IMLI

MOTHER LANGUAGE

Vol.: 9 | Issue: 2 | Page 21-43

DOI: https://doi.org/10.3329/ml.v9i2.89156

Language and Gender: A Sociolinguistic Analysis of Gendered Speech Patterns in Urban Bangladesh

Md. Mahbub Rahman* Rakibul Hasan**

Aticle Info

Article history

Date of Submission
30-09-2025
Date of Acceptance
29-10-2025
Date of Publication
30-12-2025

Keywords

Sociolinguistics, Language and Gender, Bangladesh, Politeness, Discourse Analysis

Abstract

In this study, we investigate how gendered speech is produced and perceived in urban Bangladesh. To do this, we recorded 30 informal mixed-group conversations in Dhaka, which we analyzed for specific linguistic features like hedges and direct commands. We paired this discourse analysis with a perception survey of 150 Bangladeshi listeners. Our results show a tendency for women's speech to employ more politeness strategies, while men's communication was often more direct. Crucially, our survey data reveals a stark double standard: listeners judged identical direct speech as confident from a man but aggressive from a woman. However, we found these patterns are not fixed. In specific groups, particularly among university peers, these traditional norms were disrupted. This indicates that gendered language is actively negotiated within social contexts, reflecting a dynamic interplay between tradition and modernization. We conclude that everyday conversation is a primary site for understanding social change and offer practical recommendations for educators and policymakers.

* Md. Mahbub Rahman, Associate Professor (Sociology), Department of Arts and Sciences, Bangladesh Army University of Science and Technology (BAUST), Saidpur Cantonment, Corresponding Author: email: mahbub@baust.edu.bd

** Rakibul Hasan, Lecturer in Bangla, Department of Arts and Sciences, Bangladesh Army University of Science and Technology (BAUST), Saidpur Cantonment

Introduction

We often think of language as just a way to exchange facts. But in truth, it is much more than that. It is a fundamental part of how we live together. The way we talk helps us show who we are, form connections with others, and understand our place in a community. Language can uphold existing social structures, but it can also be a tool to question and change them. This is particularly evident when we examine how language interacts with gender. Studying this helps us see how everyday conversations are filled with our culture's beliefs about men and women. These ideas appear in small, everyday choices: the specific words a person picks, the rise and fall of their voice, who feels permitted to speak, and what it means when someone stays quiet. To note that communication is gendered is to acknowledge a basic, yet profound, aspect of how we relate to one another. Our research moves beyond these general observations to focus on a specific place: the rapidly changing urban environments of Bangladesh. The country has a rich linguistic heritage, with many local dialects and languages. While this research concentrates on standard Bangla spoken in cities, it acknowledges this broader, vibrant context. Understanding how men and women speak here is not only interesting-for understanding social change. Cities such as Dhaka are the epic center of this change. They are bustling places where long-standing traditions meet modern, global influences. This clash and blend of old and new is happening in real time. You can hear it in university common rooms and city cafes. A new generation, inspired by both Bangladesh's history and its digital present, is actively shaping how the language is used today. They are writing the next chapter of the nation's story through their words.

This paper, therefore, seeks to provide a finely-grained, empirically robust, and nuanced analysis of how gendered speech patterns are manifested, socially perceived, and potentially transformed within the dynamic confines of contemporary urban Bangladeshi society. It interrogates not only what differences exist but, more importantly, why they persist, how they are interpreted by listeners, and where they are being most effectively disrupted.

Identification of Research Problem

The global academic conversation on language and gender is vast and deeply established, a veritable river of thought that has shifted its course over decades. The field was fundamentally shaped by Robin Lakoff's pivotal, albeit controversial, 1975 thesis, which framed women's speech through a deficit model, characterizing it as a language of uncertainty and powerlessness. The 1990s witnessed a significant paradigm shift with Deborah Tannen's difference model, which suggested men and women essentially hail from different cultural planets, one prioritizing "report" talk (focused on information and status) and the other "rapport" talk (focused on connection and intimacy). The current dominant view in gender studies is the constructivist approach, which has been widely developed by scholars like Penelope Eckert and Sally McConnell-Ginet (2013) through their idea of "communities of practice." This perspective argues that gender is not a fixed trait that dictates how we speak. Instead, it is something that is created, recreated, and challenged through shared actions, including language, within particular social groups.

However, despite the wealth of global research on the topic, the context of Bangladesh has been largely overlooked. It is often mentioned only briefly or generalized in broader studies of South Asia. While local research has made important contributions, it has mostly focused on big-picture issues such as women's rights, economic participation, and access to education. While these topics are important, they often miss the core issue: the detailed study of how gender is expressed in everyday conversations. We have focused on broad themes but have neglected the finer details. This is the gap that this research intends to fill.

The real need is to shift focus from these broad issues to the small, everyday interactions—those fleeting moments in conversation where gender is performed. It's about the quick decisions that we make in language, the small changes in sentence structure, the tone of voice - all of which has important social meaning. These are the areas where gender identity is most visibly and actively created. This research aims to explore

the specific language features (e.g., tag questions, hesitations, commands and interruptions, and length of pauses) that signals gender in conversations in the urban parts of Bangladesh. It also looks at how listeners interpret and judge these features, and what social consequences come with following or defying these expectations. The goal is to understand how language both reflects and shapes gender views in the context of urban Bangladesh.

Objectives of the Research

Guided by the identified problem, this research is meticulously designed to achieve the following interconnected objectives:

1. To identify, describe, and quantitatively analyze key linguistic features (e.g., hedging, tag questions, interruptions, minimal responses, command forms, and honorifics) that demonstrably vary across genders in a corpus of informal mixed-group conversations recorded in urban Dhaka.
2. To analyze, through a meticulously designed perception survey, the social perceptions and evaluative judgments made by Bangladeshi listeners regarding these gendered speech patterns, mapping how specific linguistic behaviors are attributed traits like confidence, rudeness, kindness, or weakness based on the perceived gender of the speaker.
3. To interpret the empirical findings within the broader, interdisciplinary theoretical framework of language as a social practice, drawing on sociological, anthropological, and linguistic theories to discuss the profound implications these patterns hold for understanding gender relations, power dynamics, and social change in contemporary Bangladesh.

Literature Review

The academic journey into the nexus of language and gender is itself a story of intellectual evolution and paradigm shifts, reflecting broader transformations in feminist and sociological thought. Of course. Here is a rewritten version of the text, using simpler language and a more direct, researcher-focused tone.

The study of language and identity has evolved from a simplistic view to a more nuanced understanding, acknowledging how our identities are influenced by social contexts. This shift in perspective is often traced back to the "deficit model." Robin Lakoff, in her groundbreaking 1975 book Language and Woman's Place, was the first to introduce this concept.

She suggested that women's speech was marked by patterns that conveyed a lack of confidence and a need to be polite. These included frequent qualifiers ("sort of," "I think"), descriptive but less factual adjectives ("charming," "sweet"), turning statements into questions ("That was fun, wasn't it?"), and an overly strict use of grammar. Lakoff did not present these as neutral differences. Instead, she argued they were weaknesses, a sign of women's lower status in society. While this was a pivotal idea at the time, later scholars heavily criticized it. They noted that it was based mostly on personal observation rather than solid data, ignored the specific situations in which people speak, and treated all women as a single group without any variation or ability to push back.

This criticism led to the development of the "dominance model." Researchers like Zimmerman and West (1975) refocused the discussion on power dynamics. Their famous study on conversations showed a clear trend: men interrupted women much more often, steered the topics of discussion, and used silence to control the interaction. From this perspective, language was not just a mirror reflecting a male-dominated society; it was the actual tool used to create and maintain that dominance. This approach was crucial for highlighting the political nature of everyday talk. However, some argued it was too rigid, as it could overlook the ways women actively resist or challenge this power imbalance.

Looking for a middle path, the "difference model" became popular, largely due to Deborah Tannen's 1990 book, *You Just Don't Understand*. Tannen proposed that boys and girls learn to communicate in different social worlds, developing distinct styles. She

described men's communication as "report talk," focused on sharing information and establishing their position, while women's was "rapport talk," aimed at building and sustaining relationships. This framework was very accessible and resonated with many people. Yet, it also drew criticism for possibly minimizing the power differences central to the dominance model. Critics worried it could mistakenly reduce gender inequality to nothing more than a misunderstanding between two equally valid communication styles. The contemporary, and now dominant, paradigm is the constructivist or social practice model, most powerfully articulated by Penelope Eckert and Sally McConnell-Ginet in their extensive work, including the 2013 edition of Language and Gender. They posit that gender is not a pre-defined, static category that determines language use. Instead, gender is continually and actively produced, reproduced, and challenged through shared practices—including language—within specific "communities of practice" (CofPs), such as a friend group, a workplace team, or a classroom. The meaning of a linguistic feature is not fixed; a tag question can be a marker of insecurity in one context but a facilitative, inclusive device in another. The focus shifts decisively from cataloging differences between men and women to understanding how individuals use linguistic resources to "do" gender in locally specific ways, in concert with other aspects of their identity like class, ethnicity, and age. This framework, with its emphasis on fluidity, agency, and context, is exceptionally well-suited for analyzing a rapidly changing society like urban Bangladesh.

Within the specific context of Bangladesh, scholarly work is growing but remains nascent. Important research by scholars like Sultana (2014, 2015) has extensively explored broader linguistic ideologies and the complex role of English in relation to power and identity. Hossain (2018) and others have examined the critical macro-level links between gender, education, and social transformation. However, a dedicated, micro-level sociolinguistic analysis of natural conversational data, applying the communities of practice framework specifically to gendered talk, remains a salient and significant gap in the literature. This research aims to fill that void, situating the rich,

complex reality of Bangladeshi speech within these global theoretical conversations.

This theoretical evolution is supported and expanded by advanced sociolinguistic texts which provide the larger methodological and epistemological foundations used in this study. Foundational works such as Meyerhoff (2011), Wardhaugh & Fuller (2015) and the reader by Coupland & Jaworski (2009) provide as good as a framework for us to analyze language as social practice, hence reinforcing the principles of the communities of practice model applied herein.

Research Rationale

We pursued this research for two main reasons, one academic and one deeply social.

First, while extensive global theories on language and gender exist, we noticed a significant lack of concrete data from Bangladesh. Much of the local research focuses on broader themes, such as access to education, but often overlooks the nuanced details of everyday conversation. We felt this was a critical gap, leaving our understanding of how gender is performed in Bangladesh incomplete. Our aim was to test the applicability of the "communities of practice" framework within Dhaka's dynamic urban environment, hoping to contribute a vital, ground-level perspective from the Global South to the field.

Second, and more importantly, we believe this work extends beyond academia. We've all seen how language reinforces social inequality - who gets interrupted, etc. Who feels that they need to be polite? These subtle interactions form invisible barriers. Our goal was to document these dynamics in real life to provide clear evidence of how such barriers are built and maintained. Ultimately, we want to translate our findings into practical steps for schools, media, and workplaces to help make everyday communication fairer and support Bangladesh's broader goals for development and equality. Taken together, the findings outline a linguistic plan for change that aligns with Bangladesh's development agenda and international

commitments, including UN Sustainable Development Goal 5. The aim is straightforward: provide concrete, data-driven steps to make everyday communication more equal.

Research Questions

To guide this inquiry with precision, the study is structured around three central research questions, each designed to probe a different, deeper layer of the complex relationship between language and gender:

1. The "What" (Descriptive-Analytical): What are the quantitatively observable differences in the use of specific linguistic features (e.g., frequency of hedges, tag questions, imperative forms, interruptions, turn-length) between male and female speakers in recorded naturalistic conversations within urban Bangladeshi communities of practice?
2. The "So What" (Perceptual-Evaluative): How do Bangladeshi listeners perceive and evaluate these gendered speech patterns? What social attributes (e.g., confidence, rudeness, kindness, weakness) are assigned to speakers based on their use of specific linguistic features and their perceived gender?
3. The "What Now" (Contextual-Transformative): How do mediating variables, such as education level, professional environment, and membership in specific communities of practice, influence or disrupt these observed gendered linguistic patterns? Where are the boundaries of traditional norms being tested and renegotiated?

Theoretical Framework

To navigate this complex inquiry, a multi-faceted theoretical lens is essential. The analysis is not conducted in a vacuum but is firmly grounded in two interconnected theoretical traditions that provide the necessary depth and analytical power.

This research is grounded in the constructivist view of gender. It draws heavily on the influential idea of "communities of practice," developed by Penelope Eckert and Sally McConnell-Ginet. This concept moves away from rigid, deterministic frameworks.

A community of practice is simply a group of people who come together around a shared interest or goal—a circle of friends, a workplace, or a club. Through their ongoing interactions, the group naturally develops its own shared ways of doing things, including unique ways of speaking and behaving.

This framework changes the central research question entirely. From this perspective, gender is not a fixed biological characteristic which determines how someone speaks. Instead it is an ongoing project - something that is actively being created through the interactions of people within these different social groups. The meaning of a word or a way of talking is not set in stone, it is worked out in the moment, within a specific context.

For example, frequent use of strong language might successfully build a "tough" masculine identity in one setting, like a workshop, but would be highly out of place and discouraged in another, like a preschool.

Therefore, the focus shifts. Rather than comparing a hypothetical "male speech" to "female speech," researchers focus on how people use language as a tool to express gender in ways that are meaningful within their specific community. In this approach, differences and exceptions in language use are not seen as issues to resolve, but as valuable insights. These variations highlight the ways in which individuals actively shape their identities. To better understand the subtle strategies people use in interactions, especially regarding authority and respect, the study also draws on Politeness Theory (Brown & Levinson, 1987).

This theory operates on a universal human premise: individuals have a fundamental desire to be liked and approved of (positive face) and to be unimpeded in their actions (negative face). Certain speech acts, a command, a criticism, a request, for example, inherently threaten these desires; they are called Face Threatening Acts (FTAs). Politeness, then, comprises the array of linguistic strategies we deploy to soften these threats. This arsenal ranges from blunt, bald-on-record

commands ("Do this.") which pay no heed to face wants, to negative politeness strategies that acknowledge imposition ("If you wouldn't mind..."), to off-record hints that avoid direct responsibility ("It's quite dark in here").

Fusing these two lenses creates a powerful analytical tool. Politeness is no longer seen as a fixed, inherently feminine trait. It is reconceptualized as a strategic communicative resource, deployed differently across different social landscapes and CofPs. The investigation becomes: How do men and women in various Bangladeshi CofPs strategically wield (im)politeness to navigate social threats and construct their identities? Is there a deeply ingrained expectation that women should heavily mitigate their FTAs, thus performing a deferential identity? Do men feel a social license to use bald-on-record commands, reinforcing a classic masculinity? And, most crucially, where are these tacit "rules" being bent, broken, or rewritten? This combined theoretical approach allows for a richly layered, context-sensitive analysis that is grounded in universal pragmatic principles while being exquisitely attentive to local cultural specificities.

Research Methodology

A comprehensive, sequential explanatory mixed-methods design was employed for this study. This approach strategically leverages the complementary strengths of qualitative and quantitative paradigms to provide a holistic, triangulated, and deeply nuanced understanding of the research problem. The qualitative component prioritizes depth, context, and the richness of lived interaction through detailed discourse analysis. The quantitative component provides breadth, generalizability, and statistical validation through systematic frequency counts and perceptual surveys.

Design

The study utilized a sequential explanatory design. Phase 1 involved the collection and primary analysis of naturalistic conversational data.

The emergent insights from this qualitative phase directly informed the design of the stimuli and the specific questions deployed in Phase 2, the quantitative perception survey. The results from both phases were then integrated during the final interpretation and discussion stage to provide a complete and coherent picture.

Data Collection

Phase 1: Naturalistic Data Collection

Setting & Participants: Audio recordings were collected from 30 separate informal mixed-gender group conversations (approximately 20-30 minutes each) across a diverse range of settings in Dhaka to capture a variety of Communities of Practice. Settings included university common rooms (10 conversations), public coffee shops (10 conversations), and workplace break rooms (10 conversations). A total of 120 participants (60 male, 60 female) were recruited through purposive sampling, aged between 20-35 years, representing a mix of undergraduate students, graduate students, and young professionals. Participation was entirely voluntary, based on informed written consent, and confidentiality was rigorously guaranteed through full anonymization of all recordings and transcripts.

Procedure: Researchers utilized high-quality, discreet audio recording equipment. To initiate organic conversation, groups were presented with a neutral, context-relevant discussion-starting prompt (e.g., "Discuss a recent film or series you enjoyed and why" for social settings; "Discuss a recent challenge or success in a project" for work settings). After providing the prompt, researchers minimized their involvement to avoid influencing the natural flow of interaction.

Phase 2: Perception Survey

Participants: A separate cohort of 150 Bangladeshi listeners (75 male, 75 females, aged 20-40) was recruited to participate in the survey to avoid any bias from the recording groups.

Stimuli Development: Based on the analysis of Phase 1 data, four key audio clips were developed in a professional recording studio

using trained voice actors (2 male, 2 female). Each actor recorded two versions of the same core directive statement:

1. A hedged/polite version: “I was thinking, maybe if it’s not too much trouble, we could possibly consider starting the meeting a bit earlier?”
2. A direct/bald-on-record version: “We need to start the meeting earlier.”

Survey Procedure: Using an online survey platform, participants were randomly assigned to listen to two of the eight possible clips (to prevent listener fatigue) and were blind to the gender of the voice actor until the moment of playback. After each clip, they rated the speaker on a 7-point Likert scale across ten bipolar traits: confident/not confident, competent/incompetent, polite/rude, aggressive/passive, weak/strong, kind/unkind, assertive/unassertive, leadership/no leadership, friendly/unfriendly, and effective/ineffective. Subsequently, they answered open-ended questions probing their impressions of the speaker's personality and likely social role.

Data Analysis

The data analysis was performed in a sequential, integrated way to ensure strong triangulation of qualitative and quantitative data findings.

Qualitative Discourse Analysis: The audio data (approximately 30 hours) were written out in transcription using a detailed transcription system that included notations of pauses, overlaps, laughter, emphasis and intonation contours. The resulting transcripts were then put through a two-cycle coding process using a scheme derived from the theoretical framework.

In the first cycle we used the Descriptive Coding to identify the occurrences of certain linguistic features. Codes included: Hedges (e.g., mone hoy “I think”; aastey “maybe”), tag questions, intensifiers, direct imperative (e.g., “Koro” “Do it”) and indirect/polite requests (e.g., “Korte parben?”

- “Would you like to try?”, Interruptions (successful and unsuccessful), Supportive Minimal Responses (“hmm”, “uhuh”), Sec. Turn-length.

In the second cycle we used Pattern Coding in which we grouped these descriptive codes into broader and more meaningful themes, for instance “Mitigation Strategies,” “Assertiveness Markers,” “Conversational Support,” and “Floor Holding.” This enabled us to go beyond simply frequency counts to learn about the functional use of these features in context - for example, a tag question employed to seek validation or a tag question employed to help form group agreement - which would respectively lead to different meanings.

Quantitative Analysis: In order to statistically confirm the patterns identified through the qualitative methods, the frequency of every coded linguistic feature was determined on a per-minute of speech basis for each individual speaker (n=120). This normalization made possible fair comparison between speakers with different values of total talk time. The data was then imported to statistical software (SPSS v.28). Comparisons between frequencies of each linguistic feature in male and female speakers were conducted using independent samples t-tests, and the results were compared for the whole data set. Furthermore, a one-way ANOVA was performed in order to study the impact of the setting (University, Cafe, Workplace) upon these linguistic patterns. The level of statistical significance was considered $p < 0.05$.

Perception Survey Analysis: The survey data of the 150 participants was quantitatively and qualitatively analyzed. Numeric ratings on the 7-point Likert scales were analyzed to generate mean scores and SD for each voice/trait combination. Cross-tabulations using the chi-square tests were performed to determine significant perceptual differences that was determined by the listener’s gender and the perceived gender of the voice in the clip. The open-ended responses were analyzed with the help of thematic analysis to identify recurring evaluative comments (e.g., “She sounds too pushy”, “He sounds like a leader”).

Triangulation of Quantitative and Qualitative Data:

The key strength of this mixed method approach was the seek to triangulation of findings from different data streams on purpose. The process could be seen in the table below:

Phase	Data Type	Finding (Example)	How it Triangulates
Phase 1 (Recording)	**Qualitative:** Discourse analysis of conversations.	Observed that women in cafes often used rising intonation on statements.	**Identified the phenomenon in natural speech.**
	Quantitative: T-test on frequency of hedges.	Found a statistically significant higher use of hedges by women (4.2/min vs. 2.7/min, $p<.001$).	**Provided statistical validation and scale for the qualitative observation.**
Phase 2 (Survey)	**Quantitative:** Listener ratings of direct speech.	The direct command was rated "confident" for male voice (Mean=6.1) but "aggressive" for female voice (Mean=5.2).	**Explained the *social consequence* of the pattern found in Phase 1, showing why it persists.**
	Qualitative: Thematic analysis of open-ended survey responses.	Listeners described the direct female voice as "rude" and "unfeminine."	**Added depth and context to the quantitative ratings, revealing the underlying bias.**
Integrated Finding		**The double standard is confirmed:** Women use more hedges (Quant Phase 1) *because* when they don't, they are socially penalized (Quant/Qual Phase 2). The qualitative data from both phases explains the 'why' behind the numbers.	

This triangulation takes one from observation (what people do), to validation (how often they do it), to interpretation (how it is perceived and why it matters) producing an effective chain of evidence.

Discussion

This study's findings reveal a linguistic environment that is clearly and actively changing. Urban Bangladesh is not a single, uniform entity but a complex social space where long-standing traditions continuously interact with, and are pressured by, new, modern influences. The data shows that traditional ways of speaking remain strong. However, the more significant finding is that it identifies the specific areas where these old patterns are beginning to break down and be actively redefined.

At a very basic level, the numerical data is a story that will be recognizable to researchers in this field. Overall, women used hedging devices - words or phrases that soften a statement, e.g. "aastey" (maybe) or "mone hoy" (I think) - 35-40% more often than men. This was frequently paired with a specific speech pattern: a rising pitch at the end of a sentence that should be a statement. This had the effect of turning a definite "We start at five" into a more questioning "We start at five?", as if seeking confirmation. This pattern acts as a verbal request for agreement, a subtle sound cue that aligns with established social norms encouraging feminine modesty and politeness. Male speech, by contrast, often exhibited a different texture. It was frequently more direct, less adorned, characterized by bald-on-record imperatives like "Koro" (Do it) or assertive declarations like "Shuru kori" (Let's start). This performative divide was most visibly enacted in social settings like cafes, which often function as theaters for the conscious (and subconscious) performance of well-rehearsed gender roles.

However, the true revelation, the key to understanding the why behind these patterns, emerged from the perception survey data. Here, the power of gendered expectation was laid bare. The exact same utterance, the directive "We need to start earlier," was transformed into two entirely different social acts based solely on the perceived gender of the speaker. When attributed to a male voice, it was consistently evaluated as confident, decisive, and indicative of leadership qualities. When produced by a female voice, those

identical words were frequently perceived as abrupt, aggressive, and frankly, rude. Conversely, the hyper-polite, heavily hedged request ("Maybe if it's not too much trouble...") from a woman was rated as nice and polite, but also, devastatingly, as less authoritative and weak. The societal double bind is thus rendered with painful clarity: women are penalized for directness and for indirectness alike. This perceptual bias is not a passive observation; it functions as a powerful, invisible normative police force, vigilantly guarding the borders of "appropriate" gendered speech and fiercely discouraging any meaningful deviation.

However, it would be a serious mistake to assume these patterns are universal. The most important finding within the data is not the overall trend, but the significant and meaningful variation that exists. This is where the concept of "communities of practice" proves to be absolutely essential.

To understand this, consider the data gathered from university common rooms, especially among highly competitive students in fields like Computer Science and Economics. In these settings, the traditional rules of conversation appeared to break down. For these groups, a shared identity—that of being a sharp, competitive student—seemed to override traditional gender roles.

Within these specific social groups, the female participants were not just participating equally; they were frequently leading the discussions. They spoke for longer periods, guided the topics of conversation, and used a direct, unambiguous speaking style with very few softening words. They managed to speak in this way without facing social consequences from their peers. Their recognized expertise and strong position within the group allowed them a freedom in speech that they might not have had in more traditional settings, such as family gatherings. This is not just an exception; it provides important evidence. It shows that how we express gender through language is not biologically fixed, but is influenced by the social context and can change depending on shared goals and a common identity.

Even in the more formal data from workplaces, an interesting middle ground emerged. While traditional expectations were still somewhat present, women in leadership roles had developed a more nuanced, mixed style. They used direct, task-focused language when managing projects and deadlines, but could easily switch to a more polite and warm style when supporting their teams and boosting morale. This does not simply reject old norms.

It is a more complex and strategic adaptation: a careful, flexible approach to managing conflicting social expectations. These women are not just talking; they are making conscious choices about how to communicate in different situations, demonstrating a high level of skill and control over their language.

Results and Findings

The quantitative analysis of the conversational corpus revealed statistically significant differences in the use of key linguistic features. The mean frequency of occurrence per minute of speech is summarized in Table 1.

Table 1: Mean Frequency of Linguistic Features per Minute of Speech by Gender

Linguistic Feature	Female Speakers (n=60)	Male Speakers (n=60)	p-value
Hedges (e.g., mone hoy, aastey)	4.2 (SD = 1.1)	2.7 (SD = 0.9)	$p < .001$
Tag Questions	1.5 (SD = 0.6)	0.8 (SD = 0.5)	$p < .01$
Imperative Structures	1.0 (SD = 0.4)	2.3 (SD = 0.7)	$p < .001$
Supportive Minimal Responses	5.8 (SD = 1.3)	4.1 (SD = 1.0)	$p < .05$
Average Turn Length (words)	18.5 (SD = 5.2)	22.4 (SD = 6.1)	$p < .05$

Note: SD = Standard Deviation. p-values derived from independent samples t-tests.

Based on the integrated and triangulated analysis of the naturalistic conversational corpus and the perception survey, the study yields three central, interconnected findings:

Finding 1: The analysis reveals a statistically significant, probabilistic correlation between gender and the deployment of specific linguistic strategies within informal urban Bangladeshi speech. The data does show a substantial tendency for women to use a higher frequency of mitigating devices - e.g., hedges, polite modifiers, and rising intonations in declaratives - a tendency consistent with the performance of traditionally prescribed feminine norms of modesty and deference. Conversely, male speech demonstrates a pronounced propensity for direct, assertive speech acts, including unmitigated imperatives, which reinforces societal expectations of masculine assertiveness and decisiveness. Crucially, these patterns are not deterministic but represent strong probabilistic trends, a nuance that underscores the performative and socially conditioned nature of gendered communication rather than any essentialist difference.

Finding 2: A second core finding elucidates the powerful role of perceptual bias in sustaining and reinforcing these linguistic patterns Listeners' evaluations of the same speech acts were found to be shaped by strong gender expectations.

Our data reveals a clear double standard in how people judge identical ways of speaking. When a man used direct, assertive language, listeners consistently saw him as confident and a strong leader. However, when a woman used the same words, she was often viewed as abrupt, aggressive, or rude.

On the other hand, when a woman used more cautious and polite language, listeners tended to see her as kind, but also less authoritative and competent.

This creates an unfair and challenging situation for women, who are criticized for either being too direct or not direct enough. These judgments form a powerful cycle, where societal expectations shape how we perceive speech, and in turn, individuals feel pressured to meet those expectations.

This cycle reinforces the existing norms and discourages people from communicating in different ways.

A key finding is that a person's education level, and more importantly, their membership in specific social or professional groups, significantly changes these patterns. In groups where a shared professional or academic identity (like "software engineer" or "research scientist") becomes more important than gender, the usual rules are relaxed.

In these specific contexts, women can use a direct speaking style without being automatically penalized for it. Similarly, men can use more supportive and collaborative language without losing status. These groups are not just unusual exceptions. They are important examples that show how social language rules can change. They prove that people can, in certain conditions, overcome the constraints of stereotypical expectations.

Recommendations

Based on what we found, we propose following steps:

1. **Integrate Critical Language Awareness into the National Curriculum**

❖ *Action for NCTB:* National Curriculum and Textbook Board (NCTB) should devise modules for the secondary and higher secondary levels in the Bangla and Social Studies classes. These modules should move better beyond traditional grammar to include:

Analysis of Media: Students may be asked to analyze the dialogues from popular TV dramas or speeches of public figures critically with the aim of identifying patterns of gendered language and stereotypes.

Role-Playing and Reflection: Organized activities in which the students practice giving the same message (for example, a directive) in varying linguistic styles (direct, hedged, collaborative) and reflect on the perceptions that these various styles create.

Discussion of Research: Present simplified concepts from research such as this one in order to help students learn the connection between language, power, and social judgment.

❖ *Teacher Training:* The government and donor agencies should provide financial support for professional development workshops for teachers. These workshops would provide them with the skills to support these sensitive discussions, and also model the inclusion of communication in their own classrooms.

2. Encourage Diverse Models of Language in the Media and Public Discourse

❖ *Content Creator Guidelines:* Create and share a guide for good practice for script writers, journalists and advertisers. This guide would encourage:

Portraying Women in Authority: Consciously writing female leaders, professionals and characters in assertive, direct language and without the "shrill" or "aggressive" framing for the character.

Showcasing Collaborative Masculinity: Showcasing male characters that are actively using supplicative minimal responses, cooperative talk, and delegating authority without having their competence questioned.

❖ *Public Service Campaigns:* Public service campaigns such as the Ministry of Women and Children Affairs can tie up with media houses for short features or talk shows explicitly discussing the facts of this research, making the public aware of unconscious linguistic bias.

3. Implement Bias-Focused Communication in Workplaces

❖ *Shift from "Fix the Woman" to "Fix the System":* Corporate training programs need to be redesigned. As opposed to coaching women to "speak more confidently," the key should be to train all the employees, particularly the managers and team leaders to acknowledge and limit their own perceptual biases.

❖ *Structured Training Modules*

Bias Awareness Workshop: Start with sessions based on the survey findings from this study that make the double standard real. Use anonymous polling to let employee's self-reflect on their own judgments.

Calibrated Feedback Mechanisms: Establish therapeutic performance feedback structures which aim to elicit evaluation from evaluators who give evidence-based comments about communication, rather than labeling people "aggressive" or various shades of "not assertive enough."

Further Academic Research: Future research should adopt longitudinal designs to track these sociolinguistic changes within specific cohorts over time, providing insights into the pace and direction of change. Studies should also expand beyond the current urban, Bangla-speaking focus to include rural communities and the many indigenous linguistic groups of Bangladesh (e.g., Chakma, Santali, Garo) to understand how these dynamics play out across the nation's rich and diverse linguistic tapestry, ensuring an inclusive and comprehensive understanding of the country's gendered linguistic landscape.

Conclusion

This study has demonstrated that gendered speech patterns in urban Bangladesh are a tangible, significant, and complex social reality, intricately woven into the very fabric of daily interaction. The way we speak is never just about style. It is deeply connected to how we reflect, reinforce, and sometimes resist the unwritten rules and power imbalances in our society. There is a powerful, often unseen, pressure to communicate in expected ways. This pressure doesn't just affect the speaker - guiding their choice of words and sentence structure - it perhaps even more powerfully affects the listener. It helps define the filter through which we hear someone and how we go about judging that person.

Our findings clearly show this creates a powerful double standard for women. They face systematic criticism for their way of speaking,

whether they choose to be direct or polite. This works as a very efficient form of social control. It upholds existing hierarchies not through official rules, but through the quiet, self-policing fear of social disapproval.

However, our research also found strong, convincing evidence of change and resistance. The differences and exceptions we noticed in certain social groups are not random; they are essential for understanding how language evolves. They demonstrate that using language to express gender is not a fixed biological process, but a flexible, ongoing one that is shaped by context. People, especially younger, educated city-dwellers who balance tradition and modernity, actively participate in this process. They skillfully manage and sometimes reshape the language they use to meet their needs.

Attributing to this tension, the constant impact of the social structures and the possibility of individual choice, is highly important to the development of a more equitable linguistic environment. It is not aimed at destroying all the distinctions in the way people talk, which would be impossible and unfriendly to culture. Rather we ought to strive to enhance our cognition of what is legitimate and authoritative. We should aim for a society where the key measure of communication is not whether people conform to gendered expectations, but whether the conversation is effective, clear, and successful for everyone involved.

Ultimately, the data presents a clear picture: the speech patterns of urban Bangladesh are not fixed. They are alive, debated, and evolving right now. This study has aimed to carefully observe these subtle changes. The conversation it documents is deeply significant. Its meaning goes beyond specific words or grammar; it reflects the broader processes of social change. It signals an ongoing and complex struggle over identity, power, and everyone's fundamental right to be heard for exactly who they are.

References

Brown, P., & Levinson, S. C. (1987). *Politeness: Some universals in Language Usage.* Cambridge University Press.

Coupland, N., & Jaworski, A. (Eds.). (2009). *The New Sociolinguistics Reader.* Palgrave Macmillan.

Eckert, P., & McConnell-Ginet, S. (2013). *Language and Gender* (2nd ed.). Cambridge University Press.

Hossain, M. A. (2018). *Gender, Education, and Social Transformation in Bangladesh.* Bangladesh Education Press.

Lakoff, R. (1975). *Language and Woman's Place*. Harper & Row.

Meyerhoff, M. (2011). *Introducing Sociolinguistics* (2nd ed.). Routledge.

Sultana, S. (2014). English as a medium of instruction in Bangladesh's higher education: Empowering or disadvantaging students? *Multilingual Education,* 4(1), 1–18. https://doi.org/10.1186/s13616-014-0018-x

Sultana, S. (2015). Transglossic Language Practices: Young Adults Transgressing Language and Identity in Bangladesh. *Translation and Translanguaging in Multilingual Contexts,* 1(2), 202–232. https://doi.org/10.1075/ttmc.1.2.04sul

Tannen, D. (1990). *You just don't Understand: Women and Men in Conversation.* William Morrow.

Wardhaugh, R., & Fuller, J. M. (2015). An Introduction to Sociolinguistics (7th ed.). Wiley-Blackwell.

Zimmerman, D. H., & West, C. (1975). Sex roles, Interruptions and Silences in Conversation. In B. Thorne & N. Henley (Eds.), *Language and Sex: Difference and Dominance* (pp. 105–129). Newbury House.