

Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences

ISSN: 2663-239X



INTER-TEXTUAL

Revue semestrielle en ligne des Lettres et Sciences Humaines
du Département d'Anglais adossée au **Groupe de recherches
en Littérature et Linguistique anglaise (GRELLA)**

Université Alassane OUATTARA, Bouaké
République de Côte d'Ivoire

Numéro 11 novembre 2025

www.inter-textual.net

REVUE INTER-TEXTUAL

Revue semestrielle en ligne des Lettres et Sciences Humaines du Département d'Anglais adossée au Groupe de recherches en Littérature et Linguistique anglaise (GRELLA)

Université Alassane OUATTARA, Bouaké

République de Côte d'Ivoire

ISSN : 2663 – 239 X

Directeur de Publication:

M. Pierre KRAMOKO, **Professeur titulaire**

Adresse postale: 01 BP V 18 Bouaké 01

Téléphone:

(+225) 0101782284

(+225) 0789069439

(+225) 0101018143

Courriel: pkramokouib.edu@gmail.com

Lien de la Revue: www.inter-textual.net

ADMINISTRATION DE LA REVUE

DIRECTEUR DE PUBLICATION

M. Pierre KRAMOKO, Professeur titulaire

COMITÉ DE RÉDACTION

- M. Guézé Habraham Aimé DAHIGO, Professeur Titulaire
- M. Vamara KONÉ, Professeur titulaire
- M. Kouamé ADOU, Professeur titulaire
- M. Kouamé SAYNI, Professeur titulaire
- M. Koffi Eugène N'GUESSAN, Maître de Conférences
- M. Gossouhon SÉKONGO, Professeur titulaire
- M. Philippe Zorobi TOH, Professeur titulaire
- M. Jérôme Koffi KRA, Maître de Conférences
- M. Désiré Yssa KOFFI, Maître de Conférences
- M. Koaténin KOUAME, Maître-Assistant
- Mme Jacqueline Siamba Gabrielle DIOMANDE, Maître-Assistante

COMITÉ SCIENTIFIQUE

- Prof. Ouattara AZOUMANA, Université Alassane Ouattara, Côte d'Ivoire
- Prof. Daouda COULIBALY, PhD, Université Alassane Ouattara, Côte d'Ivoire
- Prof. Arsène DJAKO, Université Alassane Ouattara, Côte d'Ivoire
- Prof. Hilaire Gnazébo MAZOU, Université Alassane Ouattara, Côte d'Ivoire
- Prof. Lawrence P. JACKSON, Johns Hopkins University, USA
- Prof. Léa N'Goran-POAME, Université Alassane Ouattara, Côte d'Ivoire
- Prof. Mamadou KANDJI, Université Ckeick Anta Diop, Sénégal
- Prof. Margaret Wright-CLEVELAND, Florida State University, USA
- Prof. Kenneth COHEN, St Mary's College of Maryland, USA
- Prof. Nubukpo Komlan MESSAN, Université de Lomé, Togo
- PEWISSI Ataféï, Université de Lomé
- Prof. Obou LOUIS, Université Félix Houphouët Boigny, Côte d'Ivoire
- Prof. Koléa Paulin ZIGUI, Université Alassane Ouattara, Côte d'Ivoire

TABLE DES MATIERES / TABLE OF CONTENTS

LITTERATURE / LITERATURE

1. LA PERCEPTION DU MARIAGE INTER-CULTUREL DANS LA SYMBOLIQUE DU RÊVE AMÉRICAIN : UNE LECTURE DE *MARTIN EDEN* DE JACK LONDON
Yao Markos KOUASSI, Selay Marius KOUASSI, Hélène YAO-----1 – 12
2. LA RECONSTRUCTION DU GENRE DANS *SECOND CLASS CITIZEN* DE BUCHI EMECHETA : DU PARADOXE DE LA CITOYENNETE AU PLAYDOYER POUR L'INCLUSION DE LA FEMME
Kouakou Florent Lucien N'DIA-----13 – 32
3. TRAVEL-ISM AS AN ESSENCE OF IMPERIALISM IN OCTAVIA ESTELLE BUTLER'S *KINDRED* (1979 [2003]), *WILD SEED* (1980) AND *DAWN* (1987)
N'Goran Constant YAO-----33 – 47
4. THE NEW NEGRO IN TONI MORRISON'S *GOD HELP THE CHILD* : BLACK FEMALE EXCEPTIONALISM IN BUSINESS
Adama SORO-----48 – 60
5. SATIRE AND SOCIAL VISION IN OSCAR WILDE'S DRAMA
Moussa KAMBIRE-----61 – 74
6. PLOTTING NARRATIVES WITH TEXTUAL SEMANTICS: AN ONOMASTIC SURVEY OF AFRICAN AND HISPANIC LITERATURES
Ataféï PEWISSI, Pedi ANAWI, Essobiyou SIRO-----75 – 89
7. ENVISIONING THE FEMINIST FUTURE: A STUDY OF WOMEN'S ALTRUISTIC RESISTANCE IN CHIMAMANDA NGOZI ADICHIE'S *THE DREAM COUNT*
Konan Guy KOUADIO-----90 – 101
8. *SONGS OF STEEL* OR SONGS OF GUNS: A NARRATIVE ILLUSTRATION OF VIOLENCE BY ANDREW EKWURU
Evrard AMOI & N'guessan KRAMO-----102 – 112
9. RECONCEPTUALIZING SLAVERY IN CHARLES JOHNSON'S *OXHERDING TALE*
Emmanuel N'Depo BEDA-----113 – 127
10. RETHINKING RACIAL STRUGGLE IN POST-RACIAL AMERICA: AN ANALYSIS OF PAUL BEATTY'S *THE SELLOUT*
Celestin TRA Bi-----128 – 144
11. WAR WITHOUT WEAPONS: POLEMOMOLOGY, SATIRE, AND POST-IMPERIAL IDENTITY IN DAPHNE DU MAURIER'S *RULE BRITANNIA* (1972)
Nannougou SILUE-----145 – 155

LIINGUISTIQUE / LINGUISTICS

**12. THE RISE OF ANTI-FRENCH SENTIMENT IN THE SAHEL: A CRITICAL DISCOURSE
ANALYSIS OF POLARIZATION IN THE SPEECHES OF THE JUNTA LEADERS IN
MALI AND BURKINA FASO**

Kouamé Aboubakar KOUAKOU-----156 – 168

**13. HEDGING AND GENDER: A PRAGMATIC ANALYSIS OF POLITENESS
STRATEGIES IN LEYMAH GBOWEE'S *MIGHTY BE OUR POWERS***

Assiaka Guillaume AKABLA-----169 – 181

**14. LE DOUBLE HERITAGE SYNCHRONE D'OUMAR SANKHARE DANS *LA
NUIT ET LE JOUR***

Komi KPATCHA-----182 – 201

INTER-TEXTUAL

HEDGING AND GENDER: A PRAGMATIC ANALYSIS OF POLITENESS STRATEGIES IN LEYMAH GBOWEE'S *MIGHTY BE OUR POWERS*

Dr Assiaka Guillaume AKABLA, Université Alassane OUATTARA, Côte-d'Ivoire
assiakaguillaume@gmail.com

Abstract

This paper focuses on the way gender influences speech pragmatics. It analyses the use of hedging as a politeness strategy in *Mighty Be Our Powers*. Using P. Brown and S. Levinson's (1987) Politeness Theory and J. Searle's (1979) Speech Act Theory to explore the function of hedging in interactions, namely in both personal relationships and public discourse, the study reveals through Gbowee's narrative that patterns of linguistic mitigation align with traditional gendered communication norms. Thus, Leymah GBOWEE demonstrates a strategic shift towards assertiveness as she transitions from a victim of war to a leader in peace activism. Through a descriptive qualitative analysis, the study therefore concludes that hedging is a gendered strategy that is strategically used to negotiate authority in male-dominated spaces, reduce conflict and maintain solidarity in collective struggles. Hedging in this endeavor, stands as tool for empowerment and persuasion that transforms linguistic politeness into a resource for peacebuilding and leadership.

Keywords : Activist-Female-Hedging-Leadership-Peacebuilding-Politeness-Pragmatics-Solidarity.

Résumé

Ce document se focalise sur la manière dont le genre influence la pragmatique du discours. Il analyse l'usage de l'atténuation (*hedging*) comme stratégie de politesse dans *Mighty Be Our Powers*. En s'appuyant sur la théorie de la politesse de P. Brown et S. Levinson (1987) ainsi que sur la théorie des actes de langage de J. Searle (1979), l'étude explore la fonction de l'atténuation dans les interactions, notamment dans les relations personnelles et dans le discours public. À travers le récit de Gbowee, l'étude révèle que les schémas d'atténuation linguistique s'alignent sur les normes traditionnelles de communication liées au genre. Ainsi, Leymah Gbowee illustre un passage stratégique vers l'affirmation de soi, en évoluant d'une victime de guerre à une dirigeante engagée dans l'activisme pour la paix. Grâce à une analyse qualitative descriptive, l'étude conclut que l'atténuation constitue une stratégie genrée utilisée de manière stratégique pour négocier l'autorité dans des espaces dominés par les hommes, réduire les conflits et maintenir la solidarité dans les luttes collectives. Dans cette démarche, l'atténuation apparaît comme un outil d'émancipation et de persuasion, transformant la politesse linguistique en une ressource au service de la consolidation de la paix et du leadership.

Mots clés : Activiste-Consolidation de la paix- Discours atténué -Féminin- Leadership - Politesse- Pragmatique-Solidarité.

INTRODUCTION

Language functions not merely as a tool for communication but as a mirror that reflects social relationships, identity constructions, and underlying power structures. Within this communicative landscape, gender significantly influences how individuals articulate thoughts, negotiate meanings, and sustain social balance. Among the linguistic strategies that reveal gendered patterns of interaction, hedging stands out as a key pragmatic device. It allows speakers to soften their statements, express uncertainty, and demonstrate politeness. Pragmatically, hedging operates as a mechanism for maintaining interpersonal harmony, safeguarding face, and mitigating potential conflict in discourse.

This article examines the relationship between gender and politeness through a pragmatic analysis of Leymah Gbowee's *Mighty Be Our Powers*. The memoir traces Gbowee's transformation from a victim of Liberia's civil war into a prominent leader in peace activism. The study investigates how Gbowee, as a female voice in a patriarchal context, strategically employs hedging to achieve both self-preservation and empowerment. Anchored in Brown and Levinson's (1987) Politeness Theory and Searle's (1979) Speech Act Theory, the research explores the functions and meanings of hedging in Gbowee's discourse. Brown and Levinson's (1987) Politeness Theory posits that speakers use linguistic strategies such as hedging to preserve both their own and others' "face" (social self-image) during communication. Searle's (1979) Speech Act Theory explains that language performs actions (e.g., requesting, apologizing, asserting), emphasizing the relationship between utterances, intentions, and social context. The study identifies and categorizes the various hedging and politeness strategies employed by Leymah Gbowee in *Mighty Be Our Powers*; and next analyzes the pragmatic functions of these strategies within the socio-gendered and communicative contexts of through different interactions.

Through language, people are able to do a lot of things like to communicate, interact, learn, teach and so on. As H. Adamczewski (2000, p. 13) mentioned when quoting G. Guillaume (1982) « la langue est pleine d'opérations mystérieuses (...). L'étude de la langue nous met en présence de choses auxquelles un esprit cultivé peut n'avoir pas songé (...) »¹. Aligning with this thought of G. Guillaume, it comes to pass that the use of language can even help measure the degree of social distance. That is, language plays a great part in the social relations, personal and even political by the device of techniques of communication among which hedging. In linguistics and pragmatics, hedging refers to the use of linguistic devices that express

¹ The language is full of mysterious operations (...). The study of a language leads us to unexpected things which a cultivated mind may not have thought of.

tentativeness, uncertainty, or politeness, thereby softening the force of an utterance. Hedging allows a speaker or writer to avoid absolute commitment to the truth of a proposition or to reduce potential face-threatening effects in communication. R. Lakoff (1972) defines hedges as “words or phrases whose job is to make things fuzzier or less fuzzy.” B. Fraser (2010) explains hedging as “a pragmatic strategy used by speakers to indicate a lack of full commitment to the proposition expressed.” As to K. Hyland (1998), he views hedges as “the linguistic means by which writers signal their stance and the degree of certainty they wish to convey.” In short, Hedging is a pragmatic strategy that modulates the strength of statements to express caution, politeness, or epistemic uncertainty, thereby achieving communicative balance and face management

In *Mighty Be Our Powers*, Leymah Gbowee’s public discourse unfolds through a subtle interplay of assertiveness and restraint, reflecting the pragmatic complexity of gendered communication. Her speeches and interactions reveal a deliberate use of nuanced language like hedges, mitigations, and politeness markers to balance authority with empathy. Linguistically, these nuances serve to soften face-threatening acts while reinforcing solidarity and credibility within male-dominated and conflict-sensitive settings. Gbowee’s rhetorical style thus exemplifies how strategic linguistic choices transform personal narratives into powerful acts of persuasion, leadership, and peace advocacy.

The objective in this work is to analyse Leymah GBOWEE’s speech acts from a pragmatic perspective and explore how she uses hedging as a politeness strategy in different contexts, such as personal reflections, negotiations and activism. To this end, these questions help give an orientation to the work. How does Leymah Gbowee pragmatically use hedging as a gendered communicative strategy as a leader in peace activism in *Mighty Be Our Powers*? What are the markers of hedging expressions in Gbowee’s discourse, and what are their pragmatic functions? How do these hedging expressions reflect politeness strategies? How does hedging as a politeness marker contribute to Gbowee’s goal of empowerment, persuasion, and peacebuilding? First, the work articulates around the Markers of Hedging expressions in Gbowee’s discourse and their pragmatic functions, second addresses Hedging as a politeness strategy and ends up with Hedging as a peacebuilding strategy.

The study adopts a qualitative, descriptive, and interpretative approach, using selected excerpts from *Mighty Be Our Powers*. It applies pragmatic and discourse analysis within

Searle's (1979) Speech Act model and Brown and Levinson's Politeness Theory to identify, classify, and interpret hedging expressions and their functions in context.

1. Markers of Hedging Expressions in Gbowee's Discourse and Their Pragmatic Functions

Hedging expressions constitute linguistic devices that allow speakers to communicate uncertainty, politeness, or epistemic caution. They function as markers of subjectivity and interpersonal awareness within discourse. In *Mighty Be Our Powers* (2011), Leymah Gbowee consistently employs hedging as a strategic communicative tool to navigate complex sociopolitical and interpersonal contexts.

1.1. Modal Auxiliaries as Negotiation Tools and Mitigators

The corpus displays many indices of hedging expressions such as modal auxiliaries as in :

- (1) "We **can** bring peace to our country" (p. 123),
- (2) "We **should** stop waiting for the men to make peace" (p. 152).
- (3) "We **could** sit and talk about what was tearing our country apart" (p. 127).
- (4) "...I **could** get more training and find a job. I **could** earn a living. I **could** take the kids and leave." (p. 44)

In utterance (1), the modal auxiliary *can* is interpreted as a hedging marker because it is used to express ability, capacity and possibility of these women to commit themselves to put an end to the war. In fact, in using this hedging marker Gbowee attempts to address women's reluctance to act for the return of peace. Through the modal *can*, she expresses collective ability and empowerment rather than command. This use of *can* mitigates the force of obligation while fostering solidarity among women, inviting participation through shared potential. Likewise in utterance (2), the use of the modal auxiliary *should* is meant to express a deontic modality. *Should* indicates a moral or social obligation of the women to fight for peace. The modal *should* functions as a soft imperative, combining ethical urgency with politeness to avoid confrontation, thus aligning with P. Brown and S.C. Levinson's (1987) politeness framework. Utterance (3) displays the modal auxiliary *could*, interpreted as a hedging marker. This modal is a dynamic modality. Gbowee uses it to describe past ability. In dialogue with peace negotiators and community leaders, Gbowee's use of *could* serves as strategic tentativeness, encouraging mutual understanding. In utterance (4), we have a hedging marker of the category

of epistemic modality. According to Searle's (1979) typology, speech acts can be classified as representatives, directives, commissives, expressives, and declarations. Gbowee's statement predominantly combines representative and commissive illocutionary forces. The utterance (4) "I could get more training and find a job" expresses Gbowee's belief about a possible future action grounded in her reasoning and perception of capability. It presents a tentative self-assessment of her potential rather than a firm assertion, reflecting epistemic modality and personal judgment (Searle, 1979). The repeated use of *could* signals a hypothetical or conditional intention rather than an immediate plan. This indirectness reduces the assertive force of the statements, situating them within tentative self-projection rather than explicit resolution. The speech act thus occupies an intermediate zone between self-reflection (representative) and commitment (commissive), expressing both *possibility* and *desire*. In essence, Gbowee's utterance constitutes a self-empowering commissive framed through epistemic caution, reflecting her psychological transition from dependency toward autonomy.

Though Gbowee's speech contains auxiliaries such as *can*, *could*, *should*, and *must* that function as powerful negotiation tools and mitigators by reducing the force of assertions and framing obligations more politely, other important category of linguistic devices also appear. The epistemic verbs.

1.2 Epistemic verbs and their softening function in discourse

Epistemic verbs like *I think*, *I believe*, *I suppose*, *I feel* and *I guess*, signal personal evaluation; and adverbial modifiers such as *perhaps*, *maybe*, and *sort of*, soften the force of assertions. K. Hyland (1998, p.1) defines hedging as "the expression of tentativeness and possibility in language use," emphasizing that it allows speakers and writers to "reduce their commitment to a proposition". Hedging as a linguistic tool of communication is also expressed through some epistemic verbs or expressions that can be seen in the following :

- (5) "I **think** we had grown used to the sound of gunfire" (p. 18).
- (6) "I **believe** that change starts when we stop being afraid" (p. 192).
- (7) "I **know** you are trying, but we **feel** the people's pain every day" (p. 205)
- (8) "I **guess** God was using me for something I didn't yet understand." (p. 83)

Utterances (5) to (8) are all hedging markers that are interpreted as epistemic verbs, each playing a specific function. In utterance (5), the epistemic verb *i think* indicates tentativeness and subjectivity, suggesting that the speaker is offering a personal perspective rather than an

absolute truth. The utterance expresses a collective psychological adaptation to violence but avoids direct accusation. *I believe* in utterance (6) functions as an epistemic commitment marker expressing personal conviction with affective undertones. The verb projects confidence but not coercion. It persuades through shared moral faith rather than authority. This softening strategy transforms a potential imperative (“change starts when we stop being afraid”) into a subjective moral reflection, maintaining politeness and solidarity. As to utterance (7), it displays the juxtaposition of *know*, a cognitive certainty with *feel*, an empathic experience. *Know* acknowledges the interlocutor’s effort, while *feel* introduces emotional evidence that challenges without aggression. Pragmatically, this mitigated assertion functions as a face-saving device, softening criticism and preserving harmony. In using this epistemic, Gbowee demonstrates diplomatic communication style. In utterance (8), *Guess* indicates low epistemic commitment, marking humility and spiritual uncertainty. In this context, Gbowee describes her change as something inspired by God rather than a result of her own deliberate choice. The epistemic softness expresses vulnerability and faith simultaneously, a rhetorical blend that enhances credibility and reduces ego assertion. The softening role of epistemic verbs naturally extends to Gbowee’s broader use of hedges, which function as pragmatic tools for negotiating meaning, showing respect, and maintaining harmony within interactional contexts.

2. Hedging as a Politeness Strategy

Beyond managing interpersonal nuances, hedging is widely acknowledged as a core politeness strategy. In *Mighty Be Our Powers*, Leymah Gbowee consistently employs hedging devices such as *maybe*, *kind of*, *a bit*, *I think*, *I guess*, *somehow*, and *sort of* to negotiate positive face, that is, the hearer’s need to be appreciated, respected, and included.

2.1 Negotiating *positive face* through Hedging

Gbowee’s speech display many traces of hedging markers that serve negotiating positive face. Some of them are enumerated for analysis.

- (9) “A **kind of** denial kept my parents complacent. They’d lived through instability before.” (p. 18)
- (10) “**Maybe** we had accepted war as a normal part of life.” (p. 19)
- (11) “It **seemed** like peace was something too fragile to touch.” (p. 176)
- (12) “**Somehow**, we managed to keep going, even when everything was against us.” (p. 165)

In utterance (9), the hedge is interpreted as an approximator. It attenuates the categorical force of the noun *denial*, presenting the statement as approximate rather than absolute. This hedge mitigates potential criticism toward her parents, protecting their positive face. In using this category of hedge, Gbowee, instead of directly asserting that her parents *were in denial* (which would sound judgmental), she softens her stance by implying a partial or nuanced denial, reflecting empathy and filial respect. Furthermore, utterance (10) indicates the presence of an adverbial modal phrase hedge. The hedge *maybe* introduces epistemic uncertainty, softening what could be interpreted as ‘not certain that something will happen or that something is true or is a correct number’. Instead of directly accusing Liberians of complacency, Gbowee frames her observation as a tentative reflection, maintaining politeness and collective inclusion. Pragmatically, *maybe* protects the positive face of her audience by implying shared responsibility rather than direct blame.

In utterance (11), the modal lexical verb *seemed* introduces perceptual subjectivity, signaling that the statement arises from personal impression rather than fact. This mitigates the potential pessimism of the utterance, keeping the tone empathetic. It preserves the audience’s positive face by not asserting absolute hopelessness; instead, it invites shared emotional reflection. The last utterance (12), also contains a modal lexical hedge *somehow*. This hedge is interpreted as approximator rounder because it is used when proposition is correct or partially correct. Sentences with this category of hedge can be ambiguous or not exact. *Somehow* functions as a vagueness hedge, expressing limited epistemic commitment while highlighting collective perseverance. The indeterminacy allows the reader to fill in meaning emotionally, strengthening identification. The hedge thus negotiates positive face through inclusive humility, acknowledging human limitation while affirming collective strength.

From negotiating positive face in specific interactions, hedging evolves into a marker of discursive politeness, structuring the overall communicative ethos of Gbowee’s text. It reveals not only how she speaks to others, but how she positions herself within the broader moral and emotional space of her utterances.

2.2 Hedging as a discursive politeness

According to Richard J. Watts (2003, p. 9), “Politeness is a discursive concept whose meaning is jointly constructed by interactants in the course of communication”. He argues that politeness should not be treated as a universal set of strategies but as a socially negotiated practice grounded in discourse. J. Holmes (1990) highlights that hedging expressions such as

sort of or *I suppose* enable speakers to communicate uncertainty while maintaining politeness. This aligns with Lakoff's (1975) observation that women's language often emphasizes cooperation and relational sensitivity. In *Mighty Be Our Powers*, Gbowee's use of hedges embodies these principles, allowing her to assert authority without contravening sociocultural norms of humility and decorum. When addressing community leaders or male colleagues, her hedged statements balance assertiveness with tact, thereby fostering receptivity to her peacebuilding efforts. From a pragmatic perspective, Gbowee's strategy exemplifies what S. Mills (2003) terms "discursive politeness," in which politeness is contextually negotiated rather than applied rigidly. Hedging enables her to construct an inclusive discourse that invites dialogue and consideration of alternative viewpoints. These following utterances analysis help deepen our understanding of hedging as a discursive politeness.

(13) "**Maybe** we had accepted war as a normal part of life." (p. 19)

(14) "**I think** God wanted me to understand that peace does not mean silence." (p. 103)

(15) "**Perhaps** this was the beginning of our awakening." (p. 90)

In utterance (13), the adverbial modal phrase "Maybe" is interpreted as an epistemic adverb, that is, an hedging device used to express uncertainty, tentativeness, or politeness. Gbowee uses it to softens a potentially critical claim ("we accepted war") and transforms it into collective introspection. As a discursive politeness device, this hedge mitigates, blame, and invites empathy, positioning Gbowee as inclusive and reflective rather than judgmental. Furthermore, utterance (14) displays another epistemic verb 'i think'. This verb hedges the assertion by showing that the statement represents personal interpretation rather than absolute truth. It points at subjectivity and humility, marking the utterance as belief-based, not dogmatic. In using it, Gbowee expresses a form of discursive politeness through which, this hedge invites the reader to respect differing views, thus reinforcing Gbowee's moral credibility through openness and modesty. The hedge mitigates the potential authoritative stance of invoking divine will, maintaining interpersonal respect within the discourse community. As far as utterance (15) is concerned, it is also an adverbial modal hedge. It is a hedging marker that marks epistemic modesty, suggesting a possibility rather than certainty. In Gbowee's utterance, *perhaps* functions as a discursive politeness strategy by toning down the assertiveness of moral interpretation. This adverb's softening force balances emotional depth with intellectual caution, keeping Gbowee's speech respectful and reflective. By using *perhaps*, she invites readers to co-construct meaning rather than receive a fixed moral conclusion.

Having established that hedging functions as a form of discursive politeness that manages relational meaning and interpersonal harmony, it is essential to consider how these same linguistic resources operate beyond conversational dynamics. In Gbowee's *Mighty Be Our Powers*, hedging becomes a strategic instrument in peacebuilding discourse, allowing the speaker to navigate sensitive political and emotional terrains while fostering dialogue and reconciliation.

3. Hedging as a Politeness Strategy in Peacebuilding Contexts

In peacebuilding and conflict-resolution contexts, language is a crucial instrument for facilitating dialogue, reducing tension, and fostering reconciliation. P. Chilton (2004, p.15) describes political and peace discourse as “a site of strategic interaction”, in which linguistic choices may either exacerbate or de-escalate conflict. Within this framework, hedging functions as a critical pragmatic resource, allowing interlocutors to manage sensitive issues while maintaining cooperative engagement. Gbowee's discourse offers a clear example of this strategic function in which the gender plays a crucial role. Gender in linguistics refers to the social and discursive construction of identity through language. It encompasses the ways speakers use linguistic choices such as hedging, politeness, and stance to perform and negotiate gendered identities, shaped by cultural norms and communicative practices (Lakoff, 1975; Holmes, 1995; Cameron, 2003; Eckert & McConnell-Ginet, 2003).

3.1 Fostering a Cordial and Harmonious Exchange

Hedging as a linguistic tool of cooperation is also expressed through some expressions that can be seen in the following :

- (16) “We decided to go to the men and **talk** to them as **mothers** and **sisters**, not as enemies.” (p. 134)
- (17) “**We** wanted to show them that peace was not a women's issue or a men's issue, but **everyone's** concern.” (p. 145)
- (18) “I told them we **understood** their **pain**, we had lost, too, and that was why we needed to end it **together**.” (p. 163)
- (19) “**My sisters**, I know you are tired, but we cannot stop now.” (p. 189)

In utterance (16), the lexical choices *talk*, *mothers* and *sisters* are interpreted as hedging markers because they mark relational and affective identity rather than confrontation. This

utterance performs a positive politeness strategy appealing to in-group solidarity and shared social ties. In fact, in using this utterance, Gbowee shifts discourse from power-based negotiation to empathetic persuasion, fostering cooperation. Similarly in (17), the use of inclusive pronoun *we* and *everyone* is interpreted as hedging marker and is meant to emphasizing shared humanity. They signal collective agency and egalitarian discourse. By using them, gbowee attempts to mitigates potential division by reframing peace as a universal moral obligation rather than a gendered demand. In other terms, Gbowee linguistically constructs a cooperative communicative environment, where solidarity overrides difference. In utterance (18), the emotional lexis *understood*, *pain*, and *together* function as hedging markers that are interpreted as managing emotional tone. Gbowee use them in the utterance to convey empathy and shared suffering, aligning speaker and hearer emotionally. The utterance fosters trust, essential in negotiation and reconciliation contexts. At last, utterance (19) display a particular type of hedging marker that stress empathic recognition and politeness in Address. This hedging marker operates as a vocative. Through the use of this vocative *My sisters*, GLeymah bowee establishes intimacy and solidarity, reinforcing a communal bond. The rhetorical role of this hedges help the speaker balance between empathy and leadership, fostering harmony through relational sensitivity.

Beyond creating harmonious communication, Gbowee's discourse performs a higher diplomatic function. Her tactful language and mitigated expressions operate as a form of linguistic diplomacy, where speech serves not merely to maintain politeness but to bridge ideological, cultural, and emotional divides.

3.2 A Form of Linguistic Diplomacy

In peacebuilding discourse, hedging transcends the mere expression of uncertainty; it constitutes a form of linguistic diplomacy. B. Fraser (2010) argues that politeness encompasses the broader competence of managing interpersonal relationships. Gbowee's discourse exemplifies this concept. Her hedging sustains dialogue, builds trust, and models ethical communication while advancing her persuasive appeals for peace. In this context, hedging becomes a strategic tool that balances conviction with tact, reinforcing both relational and political efficacy in peacebuilding efforts.

- (20) “When we finally met the president, I said, ‘**Your Excellency**, we come in peace. **We only ask** that you listen to the cries of your people.’” (*Gbowee, 2011, p. 213*)
- (21) “I told them, ‘**We** understand your anger. But we must think of **our** children’s future.’” (*Gbowee, 2011, p. 205*)
- (22) “We had to find a way to talk to them without making them defensive. **If we shouted**, they would walk away. **If we reasoned, maybe they would listen.**” (*Gbowee, 2011, p.132*)
- (23) “We were careful not to humiliate them; our goal was not to win an argument but to win peace.” (*Gbowee, 2011, p. 220*)

Utterance (20) displays a diplomatic address (“Your Excellency”) and mitigated request forms (“we only ask”), both features of high politeness and respect. The verbal restraint maintains deference while conveying urgency, demonstrating how linguistic diplomacy combines deference politeness and strategic mitigation. C. Caffi (2007) considers such forms as “linguistic diplomacy,” where mitigation operates as a symbolic negotiation of power and respect. In parallel, utterance (21) contains two hedging markers that are inclusive pronouns *we*, and *our*. The two inclusive pronoun together with the mitigated directive *we must think* are employed by Gbowee to de-escalate tension. The inclusive language reframes collective identity and promotes solidarity, core components of linguistic diplomacy. The modal “must” conveys moral necessity while maintaining a cooperative tone. Likewise, in utterance (22), the use of conditional and modal constructions (“if we shouted... if we reasoned... maybe they would listen”), illustrates strategic linguistic diplomacy. Gbowee organises communication as a tactical process of persuasion rather than confrontation. The use of conditional clauses mitigates assertiveness and foregrounds empathy, a hallmark of face-saving politeness (P. Brown & S. Levinson, 1987). As to Utterance (23), it displays a lexical contrast between “humiliate” and “win peace” that encapsulates the ethics of discursive diplomacy. The choice of purpose clauses (“our goal was not... but to...”) emphasizes intent and relational repair. The polite restraint demonstrates pragmatic competence: choosing harmony over dominance.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, this study has shown that hedging serves as a vital politeness strategy in Leymah Gbowee's *Mighty Be Our Powers*, enabling her to manage complex social and political dynamics. By softening assertions and mitigating face-threatening acts, Gbowee uses hedging to maintain solidarity and build rapport across diverse groups. Her use of modal verbs, mitigating adverbs, and cautious phrasing reflects both strategic communication and relational sensitivity.

Gendered aspects of language also emerge, as Gbowee's discourse demonstrates how women may employ hedging to assert authority while preserving politeness. Across the selected interactions, hedging supports conflict resolution and promotes cooperative engagement. Pragmatically, each utterance balances illocutionary force with interpersonal awareness. Overall, the findings highlight how hedging operates as both a linguistic tool and a socially grounded strategy for negotiation and peacebuilding. Gbowee's linguistic choices reveal the intricate links between language, gender, and power, underscoring the broader value of pragmatic analysis in understanding gendered communication within socio-political context.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- ADAMCZEWSKI Henri, 2000, "The Architecture of English Grammar: from the Theory of phases to the Principle of Cyclicity", Conférence Plénière (en anglais) au colloque de linguistique anglaise à Toulouse, Juillet 2000, <https://www.Geocities.com/linguistiques/thestateoftheart.htm> accessed on October 15th 2025.
- BOHAN John, 1993, "Regarding Gender: Essentialism, Constructionism and Feminist Psychology", *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, Vol 17, p. 5-22.
- CAFFI Claudia, 2007, *Mitigation*. Amsterdam : Elsevier.
- CHILTON Paul, 2004, *Analysing Political Discourse : Theory and Practice*. Routledge.
- CLEMEN Gudrun, 1997, "The Concept of Hedging: Origins, Approaches and Definitions", *Hedging and Discourse*, Hartmut Schroeder and Raija Markkanen (eds.), Berlin, de Gruyter. p. 80-97.
- TANNEN Deborah, 1994, *Talking from 9 to 5 : Women and Men in the Workplace*, William Morrow.
- FRASER Bruce, 2010, "Pragmatic Competence: The Case of Hedging", G. Kaltenböck (Ed) et al., *New Approaches to Hedging*, p. 15-34, Bingley, Emerald Group Publishing Limited.

- GBOWEE Leymah, 2011,). *Mighty Be Our Powers : How Sisterhood, Prayer, and Sex changed a nation at war*. Beast Books.
- GUILLAUME Gustave, 1982, *Foundation for Science of Language*, American and Philadelphia, John Benjamins Company.
- HOLMES Janet, 1995, *Women, Men, and Politeness*, London, Longman.
- HOLMES Janeth, 1992, "Women's Talk in Public Contexts", *Discourse and Society*, Vol.3 No.2, p. 121-50.
- HYLAND Ken, 1998, *Hedging in Scientific Research Articles*, Amsterdam/Philadelphia.
- LAKOFF George, 1975, "Hedges: A Study in Meaning Criteria and The Logic and Fuzzy Concepts", Hockney, D. (ed.), *Contemporary Research in Philosophical Logic and Linguistic Semantics*, Dordrecht, D. Reidel Publishing Company, p. 221-272.
- LEDERACH John Paul, 2005, *The Moral Imagination : The Art and Soul of Building Peace*, Oxford University Press.
- MILLS Sara, 2003, *Gender and Politeness*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- MYERS Greg, 1989, "The pragmatics of Politeness in Scientific Articles", *Applied Linguistics*, 10, p.1-35.
- PENELOPE Brown and LEVINSON Stephen, 1987, "Politeness: Some Universals" in *Language Usage*, Cambridge : Cambridge University Press, Print.
- SALAGER-MEYER, 1997, "I Think That Perhaps You Should: A Study of Hedges in Written Scientific Discourse", T. Miller (ed), *Functional Approaches to Written Text: Classroom Applications*, Washington, D.C, English Language Programs-United States Information Agency, p. 105-118.
- SEARLE Roger John, 1979, *Expression and Meaning, Studies in the Theory of Speech act*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- SEARLE Roger John, 1969, *Speech Acts*, Cambridge University Press.
- SHAW Sylvia, 2000, "Language, gender and floor Apportionment in Political Debates", *Discourse & Society*, Vol. 11 No.3, p. 401-418.
- SPENCER-OATEY Helen, 2008, *Culturally Speaking: Culture, Communication and Politeness Theory*. 2nd ed., Continuum International Publishing Group Bloomsbury Academic.
- WATTS Richard, 2003, *Politeness*, Cambridge : Cambridge University Press.