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Abstract
Various submissions on politeness matters show prearrangement for formulation rules that govern successful interaction. One of the major requirements in interaction is that a participant in an interaction must consider and protect the face of his fellow participant if he wishes to attain success in the interaction. This assertion forms its basis on the principles of politeness. Moreover, it is observed that the low number of women legislators in the Nigeria’s parliament did not hinder their active participation. It is also observed that the women successfully gain the support of the male counterpart in moving motions on proposed bills. Some of these passed bills were very sensitive and confrontational to the existing laws. This study aimed to investigate the speeches of some of the Nigerian women legislators. The study was interested in the use of politeness strategies employed by these women in their speeches; how they were able to meet the needs of their listeners by protecting their faces so as to meet the requirements that characterised successful interaction. Therefore, adopting the theories of Politeness as its framework, this paper was drafted on the basis of sociolinguistic and pragmatic studies. The data for the investigation were collected from the speeches delivered by some of the women legislators and the response to those speeches by some of the male counterparts. The data were analysed using qualitative method and findings indicated some peculiarities that women legislators adopted in their speeches in order to achieve satisfactory interaction in the parliament.
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Introduction
The parliament is a place where a country’s laws are formulated. In a democratic polity, parliamentary system must constitute representatives of units and interests of the members of the society. Views and interests are drawn and allowed to mould the society’s future (cf. Inter-Parliamentary Union 2009: Report and Document No.54). In such parliament, women are involved and their interests are represented. This ensures balance in polity.

Nigeria is a democratic nation. Its parliament is made up of two chambers: the upper chamber known as the Senate and the lower chamber which is known as the House of Representatives. Both the upper chamber and the lower chamber have female representatives. However, a report from Al-jazeera News Network streamed live on February 14, 2019 showed low turnout of women in politics in Nigeria notwithstanding her current position as the Africa’s number one democracy. To support this claim, statistics report from the International
Parliamentary Union (IPU) as at February 1, 2019, showed that barely six percent of women represent the electorates at both the upper chamber and the lower chamber of the national assembly. Meanwhile, female politicians face societal challenges such as intimidating number of male legislators, alienation, denial and harassment from their communities (Tayo et al, 2016: 156). Notwithstanding these challenges, it is observed that these women may have some potentials that make their contributions endorsed. This implies that they do not only have their way of presenting matters to the house, they also have a way of earning support; including very sensitive and confrontational matters.

It is observed that the choice of language and certain interactional behaviours may have played very important role in the success of these women. Lakoff (1975: 53-55) for instance, observes politeness as strategies used more by women in their speeches. Also Thorne, Kramarae and Henley (1983) cited in Holmes (1984b) observe women speech behaviour to be interactively facilitative and positive politeness oriented.

This study therefore, involves scientific and qualitative analysis of various speeches rendered by some of the female legislators in the National Assembly and the reactions of the recipients of the speeches who are predominantly men. The aim of the study is to investigate the politeness strategies employed by the female legislators in the National Assembly and how they were able to attain support for their proposals.

**Literature and Theoretical Review**

According to Karaforti (2007:120), researches on politeness matters reveal the systemisation of interaction through the formulation of rules. As such, scholarship accounts on the theories of politeness have indicated contentious ideas. This consequently generates complicated models that may work depending on the context used. For instance, Kitamura (2000) observes and discusses some strategies which are not included in Brown and Levinson’s Politeness strategies. The study considers interactant’s speech behaviour and observes the hearer’s constant use of back channelling and yet no trace of Face Threatening Act (FTA).

However, politeness matters began with Goffman (1947; 1955; 1974) when he drew attention to other culture-specific usages such as "to give face". This occurs when one speaker arranges for another to take a better line than he would otherwise have been able to take. In this case, Goffman (1955: 213) includes social valuables, such as dignity, honour, self-respect and contempt within the scope of an analysis of face-work. Goffman’s concept sees social face as one’s personal possession and the centre of his security and pleasure, and for one to maintain his social face, therefore involves conforming to a way that is acceptable (Goffman 1967:10, Arendaiiz, 2013: 68). What Goffman specified in his works is that politeness matters in interaction involve participants considering and respecting their faces. Employing such enhances successful interaction.

Slembrouck (2006) defines face as the positive social value which a person effectively claims for himself by the line others assume he has taken during a particular contact. By the line, Slembrouck refers to a pattern of verbal and nonverbal acts by which someone expresses one’s
view of the situation and the participants, especially himself/herself. A line in this sense is seen in terms of effects which are ascribed to an individual as intentional. Scollon and Scollon (1995) define face, thus, as the negotiated public image ...in communicative event. In this case, Odebunmi (2009: 2) describes this point of focus as 'losing and gaining face and the issuance of threats and mitigations.'

Meanwhile, Goffman (1974) looked beyond and behind everyday situations in a search for the structures that invisibly govern them. He observes that the schemata of interpretation enable individuals to locate, perceive, identify and label occurrences within the real world situation. This he calls frames. Goffman (1974) defines frames as organizational and interactional principles by which situations are defined and sustained as experiences; assumptions about what we are seeing in the social world. In other words, frames are the “structures of expectations” that speakers have with respect to situations, events, people, and objects. These expectations are either met or defeated when speakers engage in conversation with each other.

Snow (2007) states the function of frames in interpretive work to include focusing attention on our surroundings by highlighting what is relevant (in frame) and what is irrelevant (out of frame). Common frames and shared expectations help to ensure smooth, synchronous conversational exchanges (Gumperz, 1982). When speakers are operating under different frames, lack of conversational synchronization and participant alignment are accompanying factors.

Goffman’s frame of analysis essentially involves how social actors organise their experience in terms of recognisable activities (e.g. a game of chess, a conference talk etc.). Concerning this, Goffman draws attention to the relationship between primary frameworks and the constructed frameworks of social relationships. Goffman (1974:43-4) notes that, layeredness is presupposed by the participants’ notion of key(ing) and key refers here to a set of conventions by which a given activity, which already is meaningful at the level of a primary framework, is converted into some model for the activity but viewed by the participants to be something else. Considering this, Schiffrin (1994) sees Gumperz’s contextualization cues as a framing device. The cues in this case, indicate the frame in which an utterance should be interpreted.

According to Collins (1988:61), ‘framing permeates the level of ordinary social action. We live in a world of social relationships, in which roles are acted out, with various keying played upon them. This, according to Collins, is the core of practical activities and occupations, of power and stratification. On Goffman’s argument that social life is a stage that deeply incorporated into the nature of talk, Collins (1988: 57) asserts that “Frame space" offers a more precise perspective on the nature of norms in interaction. This suggests that, participants do not learn the norms rather they see norms naturally unfold based on situations. Hence, participants feel they have to behave in a particular way or make amends for not doing so.

The concept of footing is closely connected to that of frame and the organization it has given rise to. It indicates Goffman’s (1974) interest in margin, focus and (dis)engagement in interaction under conditions where speakers and hearers share a physical space. For Goffman, footing involves the speaker's and hearer's shifting alignments as it relates to the events at hand,
as a combination of production/reception format and participation status. He further notes that a shift in footing is another way of talking about a change in our frame for events. One of the notable features of natural talk is made obvious when participants, continuously change their footing as they speak. Hence, 'footing' brings out the need to distinguish between various speaker roles, for instance, when dealing with phenomena such as speech report, being a messenger and other types of situations where a person speaks on behalf of someone else. Goffman suggests that the 'speaker' can be replaced by a 'production format' which consists of three components: the animator, the author and the principal.

However, the theories of politeness were popularised by Lakoff (1973; 1990) and Brown and Levison’s (1978; 1987) works and since then, have since then been one of the linguists’ concerns. Notable recent scholarship accounts on politeness include Kitamura (2000), Elen (2001), Watts (2003; 2005), Vilkki (2006), Karaforti (2007), Odebunmi (2009), among others.

In her 2001 research work on politeness Elen quotes Lakoff’s definition of politeness theory as a system of interpersonal relations designed to facilitate interaction by minimising the potential for confrontation inherent in all human interchange. Judging by this definition, politeness should include the needs of both participants in the interaction (Elen, 2001). On the contrary, Lakoff’s politeness strategies are concerned more with the hearer’s needs (Elen 2001, Karaforti 2007). Meanwhile, Watts (2003), as a follow up study, identifies politeness as behavioural related rather than speech related.

Another strong contender in the business of politeness is Brown and Levinson (1987). The interest of Brown and Levinson is how politeness functions in interaction. Brown and Levinson also are interested in the concept of face and face-work. In this case, politeness is considered when the interlocutor stabilises effect of Face Threatening Act (FTA). Throwing more light to it, Kitamura (2000:1) affirms that expressing politeness is more than just minimising FTAs; it also involves satisfying the interactant’s face whether FTA occurs or not.

In Brown and Levinson’s (1987) submission, face is grouped into positive and negative face. These two grouping, according to them, are the basic wants in any social interaction, and so participants need cooperation to maintain each other’s face.

According to Brown and Levinson, positive and negative faces exist universally in human culture. Their definition of positive face includes the want of every participant that his wants be desirable to other participant. It could also mean the positive consistent self-image (Brown and Levinson, 1987: 62). Self-Image in this case must include the desire that it is appreciated and accepted. Positive face in this case, refers to one's self-pride. It is characterized by desires to be liked, admired, ratified, and related to positively.

On the other hand, Brown and Levinson’s (1987) definition of negative face involves "the want of every 'competent adult member' that his actions be unimpeded by others", or "the basic rights to one’s reserves and rights to non-distraction--i.e. the freedom of action and freedom from imposition". Negative face is characterized by the desire not to be imposed upon.

In social interactions, Face Threatening Acts (FTA) are at times inevitable based on the terms of the conversation. A face threatening act is an act that fundamentally damages the face of
the hearer. This occurs when the speaker acts against the wants and desires of the hearer. Most of these acts are verbal, however, they can also be conveyed in the characteristics of speech (such as tone, inflection and so on) or in non-verbal forms of communication.

At the minimum, there must be at least one of the FTA associated with an utterance. An utterance may also have numerous acts working within it. However, an FTA could either be positive (PFTA) or negative (NFTA). A negative face is threatened when a participant knowingly or unknowingly, refuses to avoid the obstruction of his/her interlocutor's freedom of action. This can cause damage to either the speaker or the hearer, and makes one of the interlocutors to submit his/her will to the other. If negative face is threatened, it results to impediment in the freedom of choice and action. Meanwhile, a positive face is threatened when an interlocutor does not bother about his/her interactor’s desires, feelings, or indicates less interest in what the other wants. Just as NFTA, PFTA can also cause damage to an interlocutor. A positive face is threatened when a participant is forcefully separated from others so that his/her well-being is treated less decisively.

In politeness strategies, moreover, the concept of face is perceived in two dimensions - Positive politeness and Negative politeness. Kitamura explained this dual nature of politeness. Hence, positive politeness is expressed when there occur similarities among interactants and when the interlocutor’s self-image is appreciated. On the other hand, negative politeness is determined by saving the interlocutor’s (positive or negative) face. This is usually achieved through mitigation of FTAs such as advice giving and disapproval. Another way of expressing negative face is by signalling respect for the hearer’s right not to be imposed on.

However, determining what is polite and what is not polite depends on the environment of interaction which may be influenced by some socio-cultural factors. Hence, the indicatives of polite behaviour are socio-culturally based. Odebunmi (2009: 3) on this note cites Fraser (1990) who emphasises the factor of norm breaching as a way of ascertaining what is polite, appropriate, impolite and politic. In other words, what is polite generally is determined by what is societally acceptable (Odebunmi 2009; Locher & Watt 2005; Meier 1995; Eliasoph 1987).

**Politeness Strategies and Legislative Discourse in Nigeria**

Researchers rooted in matters of politeness have consistently observed that strategies of politeness are unavoidable in matters of politics. Legislative discourse, being a segment of political discourse, involves an official interaction where arguments are raised and debated. So there may arise the risk of the participants coming in direct confrontation with each other. However, the speeches of the legislators at this point, are very important to both the legislators and the people that they represent. Therefore, legislators’ interactional behaviours are highly controlled by some socio-cultural and political factors. Hence, the need for political strategies to ensure cooperation and harmony in the legislative house. Politeness strategy moreover, may be of great importance to the members of the house whose interests are at the minority. The need to persuade and to convince becomes a priority. Some research works carried out on the Nigerian political discourse show a good number of strategies of politeness used by the politicians.
Obeng (1997) as a follow up to Nwoye (1989) observes verbal indirectness as a face-saving strategy often used by politicians to protect their face from FTA. He observes that in interviews, politicians do not present their faces to the interviewer but to a bigger audience using all verbal strategy to maintain and protect their political interests and their faces.

Furthermore, Adekunle and Adebayo (2017) in their study on politeness in the independent anniversary speech delivered by the Nigerian heads of states discover that the use of politeness strategies by Nigerian leaders make them appear friendly, grateful, appreciative and hopeful. They also observe the use of positive politeness by these leaders to show solidarity.

Also, Agbara (2014) observes politeness indicators in the speeches of the senators. According to him, politeness indicators are often employed by the speakers (that is; the senators) to express their intention to maintain cordial relationship and to show respect to other participants in an interaction. Some of these politeness indicators include address forms, examples; distinguished colleagues, distinguished etc., first person plural –we, us, rhetorical markers - allow me to…, permit me to…) and ritualised utterances such as I support …, I urge… Agbara concludes from his findings that the use of indicators minimises and mitigates impoliteness thereby promoting successful interaction.

This research restricts its investigation on female legislators examining how they are able to achieve successful interaction and speech politeness, convincing the male majority to support their interests.

Methods
The methodology used in this study is purely qualitative and descriptive in nature. The theoretical framework of this research is based on the phenomenon of politeness strategies in pragmatics. Pragmatics is the study of meaning in context. Thus, Brown and Levinson (1987) Models of Politeness has been used for analyzing politeness strategies of the Nigerian female lawmakers in the National Assembly. The speeches of two female lawmakers in the Senate Chamber were used for the investigation. The two female lawmakers were chosen on the bases that they are highly successful role models on women's behaviour during a leadership task in Nigeria. The essence of the study is to investigate the politeness strategies employed by these two women. The strategies may subsequently serve as model to aspiring female politicians. The data for this analysis were collected online. The data were then reproduced, transcribed and analysed.

Data Collection
The source for data collection for this study consists of two video recorded events of plenary session at the Nigeria’s Upper parliamentary chamber. They were all downloaded from the https://www.youtube.com. The data presented comprise two speeches made by two female lawmakers: Senator Abiodun Olujimi and Senator Oluremi Tinubu and two counter speeches made by Senator Ahmed Yerima and Senator---- over a bill on Gender Parity and Prohibition of Violence against Women which was presented by a female lawmaker, Senator Abiodun Olujimi
on March 15, 2016. The data were then transcribed and subsequently used for the analysis. The analysis were grouped into different categories on the basis of strategies adopted where in collected data has been analysed based on the politeness theories in pragmatics.

**Presentation of Data**

**Data 1 (Speaker A):** This consists of a 15 minutes long speech made by Senator Abiodun Olujimi representing Ekiti South Senatorial zone on the second reading of the bill on Gender Parity and Prohibition of Violence against Women. The proposed bill has passed the first reading during the seventh assembly. Citing from www.wikipedia.com, Abiodun Christine Olujimi is one of the few Nigeria’s female legislators. She represented Ekiti South constituency and minority leader of the Nigerian Senate at the eighth assembly. She is known for her courage in politics, grass root governance and her contributions in the Nigerian Telecommunication industry where she was a board member of Nigerian Communications Commission. Senator Olujimi by profession is a journalist. She built a remarkable career in her profession as she worked with reputable media houses such as Nigerian Tribune, Nigerian Posts and Telecommunication and Nigerian Television Authority. She may have drawn her inspiration of being a politician from her husband, Chief Ariyo Olujimi who is also a renowned Nigerian politician.

**Data 2 (Speaker B):** This is another 2 minutes speech presentation by Senator Oluremi Tinubu, representing Lagos Central Senatorial Constituency since 2015. She is the wife of a veteran politician, Chief Bola Asiwaju Tinubu, the former governor of Lagos State from May 1999 to May 2007. This suggests that the possibility of her apparent political interest may have been a nurture from her husband. A confirmation from nigerianinfopedia.com shows that her political ambition began at the time she was the first lady of Lagos State. As an educationist by profession, she has developed interest in empowering women, the youth and child development. This may have been the reason for her emotional speech on October 1, 2016 which prompted the bill to scale through the second reading.

**Analysis of Data**

**Data 1: Speaker A**

Speaker A’s speech comprised carefully selected words. This showed that she was aware of the sensitivity of the bill she was about to present to the house. She was also aware that her choice of words would determine if the bill would pass through the second reading. Considering the positive politeness in the speech, the speaker was expected to satisfy both her positive face and that of the audience. She followed the normal procedure of salutation before delving to the speech proper. Her usage of such words as *Mr President, distinguished, highly distinguished* from time to time to address her colleagues indicates her consideration for her co-interactants’ positive face. These are what Agbara (2014) called the ‘Politeness Indicators’ which are employed in order to maintain cordial relationship and a sign of respect to the other colleagues. Other indicative of positive politeness is the fact that she asked for permission before making her speech. Considering her tone, she spoke slowly, there are observations of pause (sometimes long,
sometimes short) after making salient points and she also has some subtle but persuasive appeal to her tone.

Speaker A also considered the negative face of her recipients to her speech and this could also be perceived from her choice of words. According to Enang, Eshiet and Udoka (2014: 4), “this is a strategy in language use in which the speaker recognizes and respects the addressee, would not like to interfere with his freedom of action if not the circumstances that compel him to do so.” This is to say that she was aware that majority of her recipients are men and that the bill will counter some cultural and religious norms. Hence, takes to generalising the issues that are expected to be protected by the bill.

Example,

a. She makes the house know that it is a global issue.

b. She avoids mentioning names.

c. She summarises her speech by differentiating between parity and equality knowing that the society may view her idea may pose as a FTA to some members of the society.

The speaker is also aware of possible FTAs in her presentation. She finds a way of mitigating such acts by saving the face of her recipients. For instance, the time when she presents the modifications which the bill seeks knowing that it will pose a threat to social, religious and cultural norms. She is also able to achieve this through her choice of words as well as the tone choice.

Reaction from the recipients

Even though speaker A applied the strategies of politeness in her speech, there was interruption from a good number of the recipients towards the ending part of her speech showing disapproval. In fact, one of the members of the house in a different video clip recording openly showed disapproval when he states:

_A woman can do whatever she likes would give rise to a situation where in OUR northern language Hausa language that is said MIJIN HAJIYA (laughs at the background). Would become MIJIN HAJIYA at the end of the day where your woman can move around, interact anyhow UNDER YOUR WATCH, UNDER YOUR WATCH. THIS Mr President is an apostasy._

The Hausa word _Mijin Hajiya_ literally means woman husband and it is an abomination according to both the religion and the culture of northern Muslim majority.

Moreover, Senator Ahmed Yerima’s speech on the matter was studied. The senator was a renowned Nigerian senator representing Zamfara West Constituency. His speech however, represents a counter speech made by Speaker A. This speech was direct. The speech flouted all the rules stipulated by politeness strategies. The speech flouted the positive face of the recipients of his speech when he did not follow the due protocol. He did not acknowledge the presence of his audience. Surprising enough, no participant in the interaction felt threatened by the act. This act could be an exception to Brown and Levison’s stipulation that FTAs if not stabilised, may mare an interaction.
Notwithstanding that he felt his negative face threatened by speaker A’s act; when she read out the aspect of the bill seeking for modulation of some religious, social and cultural norms, he declined to mitigate the FTA while making his speech. However, he seemed to direct his speech to speaker A, even though he consistently failed to recognise the FTAs. Hence speaker A’s negative face was threatened. In fact, he ended his speech in a blunt manner when he said:

I will…I mean I will ask the sponsor of this motion to revisit her law and remove all areas that are in conflict with the constitution before it is being presented (Advice giving)

Senator Yerima saw the bill as speaker A’s law coming in confrontation with the national constitution.

Despite record of a good number of the unmitigated threats and the flouting of the rule of politeness, the interaction proved to satisfy the needs of the participants and they rapidly approached mutual understanding. In later interview with Channels Television, Nigeria dated 15th March, 2016, we would see Speaker A mitigating the FTAs posed by speaker B’s speech thereby saving the face of speaker B. She did that by agreeing to take the advice given to her by Senator Yerima.

Data 2: Speaker B
This comprised the speech made by speaker B in a plenary session seeking for revisit on the proposed bill formally presented by speaker A. The speaker also, like speaker A, was aware that she has to apply the rules of politeness in her speech in order to persuade her audience. Examining the positive politeness employed, she accordingly recognised her co-participants. Such words like erudite scholar, Mr President, I plead to our men. However, Speaker B seemed to have carefully learnt the interactional behaviour mutually exhibited by other participants. She might have studied the reaction of the participants towards the speech of speaker A. Hence, she needed to re-strategize her approach to suit the needs of the house. She had to join the majority in order to convince them accept the bill. Part of strategies included flouting the rules of politeness strategies and unmitigated statements that may have stimulated situations for FTAs. She said:

Look at this room. How many women are here?
And so with the attribute to the fact that I don’t shake hands with men.
I told them that too many, many here and I feel intimidated
And I feel that if I shake hands with 102 men in a day that I’m going to shriven away. So I can’t. It’s intimidating enough….

Also in her speech, she risked the use of advice giving another FTA to appeal to the emotion of her listeners.

Support this bill and let this go, not for us, not for you, but for your children; your daughters and even generations unborn. Thank you Mr President.
Discussion
This research defines the national specifics of the image of the Nigerian female lawmakers. It has used Politeness Strategies in pragmatics for the analysis of the speeches of the female Nigerian Lawmakers in the Senate. Hence, from the investigation, we were able to observe the following strategies adopted by the two female lawmakers in their speeches:

1. **Positive Politeness**
This shows that listener has a desire to be respected. In Brown and Levinson’s theory of politeness (1987), positive face always reduces the threats to the hearer’s face. The female Nigerian lawmakers made use of this strategy in their speeches. Some of the examples are:

   a) Mr President, my distinguished colleagues, permit me to lead this debate on the gender and equal opportunities bill which seeks to give effect to the provisions of chapter two and four of the constitution of the Federal Republic of Nigeria 1999 (Sen. Abiodun Olujimi, March 15, 2016)

   b) I like the fact that DSP spoke, he was the first person to speak, an erudite scholar who invoked part of the constitution and I am very grateful today that he is one of those who are amending the constitution (Sen. Oluremi Tinubu, October 1, 2016).

   c) Mr President, distinguished colleagues, I therefore seek your support and urge all my distinguished colleagues to support the second reading of this all important bill.

This excerpts show the female Nigerian lawmakers in their speeches avoided the use of strong vocabulary and carefully observed positive politeness strategy. The example (a) shows the speaker’s ability to justify her rationale of presenting the bill. Meanwhile, the speakers’ choice of words is suitable for maintaining both self-respect and social integrity.

2. **Negative Politeness**
Brown and Levinson (1987) see negative politeness as redressive action addressed to the addressee’s negative face. Negative politeness is essentially avoidance-based. According to Brown and Levinson (1987) cited in Yasmeen, Jabreen and Akram (2014: 245) “negative politeness is the heart of respected behaviour, which performs the function of minimizing the particular imposition which the FTA unavoidably effects.” In the speeches of the female Nigerian lawmakers, the strategy was used to appeal to the emotions of the male counterpart.

   Example:
   Mr President I plead with our men that we have done the best we can with this bill. And I believe that if we do this at this time, it is not for now. It is for the future of our children and Nigeria going through recession today is part of the way we have embraced things in this country…
3. **Politeness Indicators**
The female lawmakers use politeness indicators in their speeches. Agbara (2018: 7) observes the work of politeness indicators in maintaining cordiality during the plenary session. Following his research, this investigation was able to identify and group the politeness indicators thus:

a) **Address forms**: Address forms are used to maintain cordiality. It could also indicate submissiveness to or recognition of higher authority.
   Examples are: Mr President…, distinguished colleagues…, respected colleagues, highly distinguished colleagues…, I appeal to my colleagues today…, I… urge all my distinguished colleagues

b) **The first person pronouns**: The female lawmakers also made use of first person pronouns in plural forms such as we, our, us. These are used to indicate inclusiveness.
   Examples are:
   i) We have come to a time in our nation and in our polity that we have to really compensate to speak our women… (Sen Oluremi Tinubu, 1 October 2016)
   ii) And when we talk about Nigeria today, we cannot …(Sen Oluremi Tinubu, 1 October 2016)
   iii) …it will be a good place to start where we amend that part of the constitution (Sen Oluremi Tinubu, 1 October 2016)
   iv) …it is for the future of our children…(Sen Oluremi Tinubu, 1 October 2016)
   v) Look at what America is showing us today…(Sen Oluremi Tinubu, 1 October 2016)
   …it is for us to have a say… (Sen Abiodun Olujimi)

c) **Rhetorical Politeness indicator**: The female Nigerian lawmakers apply rhetorical politeness to indicate they are not trying to impose their ideas rather let their ideas open for a debate. Hence they have given free hands to their audience to speak their minds and also given the air of acknowledging their listeners’ points of view. Some of the examples are:
   i) Permit me to lead this debate… (Sen Abiodun, 15 March 2016)
   ii) I therefore seek your support… (Sen. Abiodun, 15 march 2016)
   iii) I plead with our men… (Sen Oluremi Tinubu, 1 October 2016)
   iv) I pray that…(Sen Oluremi Tinubu, 1 October 2016)
   v) I appeal to my colleagues today…(Sen Oluremi Tinubu, 1 October 2016)

4. **Bald on Record**
This strategy does nothing to minimize threats to the hearer’s “face”. It is said to be the most clear and direct way of saying something. This is performed without redressive actions. Cutting (2008) cited in Yasmeen, Jabreen and Akram (2014: 245) states that “the speakers tend to contain the imperative without any mitigating device.” However, based on the data it is observed that Female Nigerian Lawmakers sparingly used this strategy. This may be based on the fact that they are at the minority. To support this act, Brown and Levinson (1987) statement on politeness...
and power asymmetry; that is, the tendency of one being more polite to social superiors. Meanwhile, Speakers A and B showed some of the characteristics of female gender speech style, such as frequent appeal to the sympathy and emotions in the audience.
Example:

… Look at this room. How many women are here? And so with the attribute to the fact that I don’t shake hands with men. I told them that too many, many here and I feel intimidated And I feel that if I shake hands with 102 men in a day that I’m going to shriven away. So I can’t. It’s intimidating enough….(Sen Oluremi Tinubu, 1 October 2016)

Conclusion
This study was started with key objectives of exploring politeness strategies peculiar to female legislators in the Nigerian parliament. From the findings, there are numerous strategies employed by the female legislators such as politeness indicators, positive politeness, negative politeness, mitigation of FTA and appeal to emotion. However, these women combined both male and female gender speech style in their bid to convince. Power difference among the members of parliament obliged them to be more polite.

References

Kitamura, N (2000). ‘Adapting Brown and Levinson’s ‘politeness’ theory to the analysis of
casual conversation.’ *Conference of the Australian Linguistic Society.*

Lu Yin (2009). ‘Cultural differences of politeness in English and Chinese.’ *Asian Social
Science 5*(6):154-162

Marjana, S and Dijana, J. (2014). ‘Gender differences in political discourse’
*Journal of Foreign Language Teaching and Applied Linguistics.*

empower women's behaviour in leadership tasks’ *Journal of Experimental Social
Psychology* https://www.elsevier.com/locate/jesp

*California Linguistic 34*(1) winter, 2009: 1-26

Obasanjo and Fayose’s fracas.’ *International Journal of Humanities and Cultural
Studies. 2* (4):1027-1037

Conceptual and theoretical issues for an enhanced political participation in the fourth

women in politics: Lesson for and from Nigeria.’ *The Nigerian j
Journal of Sociology and Antropology. 14*(1): 145-165

experimental study of political communication.’ *Nordicom Review 28*(1): 17-32

Festschrift in Honour of Fred Karlsson, 322–332

politicians’ *Academic Research International 5*(3): 245-253

https://www.ipu.org/resources/publications/reports/2016-07/equality-in-politics-survey-women-

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=73mnzyYL0zQ. Retrieved on May 30, 2019


https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=5IRkDRqYa94. Retrieve on May 30, 2019
