



Linguistics and Literature Review (LLR)

Volume 8 Issue 1, 2022

ISSN(P): 2221-6510 ISSN(E): 2409-109X

Journal DOI: <https://doi.org/10.32350/llr>

Issue DOI: <https://doi.org/10.32350/llr.81>

Journal Homepage: <http://journals.umt.edu.pk/llr/Home.aspx>

Article: **Gender Based Politeness Strategies: A Case study of department of English University of Gujrat**

Author(s): Ayesha

Affiliation: University of Gujrat, Gujrat, Pakistan

Article DOI: <https://doi.org/10.32350/llr.81/04>

Article History: Received: September 9, 2021
Revised: February 22, 2022
Accepted: March 1, 2022

Citation: Ayesha. (2022). Gender based politeness strategies: A case study of department of English University of Gujrat. *Linguistics and Literature Review*, 8(1), 85–105.

Copyright Information:  This article is open access and is distributed under the terms of [Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/)

Journal QR



Article QR



Ayesha

Indexing



A publication of the
Department of Linguistics and Communications Institute of Liberal Arts
University of Management and Technology Lahore, Pakistan

Gender-Based Politeness Strategies: A Case Study of Academics from the Department of English, University of Gujrat

Ayesha *

University of Gujrat, Pakistan

Abstract

Gender-based differences in language use have been investigated by researchers for a long time. It has been observed that men and women comply with different linguistic norms in their speeches. This fact not only characterizes their individual style but also portrays their respective masculinity and femininity. However, it has been noted also that linguistic norms are not necessarily gender specific. In this regard, this research paper aims to analyze the politeness-based strategies used by male and female faculty members of the Department of English, University of Gujrat while making conversation. Data was collected through purposive sampling technique keeping in view Lakoff's politeness principles. For this purpose, the lectures of two male and female faculty members were recorded. The collected data was analyzed to highlight which gender complies more with the principles of politeness, as depicted by Robin Lakoff. The findings proved female faculty members to be more polite as compared to male faculty members. The current research helps future researchers and readers to understand how language works spontaneously among different genders and how communication can be improved by pedagogics while using the politeness principles laid down by Robin Lakoff.

Keywords: communication, gender, language use, lectures, politeness

Introduction

Language is the most vital tool of communication. There exist many differences in language use by both genders; such that they indicate whether the speaker is a man or a woman. A variety of linguistic features characterize the gender that utilizes them in their speech. For instance, women tend to use more prestigious forms of language. Over the past few decades, the women's movement has raised issues concerning the use of gender-based language (Ijem & Agbo, [2019](#)). As one may expect, language

*Corresponding author: riaz62241@gmail.com

depicts gender differences, for it is in its task to transmit, record, and reflect the social contrast. Language is a medium of communication which helps us to express our thoughts and emotions. Different individuals may possess similar ideas but choose linguistically distinct ways to express them (Xia, [2013](#)). While delivering a speech, different genders tend to pose a different style to convey the idea. Studies have shown that women tend to be more emotional during their speech and are more inclined towards politeness than men in same and cross-gender communication. Women use domesticized vocabulary more as compare to their male counterparts. The domesticity of their vocabulary gives a touch of politeness to their speech. Men, on the other hand, remain impersonal. It also reflects the fact that men pose politeness in their behavior as well (Newman et al, [2008](#)).

Significance of the Research

To date, a vast amount of research has focused on analyzing the differences in the daily communication of male and female members of the society at the domestic level. However, little work has been carried out to analyze gender-based differences in the use of communication norms at the workplace. Hence, the current study aims to fill this gap by analyzing the differences in the use of communication norms at the workplace. Moreover, it also investigates the effects of these differences on the employees.

Research Questions

This study attempts to answer the following questions:

1. How do male and female faculty members achieve different levels of politeness while delivering lectures?
2. What are the effects of the differences in the politeness level of male and female faculty members on students in co-education?

Literature Review

Gender can be defined as a range of traits. Particularly, in the case of men and women, it is also used to differentiate the corresponding features of femininity and masculinity attributed to them. There is a clear difference between gender and sex. Sex is related to biological differentiation between men and women. Gender, however, refers to the social construct of man and woman (Udry, [1994](#)). Socially, a language uses us as much as we use the

language. The particular style of language we use in our speech reflects the way we construct our gender.

Robin Lakoff (1973) used the deficit approach to define the women's use of language. She said that women use language in dimensions and manners that reflect their powerlessness, politeness, submissiveness, or an empowered state. Women tend to use certain grammatical structures of language, including the distinctive use of its lexicon (adjectives, colors, and interjections) and syntax (tag questions, respects). Moreover, their language use can be understood and analyzed by considering their contextual background to have a better understanding of it. Robin Lakoff proposed some suggestions to the future activists of women empowerment, about the kind of language to be used by women, in order to help them claim their rights more effectively.

Women use more intensifiers, questions, personal pronouns, sentences beginning with adverbs, and justifiers. Whereas, men use conjunctions, directives, and are also more likely to interrupt a conversation than women (Mulac et al., 1988). Furthermore, women tend to use more polite forms of speech when they address someone, that is, they use questions and humor more than men; whereas, men notably use more affirmatives, and fillers (Subon, 2013). Moreover, women showcase more consciousness and hesitance in their speech as compared to men, - who are evidently more assertive in their way of talking (Leaper & Robnett, 2011). Previous studies have emphasized gender differences in language use during face-to-face interactions in cross-gender instances. These differences can also be measured in electronic communication such as emails sent to strangers. The linguistic features used by women show their concern for maintaining a good rapport (Colley & Todd, 2002). In academic settings, female students are more polite than male students. However, these results cannot be generalized in every circumstance. They also need to communicate in other social contexts depicting a variety of equations, such as- the discourse between a customer and a shopkeeper, student/teacher interaction and a doctor/patient scenario, among others (Wahyuningsih, 2018). Women's excessive use of boosters, hedges, apologies, and compliments collectively illustrate the differences in the way they communicate as compared to men (Holmes, 2013). The extent to which the speakers use tag questions emerges as an exception due to their usage being culturally conditioned, instead of being determined by gender. This is because both men and women use

various types of tag questions. As far as cultural variations are concerned, English speakers use more tag questions in their speech than the Serbians. Yet, the degree of their usage varies according to the type of discourse-, that is, whether it is a cross-gender or same-gender discourse (Jovanovic & Pavlovic, [2014](#)).

The functions and distribution of a variety of approaches of verbal politeness in men's and women's speech postulate the possible whys and wherefores of gender differences (Holmes, [2013](#)). Politeness differs according to the context. It can be either positive or negative. Negative politeness strategies include maintaining the communication distance with the interlocutor. On the other hand, positive approaches aim to remove the distance between people.

Previous studies found a gender-based inclination towards the use of politeness, that is, men use negative politeness strategies, while women use positive ones. This varying inclination towards the use of politeness strategies portrays the gender differences in speech styles (Ramadhani, [2013](#)). Men's speech is considered more directive and simpler, as opposed to the female speech. They also tend to be straightforward. On the other hand, women use different strategies to express their psychological states, including how they express their feelings and emotions (Wahyuningsih, [2018](#)). They gravitate towards an attitude of compromise, avoiding the display of any strong expressions that may stir up conflicts. Almost contrastingly, men do not refrain from using direct imperatives; indeed, they are likely to express their ideas without the fear of sparking resentment and conflicts. Such instances disclose the socially constructed boundaries and domains for both men and women which they implicitly observe in their speech. In personal relationships, women prefer to seek the permission and assistance of their partners in order to preserve intimacy. On the other hand, men are in a habit of using the directive style, wanting to show their independence. They use to speak in formal manners, reflecting their communicative distance (Tannen, [1990](#)). Keeping in view these crucial findings, the current study aims to uncover the differences in the use of politeness between male and female faculty members while delivering a lecture at the university level.

Theoretical Framework

The study relies on Lakoff's politeness strategies ([1973](#)) as the theoretical framework used for supporting the research questions. She proposed ten principles of politeness which are as follows: (i) use of hedges, (ii) use of tag questions, (iii) speak in italics, (iv) use of empty adjectives, (v) apologize more, (vi) use of correct grammatical structure and super correct form, (vii) indirect requests, (viii) use of the super polite form of language, (ix) avoid cursive language, (x) and speak less frequently. She proposed these principles on the basis of three maxims: (i) don't impose, (ii) give options, and (iii) make your receiver feel good. As mentioned above, Lakoff accentuates a greater use of politeness strategies by women than men during oral communication. The proposed principles can be used to measure politeness. They need not be employed in a given speech, all at once. Rather, politeness can be measured via the number of times a person uses any of the principles suggested by (Lakoff, [1973](#)).

Methodology

A piece of research relies on the strands of methods employed for conducting it. Consequently, methodology remains a vital part of any research work. The current research employs a qualitative method by which it intends to investigate the effects of gender-specific language and expressions in lectures delivered by male and female faculty members of a university.

Nature of the Study

This research is descriptive in nature.

Design of the Study

The current research was conducted in the form of a case study. The researcher chose the sample participants using the purposive sampling technique. On the other hand, data was collected from the participants using a quantitative approach.

Instrumentation

To measure the components of this study, the researcher used oral recorded lectures of the faculty members.

Data Collection Procedure

The data was collected in three steps. In the first step, the researcher secured the verbal consent of the lecturers to record their lectures. In the second step, the researcher recorded the lectures of female faculty members. In the third step, the researcher recorded the lectures of male faculty members.

Procedure for Data Analysis

The recorded data was analyzed in three steps. In the first step, the researcher transcribed the audio recorded data to bring it in a written form. In the second step, the researcher sought the use of politeness strategies proposed by Robin Lakoff in the data. In the third step, the researcher analyzed the speeches on the basis of politeness strategies implied by each speaker, individually.

Data Analysis

Analysis of the Lecture Delivered by First Female Lecturer

Table 1

List of Parameters Used by First Female Lecturer

List of Parameters	Number of Use
Italics	Once
Hedges	Eight fold
Super correct form (the stressed from)	Six fold
Interjection	Twice
Filler words	Four fold
Repetition	Once
Source: Researcher's Own Description	

In the beginning, the said speaker used an imperative tone (see Appendix 02 A). The lecturer is a non-native speaker of English. Observably, she used the super correct form by laying stress on each word in every sentence. She also used an apologetic tone to address the audience by starting the lecture with the words “I hope”. The use of “I hope” indicates the lack of confidence at the speaker’s end, as well as an implicit attempt to gain consent from the students. The direction of the speech shifts from ‘I’ to ‘you’, showing the lecturer’s attempt to build intimacy while delivering the lecture. She used the term “dear” to address the audience, collectively

addressing all of them, hence seeking their collaboration to move ahead with the lecture. Sentence (b) starts with the same expression. The repetition of “dear” with the pairing of the sentence (a) illustrates that the speaker does not want to hold the floor alone. The use of the intensifier “a great” with the stress on “idea” (the super correct form) indicates that the speaker wants the attention and consent of the audience. In the second part of the sentence, the use of “so”, along with the lexical word “assume”, gives the sense of weak access. It makes the speaker appear as unconfident and hesitant. In addition, the use of hedges by the speaker supports this inference.

The said lecturer used hedges eight times, which reiterates her lack of confidence concerning the information she aimed to deliver. She used hedges to pronounce the following word by laying stress on the very next word to make it more emphatic. Then she gradually shifted her tone, to adopt a more declarative one. The mixing of native lexis such as “Tu, Tum, and Ap” indicated an increased level of comfort and confidence in her speech. She also used intensifiers such as “**simply, closeness, and friendliness**” to gain the attention and collaboration of her audience. She used phrases such as “you know” as fillers to mitigate silence in the classroom or to avoid the excessive use of hedges in her speech. Hedges and filler words do not add much value to the meaning of a sentence but do add sense of uncertainty related to the stated words. Moving on to the next parameter, she also incorporated different interjections to gain the attention of the audience by indulging them emotionally. The speaker also used italics which signposts the language of the speaker as super correct language. The repetitive use of italics shows that the speaker is intensifying something formal.

To summarize, the analysis revealed that Lakoff’s understanding of politeness principles aligns with the findings of this study. It was found that the speaker exudes the lack of confidence and incompetence through the excessive use of hedges. The overall analysis of the speech showed that the speaker, although is in a position of floor holding, was trying to involve the audience, and seeking their consent on every point of her discussion.

Analysis of the Lecture Delivered by Second Female Lecturer

Table 2

List of Parameters Used by Second Female Lecturer

List of Parameters	Number of Use
Hedges	Eight Fold
Super correct form	Nine Fold
Interjection	Once
Intensifier	Once
Repetition	Once
Use of italics	Thrice
Modifier	Twice
Filler words	Once

Source: Researcher's Own Description

The paragraph mentioned in the appendix reflects the sense of “declarative”. The speaker started the conversation with the phrase “my dear” which shows her intent to establish intimacy with the audience (see Appendix 02 B). In the next sentence, she used the intensifier “very”, which indicates that she wants to grab the attention of the audience. In doing so, she used the intensifier to modify the meaning of the sentence. Seemingly, she prioritized her students’ consent and collaboration during the lecture, over being authoritative and imposing her ideas. The use of the interjection “well” at the very outset of a sentence has dual meaning. It aids the speaker in implicitly gaining her audience’s consideration/consent when beginning a discussion while also acting as a filler. Once removed, the meaning of the sentence remains unchanged. The speaker used the super-correct form at three different positions - at the end of the first sentence “**sociolinguistics**”, in the middle of the second sentence “**to introduce sociolinguistics**”, and thirdly in the middle of the last sentence “**to think about it**”. The use of super correct form in different positions in the sentence showed that the speaker wanted to intensify the significance of the sentence without using intensifiers. In the above-mentioned paragraph, she used hedges twice in the same sentence. The use of hedges also gives a dual sense - firstly, it

shows the implicit lack of competence and secondly, it indicates that the speaker wants to deliver the importance of the sentence.

The analysis of the paragraph mentioned in the appendix shows that the content of the lecture delivered by the speaker is subjective in nature. She started the sentence with the use of a lexical hedge “**I think**”, indicating a level of uncertainty and a lack of confidence in what she conveyed, due to the subjectivity involved. In the next sentence, she used the hyper correct form and laid stress on the word “**combination**” to give it a thematic touch. Through its use, one could infer that she sought support from her audience. Her last sentence started with the use of **Italics**, indicating her attempt to conclude her discussion by emphasizing the information shared previously. The applied parameters conformed to the maxim of “**Don’t impose**” proposed by **Robin Lakoff**.

To deliver the content, she used modifiers, hedges, italics and hyper correct form of language. The use of hedges on three different occasions indicates not only her incompetence but also her unwillingness to impose her perceptions on others. To increase the motivation level of the learners, she employed different techniques in her speech, such as the use of hyper correct form of language in three different sentences- pointing towards her emotional involvement in the speech. Also, she used filler words, such as “you know”, to keep her students’ attention intact during the lecture.

Analysis of the Lecture Delivered by First Male Lecturer

Table 3

List of Politeness Parameters Used by First Male Lecturer

List of parameters	Number of Use
Hyper correct form	Eight Fold
Use of hedges	Twice
Language switching	Five Fold

Source: Researcher’s Own Description

The speaker started the conversation without a formal greeting such as “how are you all”, among other examples (see Appendix 02 C). Such a way of commencing the lecture conveyed the speaker’s lack of regard for building intimacy with his listeners. His tone was declarative which exhibited his desire to hold the floor alone. He stressed on two words ‘**no**

language' and **'lingua franca'**, respectively. In this regard, the use of stress or emphasis indicated the importance of what is being delivered. From the sentence **'That is why'** it is evident that the speaker intended to conclude the discussion on the basis of his own knowledge without consulting his listeners. Through the speech pattern that he followed and the tone he adopted; it is evident that he violated the maxim **'don't impose'** proposed by **Robin Lakoff**.

The speaker used an assertive tone, rather than an imperative one. He subsequently resorted to code switching in his lecture by using his native tongue in some instances. This shift of language has a dual meaning. Firstly, he used language alternation primarily due to a lack of competence regarding the language of instruction. Secondly, this was intended to give a more detailed and comprehensible answer that the listeners could take in more attentively. In the given scenario, he switched between languages, that is, between L1 and L2, more often than once.

Moreover, it was observed that he imposed his knowledge; a phenomenon noticed in utterances such as "uski waja me apko btata houn (I will tell you the reason behind that...)." He imposed what he thought or what he knew. The tone of the speaker suggested that he wanted to hold the floor, he remained independent rather than creating intimacy with his listeners. The use of hedge words in his speech can also be interpreted at two levels, that is, he may have lacked the appropriate vocabulary or he wanted to switch the language to make the concepts clearer to his students. He used the hypercorrect form in three different sentences and in three different sections of each sentence. He emphasized words such as **Pakistan, whereas, and interprovincial level**. A special focus on the said words showed his intent to underline the important aspects of his discussion or to make these the **topic sentences** of his speech.

He ended his speech on an emphatic tone and concluded the lecture without inviting any participation or contribution by the participants. This again hinted towards his willingness to independently hold the floor. While concluding the discussion, he switched to his **mother tongue again**. This phenomenon can be analyzed in two different ways. The first is to highlight the unique academic setting in his own country, as opposed to the target country. The second is to make a connection between the speaker and his listeners.

Analysis of the Lecture Delivered by Second Male Lecturer

Table No. 4

List of Politeness Parameters Used by Second Male Lecturer

Lists of parameters	Number of use
Hedges	Nine fold
Repetition	Twice
Hyper correct form	Five Fold
Use of personal pronoun	Thrice

Source: Researcher's Own Description

The lecturer was a non-native speaker of English. However, he used English as a medium of instruction (see Appendix 02 D), while his tone remained emphatic. Similar to the first male lecturer, he started communicating without any formal greetings. This proved the absence of dependence on his listeners and also showed his intent to be the only one speaking (holding the floor). He used hedges twice in a single sentence. The hedges held dual meaning: (i) weak competence over the language being used, and (ii) a strategy to gain assistance from or to refer to the students' perspectives for a better learning outcome. He continued his lecture without addressing his addressees, he did not verbally acknowledge the presence of any external observers. He used the hyper correct form of the word twice in a sentence, before and after the conjunction. He, therefore, managed to underline the significance of both the words. As per the observation, he uttered the conjunction unstressed, which shows that the only stress there was on theme words - **semantics and pragmatics**. In the same sentence, he repeated the phrase '**I will**' twice, using first person singular in both the instances. This further reiterated his desire to constantly hold the floor, without including the input of his listeners, while showcasing subjective interpretation of the information he shared.

He assigned his own definitions to different concepts. He used hedges thrice.. To attract attention, he used first person plural "**we**". The intention was to impose his own understanding on others. To achieve concision, he used repetition in the middle of sentences in an attempt to connect them with one another. The vocabulary was easy to understand which gave it a more familiar feel yet his tone revealed his stout stature. He used different engaging strategies and provided information from various sources with the

intention to hold the floor. He addressed his listeners only to impose his own observation on them.

He incorporated the hyper correct forms of theme words to give a clear cut meaning to what has been discussed throughout the lecture. Throughout the whole lecture, he violated all the maxims of politeness proposed by Robin Lakoff.

Comparative Data Analysis of Lectures of Both Male and Female Lecturers

Table 5

Comparative Data Analysis of Lectures

List of Parameters	Frequency of Usage by Female Lecturers	Frequency of Usage By Male Lecturers
Italics	Thrice	
Interjection	Twice	
Super correct form	Eighteen fold	Thirteen fold
Hedges	Twelve fold	Eleven Fold
Interjection	Once	
Filler words	Five fold	
Repetition	Twice	Twice
Intensifier	Thrice	
Language switching		Eight fold
Use of personal pronouns		Thrice
Total sfrequency of parameters	Forty-six Fold	Thirty seven fold

Source: Researcher's Own Description

The table shows that the women's speech is weaker than that of the males. Women used more politeness parameters than men. Naturally, they gravitated towards building a more collaborative style of speech with their addressees. As seen in the lectures, they addressed their students with affectionate words, such as 'my dear students' and 'dear students', among

others. Men, however, focused on maintaining their superior status, even while communicating with their students. They mostly tended to impose their own views on others. It becomes clear through this evaluation that the politeness factor is lower in men as compared to women. Women seemingly considered the satisfaction of their listeners, thus allowing them to speak without imposing their opinions on their audience. They also built the pace and determined the direction of their lectures with the consent of and in collaboration with their listeners. In complete contrast, it was observed that male lecturers disregarded the presence of any audience, in terms of inclusiveness.

Discussion and Findings

In light of the above discussion, this study attempts to answer the following questions

How do male and female faculty members differ in politeness levels while delivering lectures, as suggested by Robin Lakoff?

Both men and women have different linguistic styles. They also differ in the level of politeness they portray through their speech. Women use more hedges and polite expressions than men (Preisler, [2011](#)). The current study confirms such findings through the recorded lectures.

To grab the attention of the listeners, female faculty used affectionate phrases, such as ‘my dear students’. Recordings under this study indicated more openness by students towards the female faculty regarding academic assistance as compared to the male faculty. Females tend to use more positive politeness strategies (Ramadhani, [2013](#)). Owing to specific social restrictions, they have to keep an arm’s distance from the students, while maintaining politeness with their disciples. The current study found that male faculty were more formal, whereas female teachers were friendlier. The students consequently asked more questions from the females lecturers. The recorded lectures also revealed the reluctance shown by female faculty to hold the floor, despite being in a position of authority. They preferred to go ahead with the consent of the listeners. From the above analysis, it would suffice to claim that female faculty members are most likely to follow all the three maxims of politeness proposed by **Robin Lakoff**.

What are the effects of the difference in the politeness of male and female faculty members in co-education?

It has been observed that the male students feel a little inferiority complex in co-education. They are always in fear of being left behind. Yet, it has been noticed that they can do better if they are properly encouraged and trained. Female lecturers consistently attempted to remove the distance and intimacy with their learners, to yield desirable results from all their students, irrespective of their gender. It has been observed in this research that filler words, such as ‘**you know**’, as a strategy to involve the learners in the learning process. Filler words attract the attention of the learners (listeners), creating better effectiveness in the learning process. Duvall and his colleagues confirmed this notion by suggesting a moderate use of fillers (Duvall et al, [2014](#)). Their study indicated a positive relationship between the use of filler words by the speakers and the comprehension ability of the listeners (Duvall et al, [2014](#)). On the other hand, male teachers tended to maintain communicative distance during their lectures. In co-education, this gender difference in the style of delivering lectures and the level of politeness has a negative impact on students’ learning process. It creates discrimination which ultimately results in poor outcomes. Yet, some male faculty members may deviate from the linguistic norms that the society assigns to them, as can be seen in the scenario of the lecture delivered by the **second male lecturer who** also used politeness strategies. In a nutshell, the difference in politeness levels of faculty members in co-education can create a huge difference in overall academic outcomes, with considerable adverse outcomes.

Findings

The findings support the notion that the female gender poses more politeness as compared to the male gender in their speech. However, the use of politeness principles may not always carry gender-specificity, as in the case of **Male 2, who demonstrated a similar trend (use of the aforementioned strategies) in his speech**. Although female lecturers used more positive politeness strategies than their male counterparts, neither of the two genders used negative politeness strategies in their lectures. Moreover, the recording session revealed better attentiveness paid by students towards their male lecturers. Since the students showed reluctance

in asking any question from the male faculty, they listened carefully to what they said.

Limitation

The current study is gender-based. It analyses speech on the basis of politeness maxims. Hence, it is not applicable in assessing other aspects of speech, especially those which are not gender specific.

Conclusion

Taking into account the above-stated discussion and analysis, it can be concluded that the linguistic norms society assigns to women shape their speech, causing it to develop a politer form than males. From the analysis, it can be inferred that women choose to lead the direction of the event in collaboration with their listeners. Their excessive use of hedges indicates their inner sense of social insecurity. The findings confirmed that intimacy in communication depends on the use of politeness in language, that is, a politer form of language increases the level of intimacy experienced by the interlocutors. Since, in either form, politeness pertains to the senses of the listeners, so they involve themselves both physically and mentally. Furthermore, the analysis established that female lecturers' use of politeness strategies allowed them to attract their students' attention more easily, as compared to male lecturers. It was evident that females were predisposed towards gaining consent, rather than imposing their views on the listeners. The findings also recommend the use of politeness as a useful tool of teaching or of successfully delivering input in classroom settings in the best possible way.

References

- Colley, A., & Todd, Z. (2002). Gender-linked differences in the style and content of e-mails to friends. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology*, 21(4), 380-392.
- Duvall, E., Robbins, A., Graham, T., & Divett, S. (2014). Exploring filler words and their impact. *Schwa. Language & Linguistics*, 11, 35-49.
- Holmes, J. (2013). *Women, men, and politeness*. Routledge.
- Ijem, B. U., & Agbo, I. I. (2019). Language and Gender Representation in Chinua Achebe's "Things Fall Apart". *English Language Teaching*, 12(11), 55-63.

- Jovanovic, V., & Pavlovic, V. (2014). The Use of Tag Questions with Male and Female Speakers of English and Serbian. *Jezici I Kulture U Vremenu I Prostoru*, 3, 491-504.
- Lakoff, R. (1973). Language and woman's place. *Language in Society*, 2(1), 45-79.
- Leeper, C., & Robnett, R. D. (2011). Women are more likely than men to use tentative language, aren't they? A meta-analysis testing for gender differences and moderators. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 35(1), 129-142.
- Mulac, A., Wiemann, J. M., Widenmann, S. J., & Gibson, T. W. (1988). Male/female language differences and effects in same-sex and mixed-sex dyads: The gender-linked language effect. *Communications Monographs*, 55(4), 315-335.
- Newman, M. L., Groom, C. J., Handelman, L. D., & Pennebaker, J. W. (2008). Gender differences in language use: An analysis of 14,000 text samples. *Discourse Processes*, 45(3), 211-236.
- Preisler, B. (2011). Linguistic sex roles in conversation. In *Linguistic Sex Roles in Conversation*. De Gruyter Mouton.
- Ramadhani, P. (2013). *Politeness Strategies and Gender Differences in Javanese Indirect Speech Acts* [Doctoral Dissertation]. UNIMED.
- Subon, F. (2013). Gender differences in the use of linguistic forms in the speech of men and women in the Malaysian context. *Journal of Humanities and Social Science*, 13(3), 67-79.
- Tannen, D. (1990). *You Just Don't Understand: Women and Men*. Ballantine Books.
- Udry, J. R. (1994). The nature of gender. *Demography*, 31(4), 561-573.
- Wahyuningsih, S. (2018). Men and women differences in using language: a case study of students at stain kudus. *EduLite: Journal of English Education, Literature and Culture*, 3(1), 79-90.
- Xia, X. (2013). Gender differences in using language. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 3(8), 1485-1490.

Appendix 1

List of Terms

Terms	Explanation
L1	Mother Language
L2	Second Language
Four fold	Four Times
Five fold	Five Times
Seven Fold	Seven Times
Eight fold	Eight Times
Eleven Fold	Eleven Times
Twelve fold	Twelve Times
Thirteen fold	Thirteen Times
Eighteen fold	Eighteen Times
Thirty Seven	Thirty-Seven Times
Forty Six Fold	Forty-Six Times

Appendix 02

(A) Lecture by First Female Lecturer

Dear students this session focuses on politeness and social interaction. I hope and expect that by the end of this session, you will be able to understand the connection between the concept of politeness and social interaction. Well, my dear students at the very outset of the session it would be a great idea to revisit the basic concepts of politeness. So, I hope and assume that you all would be able to know “what is politeness?”

Simply defining politeness I would say politeness is a means of encoding social distance, you know for example..ahhh... amm... I would use the... aaa... oft-repeated example if ... aaa.. person uses for another person tu, tum or aap, through that you know the relationship with the other person ... ammm... can be shown... aaa... the kind of closeness or friendliness through tu and the kind of equality through tum and... aaa... showing respect distance through the use of aap.

“You know these are the ways through we encode politeness in language, this is just one of the ways of doing that, well ... aaa... my dear students when a linguistic (stress) interaction takes place, it is not merely a linguistic interaction this, in fact, is a social interaction, and in that process

of social interaction when we communicate or interact with somebody actually we determine the positioning, you know closeness or distance”.

You know in...aaa... relation to each other, we position ourselves which happens through the...the pragmatic (use of stress) concept of politeness. There are certain...aaa... external factors that play there in that, for example, the status of the other person. You know... aaa... the language choices in terms of politeness would be different when it comes to you know speaking to somebody who is...aaa... in status in anyways higher than you that... aaa... status can be of the profession, of job, ammmm of or ammmm of any other kind of status.

(B) Lecture by Second Female Lecturer

My dear in today’s class we would be discussing about the sociolinguistics, and I think it would be a very good idea to introduce and to talk about the term sociolinguistics. I would be expecting that at the end of the session you would be able to know what it means and how does it operate in the field of language and Linguistics. Well, my dear students... aaa... What we need to...aaa... to think about is (stress) what the term sociolinguistics consists of and what are the contents or the materials or the areas of study that fall under sociolinguistics.

“I think if you simply think about the... the word itself. It is a combination of two words social and Linguistics, the first part of its---socio comes social, which pertains to the society and to the culture whereas the second Linguistics that is the study of language makes it a complete term Socio-Linguistics. Thus, enabling us to understand that this is the descriptive study of the effect of any and all of the aspects of society, including cultural norms, values, beliefs, etc.”

“It is also advisable to understand that sociolinguistics is different from sociology. Aaaa We can draw a simple difference that sociology like the sociolinguistics is also the combination of two words—socio and logy, socio stands for society and logy is derived from the word logos (study) hence it means the study of norms and values of a society, and it is also different the term sociology of language refers to the study of the effect of society on language. So, aaa... you know this a totally opposite process, sociology focuses on the effect or impact of language on society whereas, sociolinguistics is the study of effects of language on society.”

(C) Lecture by First Male Lecturer

Today we will discuss English as second language acquisition in our settings. We have shared our cultural boundaries with India, yet there is a big Linguistic Problem lies in India, and that is there is no native language in India which could be understood in all India and could be used as Lingua Franca. That is why they have to acquire English. Indians acquire English as a language for communication, whereas we people learn it for academic purposes.

Indians learn English as a language for communication. Uski reason me apkobtatahoun , how many times India is bigger than Pakistan... ammm... four to five times, char panjuna bara hai. They do not have even a single language which could be served as Lingua Franca, yani porey India me koi aik b aisi language ni jo porey India me boli aur smjhijaey. Even the Hindi language which is spoken by the majority of Indians and considered to be as the national language of India is still not spoken in all India.

Yet, iska yh matlab ni hai k unhy English language ph complete command hai, they are so bad about it. Isi waja se Braaj Kachru ne Indian English ko Indian variety “Hinglish” ka name dea, because they have their own pronunciation, laikin at the same time Pakistan k ander aik matric pass is not as proficient in English as Indians are.... ammmm.... Tu uski waja yh hai k India requires English as a language of communication, which could be understood at inter-provincial level, whereas in Pakistani settings it the case is totally different, Pakistan has its own language Urdu that could be understood in all provinces.

So, therefore, Urdu serves as the purpose of communication. And for us, Urdu is used as a second language for we have to acquire our mother tongues that vary region to region, and English has the position of the fourth language and for some people, it has the position of the fifth language. So we have 3 to 4 languages between us and English, there is so many linguistic levels that we have to come across before English. So, hamary yahan English is studied as an academic subject.

(D) Lecture by Second Male Lecturer

Today we will discuss the meaning, their theoretical underpinning, and their practical manifestation... aaa... in the beginning I will just talk about the introduction of various concepts which are related to meaning, and here

I will... I will begin with the definition of semantics and pragmatics which are primary to the understanding of the subject of our discussion.

Semantics is... aaa... roughly defined as the study of meaning through language that means the meaning we get by knowing... aaa... or understanding a language. When we say what is a cat, generally you have to listen to as a response is a kind of animal that means we ... we got language in order to mean the language and these meanings are usually available in the dictionary and you cannot ... aaa... mean differently when... when you about such things in a literal or conventional way. This is what we mean by semantic meaning.

Every language ... aaa... has a systematic communication in which semantics meanings are very important. Semantics is a part of linguistics overall body of linguistics which deals with a meaning along with pragmatic. Semantics is considered to ... aaa... with the study of the primary ... aaa... the literal meaning of words and sentences. It is usually the study of literal, de-contextualized, and grammatical meaning of the words and sentences. Semantics not only deal with the words in isolation it also deals with how a language organize and express its meaning... aaa... through its grammar also.