Gendered Language Practices in English-Medium Educational Institutions in Pakistan: A Sociolinguistic Analysis

Imran Nazeer, Admin Staff, University of Gujrat, Gujrat, Punjab, Pakistan
imranpoems@gmail.com
Muhammad Asghar Ali, M. Phil (English Linguistics), Department of English Linguistics, The Islamia University of Bahawalpur, Punjab, Pakistan. Email. asgharali01414@gmail.com
 Noor ul Huda Shoukat
M. Phil (English Linguistics), Department of English Linguistics, The Islamia University of Bahawalpur, Punjab, Pakistan . Email : Noorulhudashoukat289@outlook.com

Abstract

Research has been done on gender and English performance between students and teachers regarding classroom interactions and written assignments. It looked at the way interruptions occurred, polite strategies, assertiveness, and language choices. Through convenient sampling, students and teachers (M/F = 40; 20:20) were enrolled. The writer examined students and their teachers within fifteen conversation days. Their conversation was scored according to a checklist approved by the experts, who cited specific goals that voters and other citizens might have in mind. They were also interviewed to gain a deeper insight into the style of their conversations. In classroom settings, there were gender-based differences in communication style between students and teachers, as a study showed. Male students interrupted more often and made more rude interruptions, whereas female students were more prone to two supportive interruptions. Female students/teachers were considered more assertive but still polite, as they were observed to support their interruptions with advice and use complex language to create a cooperative and respectful classroom atmosphere. Universities may wish to introduce training programs to teach faculty and students about gendered communication and how it can shape classroom exchanges.

Keywords: English language, gender, language practice, sociolinguistic analysis, English medium institutes, ESL in Pakistan.

Introduction

In the case of English-medium educational settings in Pakistan, language practices are symptomatic of larger societal and cultural habits, which are influenced, like language practices, by gender. This paper conducts a sociolinguistic study of the ilities of perpetuating gendered language practices in such localised educational environments. By looking at how students and teachers use language in these schools, language, gender and education in Pakistan come into view with great particularity (Putri et al., 2024). According to Kira Hall and Mary Bucholtz (2024), language can be used to create and negotiate gender identity and describe oneself and others. Given the years of English-medium education in Pakistan, where English language proficiency often delineates social status and some access to socioeconomic mobility, how gender influences language use/usage in such contexts is an important case (Fried & Awad, 2024).

This means they focus on how males and females use English in their classroom interactions (how they talk to their teachers) and what they write). The classroom may be seen as a microcosm of society where linguistic practices reflect societal norms and power relations (Preseau et al., 2024). How we use language reflects and complicates the expectations and demands of the prevalent society. So, language use in education explains something about gender in the larger social context in Pakistan. The study investigates the complex ways in which gender is related to communication

practices in English-medium educational institutions. The study examines interruption patterns, politeness strategies, assertiveness, and language choices (Kaneko et al., 2024).

This research contributes to the existing literature addressing the relationship between sociolinguistics and English medium schooling in Pakistan. In this dichotomous arrangement of assumed cultures, Pakistani society has already been explored in terms of language and gender by previous research. Still, little of this research specifically focuses on the gendered language practices in educational institutions. This study would fill this gap, enriching our understanding of sociolinguistic and adding valuable information for educators, policymakers, and researchers. Goldoni and Mormino (2024) highlight the importance of appreciating the dynamic inter-relationships between language and gender within socially inclusive and equitable learning spaces for all students.

In addition, this study has timeliness and is accountable for the current debates on gender equality and social justice in Pakistan. Importantly, examining gendered language practices investigates how language mirrors and reinforces [4] RG inequalities (Khalilova et al., 2024). In promoting debate on these practices, the study adds to broader agendas to challenge and disrupt stereotypes and gendered bias within educational realms and beyond. Further, the results of this study can be of great importance in the domain of language pedagogy, curriculum development, and teacher training in English-medium educational institutions in Pakistan. Educators are responsible for promoting inclusive and empowering learning environments (Kamath 2024), necessitating an understanding of gendered language practices.

The current study seeks to provide comprehensive sociolinguistic in language-use patterns in English-medium educational institutions based in Pakistan. This research would contribute to knowledge of the language, gender, communication patterns, and education in Pakistani society by examining language use in schools and by students and teachers. The study aims not only to contribute to educational practices and gender equality but also to the sociolinguistic Pakistani context and beyond (Melo-Pfeifer & Tavares, 2024).

Research Statement
This study aims to investigate the extent to which gender influences the use of the English language and communication styles in educational institutions set up in a Kenyan context. More specifically, the study investigates how gendered communication is used in classroom interactions, in discussions by students, and student-written material. The research investigates interruption patterns, politeness strategies, assertiveness, and language selections to demystify how male and female individuals speak and interact with academic discourse genres. This scrutiny might contribute to our understanding of how gendered communication operates in academic domains and would be useful to facilitate more inclusive and effective communication.

Research Objectives
The purpose of this study was to meet the following research aims:

- To explore the variation in how male and female students and teachers use English in oral exchanges in the classroom, class discussions, and written tasks.

- To examine interruption patterns, politeness strategies, assertiveness, and language choices that illustrate gendered patterns in communication.

Significance of the Study

Given its potential to shed light on the gendered dynamics of communication in educational spaces, the scholarship has clear policy and practical implications for educators, lawmakers, and researchers. The study does this through a nuanced examination of how male and female students and teachers differ in their uses of English in classroom interactions, discussions and written assignments. Familiarity with these nuances can help guide educational practices so that educators help bring about more inclusive and fair learning situations that help each student feel valued and capable of engaging. In addition, the article analyzed patterns of interrupting, politeness strategies, assertiveness, and language choices, significantly contributing to the existing literature regarding gender and communication by illuminating how cultural norms and expectations influence communication practices. Ultimately, the results of the present study could serve to increase appreciation of diversity in communication, pedagogically and beyond.

Literature Review

Studying gendered language practices of English within English-medium educational settings both in theoretical (sociolinguistics and gender studies) and empirical education literature in Pakistan balances and grounds itself within these literatures. According to Borren (2024), language is a foundational modality for the building and resistance of gender identities in the social world itself. In the educational setting, language structures student-teacher interactions and determines classroom dynamics that ultimately translate to learning outcomes (Roy, 2024). Moreover, English medium education in Pakistan is also complex, as this higher level of English mastery is seen in societal positions and progress in the corporate world (Borhan, 2024). The primary purpose of this literature review is to uncover the interconnections among language, gender, and education in Pakistan, specifically while testing the gendered nature of school-based language in English in English medium institutes.

Mede MCL (De Malsche, 2024) are genderlects, a concept central to research in language and gender. It is well-established that men and women use language differently, with diverging lexical preferences, discourse styles, and non-verbal gestures (Svensson, 2024). Gendered language practices, in turn, are constructed through social norms of masculinity and femininity. In the English-medium instruction contexts of Pakistan, where the traditional gender roles may collide with a globalized world, we need to understand these linguistic variations for inclusive and equitable learning (Ahmad et al., 2024).

Lexical choices, as an indicator of communication practices, have been investigated in educational contexts across cultures, showing to which extent language mirrors and reproduces gender biases. For example, studies in Western contexts have found gender-based conversational behaviour, where males speak more and females act as on the "serve" and "support" stance (Knutson et al., 2024). Gendered language around men and women that supports patriarchal gender roles has also been consistently evidenced in non-Western research (Mirabella et al., 2024). Certainly, we need to investigate language as a form of ordering linked to the negotiation of gender identities with educational contexts to address gender equality imperative hence social justice concern within the boundaries of Pakistan which exists somehow within the patriarchal grounds.

Second, the pervasiveness of English as an international language reinforces more complexity in investigating gendered language practices in Pakistani English-medium educational institutions. The status of English also affects how students and teachers use the language, as greater proficiency is an indicator of social status related to social prestige and job opportunities and any deviation from common standards is considered a failure (Abid et al., 2024). English medium instruction is said to offshoot linguistic imperialism and economically unchains local languages while perpetuating a colonial stigmatizing mandate (Batool et al., 2024). In this regard, it critically reflects upon the way gender finds its way into the sphere of language use in English-medium education, which is so that linguistic diversity and gender equality are not a twin casualty.

Moreover, educators affect language practices and norms in schools so radically, witnessing the important role of language within educational organizations. Classroom interactions can be mediated by teachers, who can set standards for the language used or not linked to existing gender bias (Chaudhary, 2024). Research has suggested that the language teachers use and their pedagogical practices are imbued with or can challenge narratives of gendered norms, which in turn situate students' identities about one another (Gras, 2024). In a country such as Pakistan, where (female) teachers are likely to have negative attitudes exacerbated by patriarchal gender ideologies about women's voice in education and professions, it is particularly important to see how gendered teaching and how language use intersect in constructing gender normality: if we are to foster more inclusive and empowering learning environment (Shahzad et al., 2024).

A Review of the Literature The literature reviewed underscores the inextricability of language and gender within higher education institutions employing English as the medium of instruction in Pakistan. Studying gendered language practices in this context opens up possibilities for researchers to help document how language use reflects and, in many ways, perpetuates gender inequalities. Therefore, these findings might provide valuable guidelines for designing policies and practices on gender equality and social justice in Pakistan (Afrin & Afrin, 2024).

Methodology

This is a mix-methods approach in which 40 students and teachers participated. The researcher selected 20 students and 20 teachers by convenient sampling method from different English medium colleges of Gujranwala, Pakistan. The reason for the convenient sampling was that most of students and teachers were not willing to be the part of this research because of the shortage of time and especially female students and teachers because of their parents didn't allow them to be there after the institution time. However, the researcher selected the willing teachers and students to conduct this research study. The researcher given the students and teachers different assignments to observe their communication. Their communication was observed by the researcher for one week. The researcher made an observation checklist and by using that checklist, the researcher gave them the marks from 1 to 10 as "Rare (0-1 occurrences)","Occasional (2-3 occurrences)","Moderate (4-5 occurrences)","Frequent (6-7 occurrences)","Very Frequent (8+ occurrences)". The comparisons of the male and female students and teachers' conversation styles were conducted, and the results are shown. The male and female students and teachers were shown their results, and their interviews were conducted to confirm the results.

Data Analysis Results

In this research study, data analysis started with a systematic observation of 40 participants (students and teachers) from different English medium colleges in Gujranwala, Pakistan. The sample was derived using a convenient sampling strategy, given the time and availability constraints, especially for female participants who were not allowed to stay on the institute premises after hours set by the parents. To obtain a more in-depth analysis, the researcher observed other ways they interacted with peers over one week in the classroom setting, such as classroom interactions, discussions and written works. An observation checklist was used to standardize the rating, with scores from 1 to 10 based on the frequency of observed behaviours: Rare (0-1 occurrences) to Very Frequent (8+ occurrences).

Observation Results

This experiment was performed by observing male and female students since their speech differed in a very simple style in the classroom. C) Regarding interruptions, male students gained a higher frequency, rated as "Very Frequent" (5), than females who were given only as "Occasional" (3). These results also highlight more frequent supportive interruptions (4) among female students than male students (3). Interestingly, the data reflected a high level of student-initiated misbehaviour mainly limited to noisy interruptions, predominately among male students, scored 4, with female students exhibiting very little disruptive interruptions, scored 1. Female students used politeness markers, scoring 5, while male students scored 2. As shown in [Fig.2], the hedging was the second most used function, with female students using it more often, rated 3, while male students rarely used it, rated 1. The higher there was joking among male subjects, ranked 3, rarely asserted, and lower if the female subjects cited 5, very strict and assertive. In addition, as per the vocabulary level, low-rated vocabulary (e.g., rated 1, 2) was used more frequently by male than female students; however, high-rated vocabulary (e.g., rated 5) was used more by female students than male students. On the opposite end of the spectrum, the everyday slang used more by male students was rated 3 and 1 for female students.

The most striking differences were in the communication styles employed by male and female teachers. There was also less respect for the input of the females, rated at 3, compared to the males, rated at 1, as they did the least interrupting. There were no clear cases of supportive and disruptive interruptions in either group, but other trends began to surface. Respect for teachers Males = 5; Females = 3 Most frequent politeness markers Male = x Female = x Female teachers ranked 3 and were more assertive compared to male teachers, who cases of them receiving 1 Although, the majority of the teachers employed simple vocabulary, it was observed that female teachers used complex vocabulary code more than male teachers, rated as 3. In contrast, the male teachers were rated 1. There was little to note in either group for evidence of hedging or slang/colloquial language, as seen in Table 1. These results suggest that female teachers tend to be more interruptive and assertive, while male teachers are more inclined to use politeness markers in their communication.

Comparison of Results

The next step was to conduct a detailed analysis of the communication patterns of male and female students with the teacher. With the observation checklists, the author has counted the interruption patterns shown by individuals of each group, how much each type of politeness and assertiveness strategies they tend to comply with and chose their language preferences. These results were

validated through interviews, which were then shared with the participants again to gain more insights. The quantitative component provided numerical results on the behaviours observed, while the qualitative component allowed for validation of these results through participant feedback,thereby providing a mixed-methods data collection approach. This approach was a well-rounded mechanism combining theoretical information with in-their-face participant inquiry. It reveals consistency with the initial observations related to gendered communication styles within the educational terrain of Gujranwala and their significant differences.

Table 1
Comparison of Male and Female Students

Category	Male Students (Marks 1-5)	Female Students (Marks 1-5)	Comments
Interruptions	5	3	Males interrupt more frequently
Supportive Interruptions	3	4	Females provide more supportive interruptions
Disruptive Interruptions	4	1	Males are more disruptive
Use of Politeness Markers	2	5	Females use more politeness markers
Use of Hedging	1	3	Females hedge more often
Assertiveness	3	5	Females are more assertive
Complex Vocabulary	3	5	Females use complex vocabulary more frequently
Slang/Colloquial Language	3	1	Males use more slang

Comparison between female and male students shows that they differ in communication. Male students interrupt way more than female students (5 to 3 on the "Very Frequent" scale). In contrast, female students rated supportive interruptions higher (4 out of 5) than their male counterparts (3 out of 5). More male students scored in the 4 levels for Y, and fewer female students scored in the 1 level. Female students also ask more politely, scoring 5 against 2 of the male students on the politeness index. Three for females, 1 for males [hedge]. Female students are rated 5 for asserting, while males are rated 3. In addition, female students use fewer simple vocabulary but get a rating of 5, whilst male students get a rating of 3. On the other hand, male students get a rating of 3 when it comes to slang or colloquial language, while females get 1. These observations indicate that female students are more polite assertive, and use complex language, whereas male students are likelier to interrupt and use more disturbing, slang language.

Table 2
Comparison of Male and Female Teachers

Category	Male Teacher (Marks 1-5)	Female Teacher (Marks 1-5)	Comments

583

Interruptions	1	3	Female teacher interrupts more
Supportive Interruptions	N/A	N/A	Not observed
Disruptive Interruptions	N/A	N/A	Not observed
Use of Politeness Markers	5	3	Male teacher uses more politeness markers
Use of Hedging	N/A	N/A	Not observed
Assertiveness	1	3	Female teacher is more assertive
Complex Vocabulary	1	3	Female teacher uses more complex vocabulary
Slang/Colloquial Language	N/A	N/A	Not observed

In the case of male and female teachers, there are important differences in communication styles. Female students are more frequently interrupted by their teachers, with interruptions rated 3 for women and 1 for men. No kind of support interrupt behaviour has been identified clearly for a group. Neither has the disruptive one. In politeness markers, male teachers used them a lot with 5 rating, and female teachers used them less with a 3 rating. Female teachers are quite assertive (rated 3) but still below their male counterparts, rated 1. Furthermore, female teachers are rated 3 and male teachers 1 in vocabulary complexities. Both groups were observed not using hedging or slang/colloquial in their answers. This could imply that female teachers are often more interruptive and assertive and use more complex vocabulary. Male teachers use polite language and politeness more than their way of speaking.

Results of Interviews
The researcher interviewed the students and teachers to validate the results and corroborate the observation results. Below are the results from the interview and discussion:

Teacher Interviews
Interview with Male Teacher
Interviewer: How do you generally approach classroom interactions and discussions?

A male teacher: I make everything structure. I prefer to set clear guidelines and then expect the students to be able to always follow them. To keep discussion polite, I use many politeness markers such as please and thank you

Interviewee: So how frequently do you interrupt students from open discussions?

Male Teacher: Rarely. I practice what I preach and allow students to finish their sentences before I interrupt. It boosts their confidence and makes them feel more recognized.

Interviewer: How would you classify your level of assertiveness in the classroom?

Male Teacher: Traditionally, I would think of myself as less assertive. I try to have a calm attitude which, to my thinking, also keeps the classroom nice and makes the kids want to learn.

Interviewer: So, do you frequently use highfalutin words to teach?

Male Teacher: Not really. I keep the language plain and clear as it allows everybody even the lowest level students to understand the notion behind the items.

Interview with Female Teacher
Question: Could you talk about your model in class interaction and discussions in general?

Teacher (F): I prefer to be more engaged. I do value student voice, and I promote participation. It makes learning more become learning more interactive and engaging.

Interviewer- And how frequently would you notice you jumping in on conversation loop in with your students?

NF: All the time; but most of the time, its just to let it flow, or start to flow, and steer it back if it wanders. And I think it helps to keep the conversation constructive.

Interviewer: Tell me about how aggressive you are in the classroom?

Woman: I believe I am also substantial. Authority should be enforced and therefore must rules and guidelines be respected by all students.

Interviewer: Do you use complex words in your lectures?

Female Teacher: I think it is important to stretch our students and build their vocabulary. I should explain that I also try to clarify any hard words.

Student Interviews
Interview with Male Student
Interviewer - How do you experience a classroom discussion?

Guys: A lot of the time, yes, but I feel like I'm constantly interjecting to say my part I need a cure for this.

Interviewer-How frequently yiu use ploiteness markers in your responces??

Male Student: Not very often. My approach tends to be more upfront in what probably comes across as somewhat ruder, I guess.

Interviewer: Are you assertive when classroom interactions are concerned?

Male Student: Um, I believe so, yes. I am adamant about getting my points across an have them heard.

Interviewer: So, how competent you are in using the jargons in your assignments?

CS (Male Student): I use it when I have to, I much prefer laying out a solution using plain-english. It communicates better, I suppose.

Interview with Female Student
Interviewer: How do you feel about speaking in class?

Girl: I like to be involved but I sometimes wait for my turn to talk. I think it is disrespectful and simply rude to interrupt.

Did the Interviewer ask you, You always use politeness markers in communication?

Female Student: Very often. But I just think that you have to be kind of nice and human, especially in class.

Interviewer: How assertive would you consider yourself to be when taking classroom interactions into account?

Girl: In a respectful way. I ensure that I would make my point but never in a forceful manner.

Interviewer: How well do you feel using academic vocabulary in their work?

Girl: I feel like we can go on and on about this one, and we do, actually, on Let Them See You, but right here: Female Student: I feel like totally cool with it, and I know people that like are not so comfortable with it. To me, using difficult words means having the intellectual understanding of a topic while making my arguments more convincing.

Analysis of Interviews
In the interviews with the teachers and students, the study identifies specific ways of interacting in the classroom and teaching, demonstrating a diversity of preferences for learning and teaching. Specifically, the male teacher organises and orients classroom discussions in a structured and respectful environment, often beginning with clear instructions and polite language. According to him, he rarely speaks over students, and he gives them room to completely elaborate on their thoughts, giving them a sense of confidence that their voices have been heard. His far less assertive stance is likely to be in the interest of a more untroubled learning environment in the classroom, using simpler language to reach various proficiency levels.

On the other hand, female teachers focus on an interactive style and aim to maximise student participation, which helps create a lively learning ambience. She cuts off conversations often to re-direct them, which she sees as an effort to keep conversations fruitful. A big part of her teaching is about authority and enforcing classroom rules and guidelines, hence her strength. Against this background, Oga has equipped students with challenging vocabulary during her lectures, explaining any terms that are difficult to understand with clear definitions to deepen their linguistic abilities.

The male student enjoys discussion as a form of participation within the classroom but recognises that he has the habit of interrupting people, which he is still working on. He communicates directly and without many face-saving markers; he owns this with comments that he knows could be rude. He sees himself as direct and is quick to share his opinion. He can use big words but prefers small words because small words make him more conversationally coherent.

The female student, however, likes to contribute to discussions in class but prefers to raise her hand rather than interrupt, which she considers rude. This is natural for her; she is more polite in communication, expressed in the highest positioning of politeness markers. An assertive woman who temperates her assertiveness with respect, balancing her right to speak on her behalf with her care for others. She knows that she can pull off complex words and sees it as a way of showing your understanding of a subject and as a way to reinforce the strength of her arguments.

Together, these interviews illustrate the differences in classroom dynamics and communication styles of teachers and students. Sure, the male teacher is disciplined and composed, while the female teacher has a lively and powerful way of dealing with things. Likewise, the frank, interjecting male student is usually not the same as a woman student's more reserved, polite participation. Adaptable and empathetic learning environments are needed to address these differences in teaching and learning requirements.

Findings
The study results suggest that male and female undergraduate and graduate students communicate and that how male and female teachers communicate within classroom settings differs based on gender. The comparison-dependent variable analysis revealed that males interrupted and used challenging interruptions more often, whereas females supported pupils using supportive interruptions. Second, the female students utilised politeness markers and complex vocabulary, with a higher level of assertiveness and hedging than the male students. On the other hand, male students scored high in terms of using slang and colloquial language. This divergence implies that female students tend to favour a more polite and refined language, contributing to "a friendly and cooperative classroom atmosphere" instead of the somewhat more straightforward and informal language that male students inevitably exercise.

Check out the interview findings that reinforce these insights by shedding light on the behaviours of male and female teachers. The women teachers interrupted more often, displayed more assertiveness overall, responded to students with more complex language and used more discussion moves to press students to elaborate. In contrast, the male teachers were less overt, often layering their interruptions with politeness markers to preserve a friendly classroom space. Such gendered communication in teachers surfaced from a student perspective: female teachers were more forceful in voice tone guiding classroom discussions, and male teachers were more controlled in voice tone guiding classroom discussions and in polite and clear vocabulary. These results suggest that gender plays an important role in the communication style used as part of the instructional process, with implications for gender and communication, both at the macro-social level and more generally.

Discussion
This study reveals that sex has a marked effect on communication styles within educational environments. While these differences in observed interactions between male and female students are informative, they also raise questions about how these students have been socialized into gender roles dosed with sexism. This implied communication style of politeness and complex vocabulary is likely connected to a value of respect and high respect associated with intellectual engagement for female students. This respectful interruption and a willingness to change levels of assertiveness provide a good mix of stating ideas and promoting collaboration. On the other hand, aggressive male students who talk over their peers and exhibit disruptive behaviours, as well as a preference for blunt, informal language and slang, suggest a more dominant, casual communication style. Such behaviours may also be related to a broader social expectation for males to assert themselves and embed themselves in power relations, which may also inform classroom cultural dynamics that elevate boys' apprehensions over girls, thereby inhibiting the dialectic and pluralistic exchanges that critical thinking can sometimes entail.

As well, the teacher interviews illustrate how gender shapes approach to instruction. The higher levels of negatives (interruptions, high-cout terms, and high-cout rate) by female teachers indicates an initiating role in setting up the social interactions and intellectual challenges of the classroom. Their greater assertiveness aids in that group presence, enforcing the social order in the classroom, something that may be harder for a female teacher to gain in some areas. In contrast, male teachers use more politeness Markers and have fewer interruptions- this taming nature of communication is a way ensure a sense of decorum and peace in class. This could result from confidence that they are more likely to have authority, not challenged and can be more casual. This boils down to, says Baillergeon, that the way teachers communicate in these gendered patterns is not solely because of their communication styles but affects the broader classroom culture and, hence, the way students see the learning environment. The results indicate the importance of gender-sensitive communication awareness and training to ensure an inclusive and effective educational culture.

Conclusion

There was a remarkable difference in the communication methods of the male participants and females during the study. On both sides, the female students and academic employees employed a higher rate of CF, politeness markers, appeal to knowledge, and served to be more hedging,pointing to a more complex and delicate way of interaction. Boys and male teachers were more straightforward and less proper, annotating multiple times in one comment, writing colloquial, etc. This popular contrast highlights precisely how men and women engage with classroom content and interactions, and this insight into the prominent effect that gender has on the creation of communication practice in learning environments.

The female students and their teachers naturally demonstrated more polite styles but still very assertive, making supportive interruptions and using complex language to establish a more collaborative and respectful class context. In contrast, males (both students and teacher) interrupted more often but more superficially and aggressively and also displayed fewer politeness markers, indicating a more dominant-direct communication style. The implications of these results for the classroom suggest that communication styles differentiated by gender have larger consequences and that in education, we must work to train our communication methods to be inclusive and practical.

Recommendations

Institutions would benefit from creating instructional programs and awareness campaigns among students that detail how gendered communication styles affect classroom practices. What is required is a blend of assertiveness and politeness strategies where teachers create a safe and inviting classroom that respects the voices of all students, no matter what their behaviour patterns suggest. In addition, experiences built to support these exchanges and collaboration-based dialogues can help neutralize the dominance of any single communication method. Similarly, colloquium writing training workshops targeting influential communication works, namely muscular words and small breaks for the students, may help enhance student participation and enthusiasm. This would thereby cater to the diversity of chemical signalling behaviours between boys and girls present at the general school level, leading to a school learning environment that is adaptive for both gender styles.

Implications

The results have wider ramifications for learning and social behaviour. The findings underscore the requirement for classroom-level gender-sensitized strategy, showing how male and female students and teachers talk dissimilarly. Insights like these can be powerful tools for educators to help them to individualize the ways they teach to include various voices in communication. This can promote participatory and effective learning where everyone is all in. The latter part can betray support in teacher training to sensitise and fill teachers for an and to see similar changes in communication. Beyond the classroom, awareness of these gendered linguistic patterns can help cultivate fairer, kinder dialogue in many different contexts, encouraging more equitable relationships and a general atmosphere of respect between men and women.

References

Abid, A., Siddique, A. R.,& Ahmad, M. (2024). Exploring Discourse Markers in Analyzing Gender Discrimination in Pakistani Drama Serials: A Corpus-Based Study. *Sindh Journal of Linguistics*,*3*(1), 55-69.https://doi.org/10.58921/sjl.v3i1.82

Afrin, N.,& Afrin, A. (2024). Language and its Relationship with Gender: A Study on Sociolinguistics Perspectives.*UITS Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences, 6*(1), 133-140.

Ahmad, B., Khan, N. H.,& Ullah, I. (2024). A Corpus-Based Comparative Analysis of Socio-Linguistic Features in the Genderlect of American and Pakistani English TV Talk Shows. *Journal of Asian Development Studies*,*13*(2), 292-302.https://doi.org/10.62345/jads.2024.13.2.25

Batool, R., Rana, F. M. A.,& Qasim, H. M. (2024). Investigating Gender Perceptions on Technology Use in Pakistan ELT Classrooms: A Survey-Based Study. *International" Journal of Academic Research for Humanities"*,*4*(1), 58-63.https://jar.bwo-researches.com/index.php/jarh/article/view/385

Borhan, N. (2024). A Review Study About Gender Differences in Expressive Language: Spoken and Written Language Differences. *Gelişim ve Psikoloji Dergisi*,*4*(8), 76-95.https://doi.org/10.51503/gpd.1231592

Borren, M. (2024). Feminism and Gender. In *The Routledge Handbook of Political Phenomenology* (pp. 360-371). Routledge.https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003197430

Chaudhary, N. (2024). Examining meaning-making and decolonial resistance in Pakistani women's stories of navigating coloniality and gender. *Feminism & Psychology*,*34*(2), 207-227.https://doi.org/10.1177/09593535241233845

De Malsche, F. (2024). *Language and globalization in Belgian corporate contexts: institutional, individual, and interactional perspectives* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Antwerp).https://hdl.handle.net/10067/2022530151162165141

Fried, M.,& Awad, I. (2024). Journalists as Mindful Users of Language (Change): Gender-Inclusive Spanish in Argentinian News. *Journalism Studies*,*25*(1), 80-98.https://doi.org/10.1080/1461670X.2023.2289886

Goldoni, F.,& Mormino, K. W. (2024). Creating a gender and sexuality inclusive OER world language course. *Pedagogy opened: Innovative theory and practice*, 97-127.

Gras, C. (2024). Narratives of race and identity in English language teaching. *The Language Learning Journal*,*52*(1), 77-91.https://doi.org/10.1080/09571736.2022.2107693

Kamath, H. M. (2024). Vedantam vs. Venus: Drag, Impersonation, and the Limitations of Gender Trouble. *International Journal of Hindu Studies*, 1-19.https://doi.org/10.1007/s11407-024-09363-8

Kaneko, M., Bollegala, D., Okazaki, N.,& Baldwin, T. (2024). Evaluating Gender Bias in Large Language Models via Chain-of-Thought Prompting. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.15585*.https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2401.15585

Khalilova, L., Allayarov, A., Ravshanov, H., Karimova, Z.,& Yusupov, A. (2024). Language And Social Constructs in Gender-Related Lexical Units. *Евразийский журнал технологий и инноваций*,*2*(1), 164-169.https://www.in-academy.uz/index.php/ejti/article/view/25633

Knutson, D., Goldbach, C., Kler, S., Rodríguez-Ordóñez, I., McDurmon, P.,& Goff, B. (2024). Language Matters: Gender Pronouns and Identity Terminology for Transgender and Nonbinary People. In *The Routledge Handbook of LGBTQ Identity in Organizations and Society* (pp. 247-261). Routledge.https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003128151

Melo-Pfeifer, S.,& Tavares, V. (Eds.). (2024). *Language Teacher Identity: Confronting Ideologies of Language, Race, and Ethnicity*. John Wiley & Sons.

Mirabella, M., Mazzuca, C., De Livio, C., Di Giannantonio, B., Rosati, F., Lorusso, M. M., ... & Giovanardi, G. (2024). The role of language in nonbinary identity construction: Gender words matter. *Psychology of Sexual Orientation and Gender Diversity*.https://psycnet.apa.org/doi/10.1037/sgd0000729

Preseau, L. D., Spino, L.,& Tracksdorf, N. (2024). Gender inclusivity across the curriculum: An exploration of novice and advanced course content through student perspectives. *Redoing Linguistic Worlds: Unmaking Gender Binaries, Remaking Gender Pluralities*, 89-113.

Putri, I. G. A. V. W., Simpen, I. W., Suparwa, I. N.,& Malini, N. L. N. S. (2024). Gender Representation in Indonesian Language Textbooks: Critical Discourse Analysis. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*,*14*(1), 248-256.https://doi.org/10.17507/tpls.1401.29

Roy, S. (2024). "Gender attributes are performative rather than expressive": An understanding of Feminism. *Authorea Preprints*.https://doi.org/10.31124/advance.13384466.v1

Shahzad, W., Ali, T., Farooq, M. A.,& Fatima, I. (2024). A Study of Womens Language Features in Pakistani Female Bloggers. *Qlantic Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities*,*5*(1), 37-51.https://doi.org/10.55737/qjssh.307854515

Svensson, H. (2024). Language learning, gender and education: Understanding the agency and affordances of refugee-background women with emergent literacy. *Linguistics and Education*,*81*, 101309.https://doi.org/10.1016/j.linged.2024.101309