authorities...”

Extract 71 [C14, 8 January 2026, 0:25 - 0:29]

“Every sons and daughters of the lion families”

Extract 72 [Co8, 25 January 2026, 1:00 - 1:01]

“...a human beings”

Although auxiliary errors appear in 9.07% of all detected errors, their dispersion across 30 clips places them among the major error category. Primary auxiliaries are forms of be, have, and do: is, are, was, were, am, has, have, had, do, does, did. Modals include can, could, will, would, shall, should, may, might, must, etc. Auxiliaries are significant in English grammar as they mark tense (had stopped), form questions (can we stop?), create negatives (should not stop), or show modality (must start), etc. Thus, errors appear as omissions, incorrect usage, incorrect tense forms, double marking, etc., as in:

Extract 73 [C14, 8 January 2026, 0:56 - 0:58]

“As your hands is stand firm...”

Extract 74 [C07, 27 January 2026, 0:59 - 1:01]

“That you are in Christ don't mean...”

Although with a slightly lower frequency than auxiliary errors and almost half of the most frequent, subject-verb agreement, redundancy, and double marking errors fall within a considerable range. Their absence in only 6 out of 32 clips suggests wide distribution. Redundancy occurs when words or expressions are needless in context, while double marking occurs when an idea is expressed twice. These errors result from an intention to place emphasis. Although rhetoric may seem strengthened, grammatical stability is weakened, as in:

Extract 75 [C27, 16 December 2025, 0:30 - 0:33]

“I have said to you time on countless times”

Extract 76 [C30, 6 December 2025, 0:29 - 0:32]

“I will destroy you and I will destroy your generation”

Tense inconsistency occurs where there is unjustified switching from one tense form to another in the same context. For instance, starting a narrative in the present and ending it in the past or vice versa without justification. The appearance in approximately half of the clips shows that this is not a dominant feature but occurs sometimes in Odumeje's English; however, it is noticeable each time, given its occurrence in 53.13% of the dataset. Tense inconsistency not only affects the logical sequence of ideas but also the temporal coherence of the narrative, as in:

Extract 77 [C14, 8 January 2026, 0:09 - 0:11]; [C18, 1 January 2026, 0:36 - 0:38]

“I have never lose a fight”

Extract 78 [C21, 22 December 2025, 1:54 - 1:58]

“...everything that existing on earth bow.”

Grammatical functions determine pronominal choices; thus, pronoun case errors reduce grammatical precision. The low occurrence of this error category in the dataset shows it is not a dominant feature of Odumeje's English. It is also the only error type that appears once in each of the affected clips, showing limited occurrence in this area. The errors occur more frequently as a subjective pronoun replacing an objective pronoun, or vice versa, as in:

Extract 78 [C18, 1 January 2026, 0:22 - 0:24]

“I and my heavenly father”

Extract 8o [C29, 10 December 2025, 2:38 - 2:40]

“He or her is possessed...”

Table 8. Distribution of Audience Comment Types Across Analysed Video Clips

Clip Id	Topic	Date	Duration	Likes	Emojis	Imitative Replies	Positive Replies	Comic Replies	Critical Replies
Co1	Self-confidence	17 Feb 2026	01:55	1.9k	10/12	0	29	1	0
Co2	Crusade announcement	19 Feb 2026	01:13	739	9/9	0	12	1	2
Co3	Perseverance in battle	13 Feb 2026	01:13	4.2k	15/19	3	29	20	61
Co4	Prophetic blessings	9 Feb 2026	01:15	4k	39/40	3	322	11	10
Co5	New-month blessing	2 Feb 2026	01:27	2.3k	19/27	0	103	1	8
Co6	Spiritual warfare vow	31 Jan 2026	01:07	14.5k	38/41	0	94	23	48
Co7	Faith encouragement	27 Jan 2026	01:10	1.3k	8/10	0	35	4	3
Co8	Spiritual warfare	25 Jan 2026	01:37	38.4k	159/200	99	291	268	328
Co9	Prophetic blessing	24 Jan 2026	01:00	1.8k	19/20	0	112	0	2
Co10	Self-assertion of power	20 Jan 2026	01:05	11.9k	47/52	25	67	29	100
Co11	Spiritual warfare declaration	19 Jan 2026	02:09	902	7/7	0	34	0	3
Co12	Divine protection	12 Jan 2026	01:41	526	7/7	0	14	0	1
Co13	Prophetic Declaration	11 Jan 2026	01:00	2.7k	22/24	0	40	15	31
Co14	Victory declaration	8 Jan 2026	01:35	1.5k	12/12	1	37	5	16

C15	Spiritual warfare	7 Jan 2026	0:42	4.4k	29/34	2	46	17	58
C16	Self-glorification	6 Jan 2026	01:02	8.1k	34/41	36	53	19	44
C17	Enemy destruction	2 Jan 2026	0:53	12.5k	37/39	2	361	9	32
C18	Divine victory	1 Jan 2026	01:11	6.8k	58/62	5	152	20	39
C19	Prophetic prayer	1 Jan 2026	01:34	3.6k	53/58	0	253	7	14
C20	Prophetic warning	25 Dec 2025	01:22	1.5k	21/24	0	16	1	3
C21	Supremacy of Jesus	22 Dec 2025	03:48	261	4/4	0	7	0	0
C22	Believers' victory	19 Dec 2025	0:59	2.6k	13/17	0	30	4	15
C23	Anti-idol crusade	18 Dec 2025	01:54	1.2k	9/10	0	19	2	6
C24	Marital advice	17 Dec 2025	06:19	469	8/9	0	7	0	1
C25	Militant self-assertion	17 Dec 2025	0:47	270	7/7	0	7	0	1
C26	Self-praise	17 Dec 2025	0:39	8k	27/28	10	70	27	46
C27	Self-exaltation	16 Dec 2025	01:47	37.2k	37/45	15	70	63	156
C28	Church invitation	15 Dec 2026	01:41	1.1k	12/13	1	17	6	9
C29	Exclusivity of Jesus	10 Dec 2025	05:08	512	7/9	0	35	0	1
C30	Spiritual militancy	6 Dec 2025	01:03	257	3/4	0	3	1	1
C31	Intimidating self-assertion	4 Dec 2025	0:46	14.7k	30/40	16	28	39	180
C32	Authenticity of ministry	26 Nov 2025	01:40	546	4/5	1	9	5	0
Total			52:41	190k	804/929	219	2402	598	1219

According to this tabular representation, followers make more positive comments than critical or corrective ones. However, such responses are elicited more by clips proclaiming goodwill than by those asserting the preacher's supernatural and spiritual dominance. Although some imitative and comic responses are also positive (comprising praise and admiration and affirmation of the persona Odumeje's words construct), the purely positive ones constitute 54.12% of the entire reviewed responses, showing that Odumeje's words are largely accepted rather than rejected.

Critical comments are next in the ranking of the major comment types. Although followers also direct their responses to Odumeje's uncommon signs and gestures as well as to his proclamations, all critical and corrective comments sum up 27.48% of the reviewed responses. This category represents followers' rejection of Odumeje's usage (grammar and pronunciation). This category is important in this analysis because it provides contrastive evidence, showing that Odumeje's English also attracts criticism. While some followers are more interested in his prophetic prowess, others still judge his speeches according to standard language expectations and react to perceived deviations.

In 13.47% of the analysed comments, followers positively engage with Odumeje's messages, with amusement and laughter. Some of the comments are somewhat satirical, but not so strongly as to be labelled critical. From a sociolinguistic point of view, humour (a comic effect) can be analysed as a means of tacit acceptance, given that the audience continues to return to the clips as sources of entertainment, and the speaker's style gradually becomes part of the community's accepted communicative culture. Although it is sometimes difficult to determine whether certain comments are particularly positive or critical, their humorous features sufficiently imply engagement and understanding. Since some comments do not show explicit rejection, they are better regarded as modest forms of acceptance of Odumeje's content.

Followers' imitative comments are the smallest in number, constituting 4.93% of the reviewed comments. In these comments, followers mimic Odumeje's slogans and epithets, which depicts linguistic alignment or adoption. Some of these comments are made humorously to allude to Odumeje's distinctive epithets, but they nonetheless suggest acceptance, without which followers would not readily reproduce Odumeje's self-assertive expressions.

The 'Emojis' column represents positive emojis as numerators and the total emojis per clip as denominators. The high counts of the numerators show that 86.54% of all reviewed emojis are positive, thus representing semiotic devices that portray acceptance and alignment, as well as the 'likes', which on TikTok suggest approval.

Conclusion

Odumeje's English is marked and exhibits patterned variation in phonological, lexical, and grammatical features owing to social identity, communicative contexts, and stylistic choices. At the phonological level, word-final consonant deletion occurs at prominent but varying rates and can affect word class and meaning. These include /t/ deletion, which occurs most frequently; /d/ deletion, which occurs less frequently although the consonant itself appears frequently in the dataset; and /z/ deletion, which occurs occasionally. Notable consonant substitutions also occur, such as [r] with [l], [ʃ] with [dʒ], and devoicing of [v] as [f], as well as occasional simplification of [tʃ] to [ʃ] and [dʒ] to [ʒ].

Odumeje's lexical patterns are characterized by distinctive self-referential epithets aimed at reinforcing a prophetic persona and a tendency towards spiritual conflict and dominance. The wide distribution of these identity and power lexes justifies their role as stylistic elements through which Odumeje asserts authority, performs sermons, and engages the audience. Thus, Odumeje's recurring use of first-person pronouns signals self-assertiveness; however, his prominent code-switching and use of second-person pronouns show audience orientation. While his words are listener-focused, they also exhibit a tendency towards confrontation. Odumeje is bluntly direct, as seen in his vulgar, threatening, and intimidating words.

At the grammatical level, Odumeje's English is marked by frequent nonconformity with Standard English norms, with subject-verb inconsistencies occurring most often, followed by word-order deviations, article misuse, prepositional inaccuracies, subject or copula omissions, pluralisation irregularities, auxiliary errors, redundancy, tense inconsistencies, and pronoun case errors. The pervasiveness of these ill-formed structures across almost every clip indicates that they are regular features of Odumeje's locution rather than mere slips.

From a variationist perspective, these ungrammatical forms can be labelled nonstandard features constituting a system within Odumeje's English grammar.

Most of the comments on Odumeje's sermons are purely positive and exceed those in the other categories. This shows Odumeje's sermons and use of English elicit more acceptance and alignment among followers than rejection. Of all emojis submitted as responses, 86% are positive. Audience alignment and acceptance are yet evinced in 'likes' on clips, with each of the 32 clips receiving an average of approximately 6,000 'likes'. Within the framework of Social Identity Theory (SIT), these responses imply ingroup affirmation, whereby followers show acceptance of a charismatic figure whose language use symbolizes community identity.

While both comic and imitative comments contain elements of criticism, according to SIT they not only show how followers align with the sermons when amused or entertained but also the followers' tendency to identify with the linguistic style during imitation.

Although 27.48% of the comments are corrective or critical, within the SIT framework this criticism does not necessarily imply disengagement but rather intragroup negotiation of specific linguistic choices.

Implication of Findings

There are numerous varieties of English fostered by social identity, communicative success, and social contexts, and not just by grammatical accuracy. Certain English forms can also be used to establish charismatic authority. Given that media exposure can influence language perception and acquisition, beginner English learners who are often exposed to online events may encounter influential public figures who use non-standard English forms that could gain currency and develop into widely accepted varieties. Thus, language forms may gain acceptance because they represent community identity and charismatic leadership.

Recommendation

Consumers of social-media language content should recognize that context, identity, and communicative purpose influence language variety, and this should not negatively affect one's language use. Accordingly, English language learners should understand that many influential figures may use substandard forms that gain social acceptance, and this does not mean such forms are grammatically standard.

Hence, English language teachers should help learners develop critical listening skills to distinguish varieties shaped by social contexts from standard norms. Teachers may include digital literacy in the syllabus to help students critically analyse digital discourse by public figures who indirectly promote socially marked language forms.

References

- Akoko, S. J. (2024). A review of factors affecting the implementation of the secondary school's English language curriculum in Nigeria. *Capital Journal of Educational Studies*, 9(1), 12–19.
- Amadi, E. A., Nnamani, O. C., & Ani, A. C. (2022). Effect of Nigerian English usage on the written English of Nigerian learners of English as a second language. *Journal of General Studies*, 4(2), 20–31
- Bansag, R. Jr. P., & Manigo, J. A. (2025). Influence of charismatic and transformational leadership on the organizational performance of network marketers in Tagum City. *International Journal of Research Studies in Education*, 14(14), 1–12. <https://doi.org/10.5861/ijrse.2025.25224>
- Cadatty, B., Suryadi, S., & Iryani, E. (2025). The influence of students' perception of social media and learning motivation on their English learning. *International Journal of Education, Language and Religion*, 7(1), 27–38. <https://doi.org/10.35308/ijelr.v7i1.12112>
- Carlos., Riadi, A., & Manurung, S. T. (2025). An analysis of writing errors in public figures' caption on Instagram. *ELSA: English Language Studies and Applied Linguistics Journal*, 5(2), 30–36. <https://doi.org/10.63848/elsa.v05n2.4>
- Dunn, J., & Wong, S. (2025). Language contact and population contact as sources of dialect similarity. *Languages*, 10(8), 188. <https://doi.org/10.3390/languages10080188>
- Giles, H., Clementson, D. E., & Markowitz, D. M. (2025). CAT-ologuing the past, present, and future. In H. Giles, D. M. Markowitz, & D. E. Clementson (Eds.), *New directions for, and panaceas arising from, communication accommodation theory* (pp. 1–31). Peter Lang. <https://doi.org/10.3726/b21641>
- Giora, R., & Gur, I. (2011). Irony in conversation: Salience, role, and context effects. In B. Nerlich, Z. Todd, V. Herman, & D. Clarke (Eds.), *Polysemy: Flexible patterns of meaning in mind and language* (pp. 297–316). De Gruyter Mouton. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110895698.297>
- Harwood, J. (2020). Social identity theory. In J. van den Bulck (Ed.), *International encyclopedia of media psychology*. Wiley. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781119011071.iemp0153>
- Hasanah, R., & Baharun, Z. H. S. (2025). Faithfluencers and digital piety: Redefining religious authority among Generation Z. *Indonesian Journal of Islamic Religious Education*, 3(2), 125–136. <https://doi.org/10.63243/Injire.v3i2.01>
- Kabylbayeva, N., & Begalinova, K. (2025). The influence of Islamic preachers on youth through social networks. *JETE – Journal of Philosophy, Religious and Cultural Studies*, 4(153)(4), 123–135. <https://doi.org/10.32523/3080-1281-2025-153-4-123-135>
- Kiruja, P. K., Kagema, D. N., & Mwongera, P. K. (2025). Digital discipleship: Investigating youth participation in online church services in FGCK Meru South District, Kenya. *Journal of Pastoral and Practical Theology*, 4(1), 87–107. <https://doi.org/10.51317/jppt.v4i1.850>
- Labov, W. (1966). *The social stratification of English in New York City*. Center for Applied Linguistics.
- Labov, W. (1972). *Sociolinguistic patterns*. University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Labov, W. (2006). *The social stratification of English in New York City* (2nd ed.). Cambridge University Press.
- Le Page, R. B., & Tabouret-Keller, A. (1985). *Acts of identity: Creole-based approaches to language and ethnicity*. Cambridge University Press.
- Mendoza, A., Sah, P. K., & Rajendram, S. (2025). English as a lingua franca and World Englishes in English language teaching. In A. Nazari & N. (Ed.), *Empowering the English language teacher in a multipolar environment*. Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-96-4839-9_12
- Mohammad, R. (2024). Intertwining worlds: The dynamics of linguistic religion and religious language. *Journal of Religion, Education, and Linguistics*, 1(2), 49–66. <https://doi.org/10.31763/jorel.v1i2.6>
- Nandhita, F. A., Oktoriyadi, A. F., Nisa, R. M., Hera, H., Wijaya, P. A., & Verawati, V. (2025). The influence of English language film media on students' English language skills. *Tunas: Jurnal Pendidikan Guru Sekolah Dasar*, 10(2), 198–201. <https://doi.org/10.33084/tunas.v10i2.11392>
- Ndububa, C. L. (2025d). American English phonology in British dictionaries and its global implications. *Global Journal of English Language Teaching*, 5(1), 6–21. <https://doi.org/10.20448/gjelt.v5i1.7627>

- Ndububa, C. L., & Ugoala, B. (2025b). Digital pragmatics and human identity in interactions with selected AI chatbots. *Confluence Journal of Multidisciplinary Studies*, 1(1), 166–184. <https://doi.org/10.34874/PRSM.cjms-voliiss1.5028>
- Ndububa, C. L., & Ugoala, B. (2025c). Style variation and politeness strategies in large language model-based chatbots. *American International Journal of Multidisciplinary Scientific Research*, 16(1), 1–13. <https://doi.org/10.46281/aijmsr.v16i1.2572>
- Oliveira, J. (2025). Social identity theory: The psychology of group identity and everyday life (Version 1) [Article]. Zenodo. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.17430203>
- Omphile, L. (2025). Influence of charismatic leadership on organizational innovation: Evidence from the South Africa. *International Journal of Leadership and Governance*, 5(3), 72–82. <https://doi.org/10.47604/ijlg.3409>
- Phineas, T. P., Yusuf, L. I., Ahmed, F. F., & Dauda, G. (2025). The role of English language in fostering human development in Nigeria. *EDUMALSYS Journal of Research in Education Management*, 3(1), 55–68. <https://doi.org/10.58578/edumalsys.v3i1.4949>
- Rafi'i, M. (2024). Pronunciation error done by some Indonesian prominent public figures on YouTube channel. *IDEAS: Journal of Language Teaching and Learning, Linguistics and Literature*, 12(2), 313–3124. <https://doi.org/10.2456/ideas.v12i2.5991>
- Richter, S., Richter, A., & Franklin, D. (2025). Sticky narratives: How micro-influencers engage and retain their audience through storytelling. *Australasian Marketing Journal*, 1–14. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1441358225134044>
- Sağlam, B., Özek, F., Buran, A., & Gooskens, C. (2025). Assessing mutual intelligibility between Kurmanji and Zazaki spoken in Elazığ at text level. *Dilbilim Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 36(3), 321–344. <https://doi.org/10.18492/dad.1696092>
- Scheller, S. O., Jones, E. B., & Vick, N. A. (2021). MarketingFaith: The megachurch pastor as social media influencer. In B. Watkins (Ed.), *Research perspectives on social media influencers and their followers* (pp. 51–71). Lexington Books. <https://doi.org/10.5040/9781978728097.ch-003>
- Setiadi, M. A., Auliah, I., Salsabillah, G. D., & Dinata, K. I. (2026). The influence of TikTok apps on the development of adolescent social identity: An analysis based on social identity theory. *Journal of Psychology and Social Sciences*, 4(1), 9–19. <https://doi.org/10.61994/jpss.v4i1.1412>
- Sharifian, F. (2016). “Glocalisation” of the English language: A cultural linguistics perspective. *KEMANUSIAAN: The Asian Journal of Humanities*, 23(Suppl. 2), 1–17. <https://doi.org/10.21315/kajh2016.23.s2.1>
- Shihan, M. S. T., & Talukder, M. S. (2025). Influence of social media on English communication skills: A study on the students at Shanto. *Interdisciplinary Perspectives of Education*, 2(1), 52–62.
- Shuaibu, A., & Maikanti, S. (2025). The impact of indigenous languages on Nigerian English pronunciation: A focus on Hausa speakers. *Ondo Journal of Arts*, 1(1), 55–77.
- Taiwo, R. (2009). The functions of English in Nigeria from the earliest times to the present day. *English Today*, 25(2), 3–10. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0266078409000121>
- Tajfel, H., & Turner, J. C. (1979). An integrative theory of intergroup conflict. In W. G. Austin & S. Worchel (Eds.), *The social psychology of intergroup relations* (pp. 33–47). Brooks/Cole.
- Tsucana, J. A. (2024). Linguistic acceptability. *International Journal for Research in Applied Science & Engineering Technology (IJRASET)*, 12, 1204–1212. <https://doi.org/10.22214/ijraset.2024.64838>
- Ugoala, B. (2020). Adaptability and linguistic creativity of Nigerian English in internet memes. *International Journal of Integrative Humanism*, 12(2), 36–51.
- Wid igdo, M. S. A. (2017). After the death of charismatic authority: A Weberian perspective on early Islam. *Afkaruna: Indonesian Interdisciplinary Journal of Islamic Studies*, 13(2), 265–276. <https://doi.org/10.18196/AIJIS.2017.0075.265-276>
- Yule, G. (2023). *The study of language* (8th ed.). Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009233446>
- Zorell, C. V. (2026). Everyday social influence and political consumerism (Preprint). Research Square. <https://doi.org/10.21203/rs.3.rs-8743711/v1>

Declarations
Author's Contribution:
<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ Conceptualization, and intellectual revisions, Data collection, interpretation, and drafting of manuscript▪ The author agrees to take responsibility for every facet of the work, making sure that any concerns about its integrity or veracity are thoroughly examined and addressed
Conflict of Interest: NIL
Funding Sources: NIL
Correspondence:
Chukwuma Livinus Ndububa
nou234303430@noun.edu.ng
How to Cite:
English Usage and Implicit Audience Alignment in Digitally Mediated Sermons: The Case of Odumeje. (2026). Wah Academia Journal of Global Religions, 2(2), 1-25. https://doi.org/10.63954/2f4xwdo3
Open Access: Publication is Open Access
Licensing: Creative Commons Attribution License - CC BY- 4.0
Copyrights: The author retains unrestricted copyrights and publishing rights