



MOTHER LANGUAGE

Vol.: 10 | Issue: 1 | Page 169-185

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.3329/ml.v10i1.91877>



Gendered Language of Bangladeshi Law and its Effect on Women's Rights: A Structural Inequality Approach

Md Towhidul Islam Jihadi*

Article Info	Abstract
<i>Article History</i> Date of Submission 15-02-2026 Date of Acceptance 06-05-2026 Date of Publication 15-06-2026	Language is not an indifferent tool of law; it creates the sense of law, behaviours within an institution and social relationships of power. In Bangladesh, even after constitutional provisions of equality and the international obligations towards rights of women, the statutory language is gendered on overwhelming basis. This paper provides a discussion with regards to the operation of the gendered terms in Bangladeshi laws to reinforce structural inequality against women such as the use of male pronouns (he). The study employs the doctrinal legal analysis and critical feminist legal theory to examine the selected statutes. The argument presented in the paper is that gendered language of the law does not simply exist symbolically but has material effects. The paper ends by providing recommendations of the gender-neutral legislative action as one of the steps that were required to realize the constitutional and international requirements of Bangladesh.
<i>Keywords</i> Gendered language, Structural inequality, Gender-neutral, Symbolic exclusion	

Introduction

The strength of law is founded to a large extent on language. (N., 2025). Laws, constitutions and judicial rulings not only provide rules of conduct: they shape social facts of visibility, empowerment and

* Md Towhidul Islam Jihadi, Lecturer, Department of Law, BGC Trust University Bangladesh; email: towhid.law83@gmail.com

periphery in the law (Ren, 2024). The long-standing argument by feminist legal theorists is that legal language replicates and reenacts patriarchal structures by making male experiences normal and making women legally peripheral or non-existent (Finley, 1989).

In Bangladesh, women rights are guaranteed by the constitution, Articles 27 and 28 of the Constitution provide equality before the law and forbids any discrimination based on sex. Besides, Bangladesh is a State Party to the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women (CEDAW). Nevertheless, even with such promises, Bangladeshi laws are still mostly gender-exclusive and use masculine pronouns, occupational titles based on men and patriarchal assumptions in their family structures (Hasan, 2023).

The paper explores the connection between the gendered language of the law and the rights of women in Bangladesh. the paper demonstrates that linguistic bias in the law promotes the perpetuation of substantive gender inequality through the formation of the interpretation of the law, institutional form and social norms.

Research Problem

The current paper questions the long-standing gendered language that is institutionalized in Bangladeshi laws and negatively affects the constitutional provisions of equality, especially Articles 27 and 28, and fails to comply with the requirements set by CEDAW. Despite these formal assurances, the statutory terms still use masculine pronouns, male-focused titles, and still assume the patriarchal attitudes, and these manifestations are highly vivid in family and administrative law sectors. In turn, such a linguistic system, has a formative impact on legal interpretation, bureaucracy, and institutional culture, and places men in the position of the default legal actors as they marginalize women. This relationship creates a gap between the formal and substantive equality in which the rights of women are entrenched in the legal text but are limited in application.

Objectives of the Research

- The Objectives of the study are:
- To analyse the application of gendered language in chosen laws in Bangladesh and how it creates male-default legal subjectivity.
- To examine how such gendered linguistic practices reproduce structural inequality and shape judicial interpretation, administrative practices and women access to justice.

To suggest gender-neutral legislative writing reforms in the sight of constitutional guarantees of equality and international human rights principles.

Literature Review

In feminist law studies, the intersection of language and law has been a subject of much discussion, with conditions that legal language is not a neutral medium but a generator of patriarchal relationships of power. Scholars (Catherine MacKinnon 1989 and Patricia Ewick and Susan Silbey 1998) argue that legal documents reinstate the norms of men and marginalize women and other non-dominant groups. MacKinnon also states that the default meaning of normativity given to men in the law makes women marginal or secondary and thus limits their legal agency and institutional visibility.

In the global community, the Committee on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women, CEDAW, has recognized the crucial aspect that language has had in sustaining inequality. General Recommendation 25 (2004) and 28 (2010) underlines that statutory language, which is gendered that is, the use of masculine pronouns, male oriented titles, and patriarchal assumptions, is structural discrimination despite the appearance of the legislation being neutral.

Comparative studies show that nations like Canada, New Zealand, and Uruguay have incorporated gender-neutral drafting conventions, which mean the replacement of the masculine terms by the neutral ones, the plural constructions, or the inclusive occupational terms, which contributes to the attainment of the substantive legal equality

both in legislations and practice (Justice Canada, 2015; Parliamentary Counsel Office, 2019).

The literature available on gendered legal language is limited in Bangladesh. Rahman (2017) and reports of the Bangladesh National Women Lawyers Association (BNWLA) (2009-2020) testify to the fact that laws like the Guardians and Wards Act, 1890, and the existing administrative regulations favour male defaults not only in the guardianship provisions but also in the appointment of the position of a public officer. Despite constitutional protection under Articles 27 and 28, along with the nation being a signatory of Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women (CEDAW), which supposedly provides equality, gendered linguistic formations still exist and thus affect the bureaucratic practice, and institutional cultures. The empirical research also shows that court actions, such as the institutionalization of mothers as the sole legal parents, can mitigate some of the effects of language bias but they are usually an ad hoc approach and do not represent a systematic change.

So, there is a gap in the Bangladesh literature regarding linguistic discrimination in law. This gap supports the necessity to possess a methodical examination of the role of language bias in reproducing structural inequality and restricting the legal subjectivity of females.

Research Question

How does gendered language in the legal system of Bangladesh reinforce inequity in the system and limit the legal subjectivity of women?

Theoretical Framework

Feminist jurisprudence clutches that the law is not a gender-neutral phenomenon, but it has been historically shaped with reference to male experience and views. Scholars argue that legal language is a way of naturalizing male domination by making the masculine norms appear to be general and objective (Catherine MacKinnon 1989 and Patricia Ewick and Susan Silbey 1998). Gendered language in legal

discourse is, therefore, not the accident but the manifestation of power correlation.

The extensive usage of masculine language creates men as the legal nominal subjects, and women as exceptions or dependents. This symbolic exclusion has real consequences, which constitute judicial thought, the action of administration, and the general attitude toward the legal position of women.

Research Methodology

This paper follows a qualitative doctrinal legal research methodology, which focuses on textual and interpretive research of statutory provisions in Bangladesh. This study is based on the feminist legal theory and critical discourse analysis, which conceptualizes the idea of law as a place where language reflects and reproduces power and inequality structures. The analysis in terms of wording, structure, and linguistic patterns of the statutory provisions is used to identify the gendered expressions. There are over a thousand laws in Bangladesh, the present study uses a purposive sampling approach. Almost 25 statutes are selected by the degree of practicality, frequency of application, and the proportion to the relations between genders. Since the study is purely doctrinal and textual, there are no empirical studies or data collection which involves human subjects.

Discussion and Analysis

Gender based Language in Bangladeshi Laws

A common characteristic of the Bangladeshi law is the masculine pronouns are used to refer to legal objects, government authorities, and legal beneficiaries; these include: he, him, and his (Fatima, Arslan, & Latif, 2025). Although this is often explained under the pretext of generic use, the study of feminist linguistics dismisses the fact that words of masculine origin are neutral (Storme & Storme, 2025). It is a subtle but effective way through which the judicial interpretation and administrative practice are framed in Favor of linguistic influence, especially in male dominated institutions.

Such as section 101 of Evidence Act, 1872 “Whoever desires any Court to give judgment as to any legal right or liability dependent on the existence of facts which he asserts, must prove that those facts exist”. The fact that the use of the word he to describe any person who claims a legal right, represents the traditional assumption that the legal subject matter is male, which symbolically constructs men as default participants in the legal processes. In a similar vein, the Code of Civil Procedure, 1908 uses masculine pronouns in procedural contexts, especially in Order VI (Pleadings), assumes the party as “he”. Gendered conventions of drafting can also be found in the Penal Code, 1860. Section 21, which defines the term public servant, is phrased in a male-oriented way. Whilst many of the provisions describe the offenders in terms such as “he commits an offence”, thus by way of these provisions, criminal responsibility is placed in a male paradigm. Even when women are the subject of the law, this sort of vocabulary makes the male the usual subject of criminal law.

Besides, gendered occupational title Such as the chairman, the policeman, and the workman are used in a number of statutes and regulations, thus implicitly relating the role of the authority and service to the population to male characters. Despite the actual practice of women holding such positions, the language of the statute still reinforces masculinized way of holding power, further enhancing a gendered idea of leadership (Archer & Kam, 2022). This symbolic ostracism is also counterproductive; it is an obstacle to female involvement in the life of the population and justifies the dominance of men in the system of government (Lombardo & Meier, 2019). Neutral language (e.g. chairperson or chair) is slowly being incorporated to international best practices, although is virtually absent in Bangladeshi law. (Mahajan & Joshi, 2025). The Police Act, 1861 includes the use of words like, policeman, masculine pronouns, and incorporates the assumptions of male authority in law enforcement.

This trend is carried over to other laws also. In section 2 of the Contract Act, 1872, like “one person signifies to another his willingness...” formulates a contractual agency through a male-centric approach. Although the provision is formally applicable to

all persons, the persistent use of “his” contributes to the symbolic exclusion of women from the imagined legal subject. Likewise, there is the Specific Relief Act, 1877 which refers to the party who insists that “he is entitled” to relief which supports the image of the male as the default rights-holder. This is still followed in the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1898 where the provisions governing the process of investigation, arrest and trial refer to persons involved in the process as “he”, making the criminal justice process to have a male subject.

The Bangladeshi family law is often characterized by a presupposition of male dominance especially in the decision-making of the guardians and the choice of their parents (Hossain & Rashid, 2000). The repetitive use of the term father as the custodian of default indicates a patriarchal family setup that leaves out the equal rights of women as parents. Even though the judicial interpretations have taken a progressive approach at times, the language of the statutes still remains restrictive to women as secondary caregivers and not equal legal subjects (Flora & Aspan, 2025). The Guardians and Wards Act, 1890, Section 19(b) places the father at the top of the hierarchy, by limiting the appointment of a guardian during his lifetime, making an assumption of paternal authority.

Figure: Pattern of male-default legal subjectivity

Statute	Example of Gendered Language
The Guardians and Wards Act, 1890	Section 19(b): prioritisation of father; use of “he” for guardian
The Penal Code, 1860	Section 21: “public servant” defined using masculine framing; various provisions use “he commits an offence”
The Code of Criminal Procedure, 1898	Sections 154, 161: references to accused/ person as “he”
The Code of Civil Procedure, 1908	Order VI (Pleadings): use of “he” for parties
The Evidence Act, 1872	Section 101: “which he asserts”
The Contract Act, 1872	Section 2(a): “one person signifies to another his willingness”

Statute	Example of Gendered Language
The Specific Relief Act, 1877	Section 5: general provisions: “he is entitled”
The Police Act, 1861	Sections 2, 23: use of “policeman” and “he”
The General Clauses Act, 1897	Section 13: masculine words include females but uses “he”
The Limitation Act, 1908	Section 3: “he may institute a suit”
The Transfer of Property Act, 1882	Section 5: “he conveys property”
The Companies Act, 1994	Sections 90, 91: “chairman”, “he” for directors
The Labour Act, 2006	Section 2(65): “workman”; use of “he”
The Local Government (Union Parishad) Act, 2009	Repeated use of “Chairman” in provisions
The Special Marriage Act, 1872	Use of “he” for parties in procedural provisions
The Majority Act, 1875	Section 3: “every person domiciled... he shall attain majority”
The Partnership Act, 1932	Section 4: “persons who have agreed... his share”
The Sale of Goods Act, 1930	Sections 4, 12: “he” for buyer/seller
The Negotiable Instruments Act, 1881	Sections 13, 138: “he is liable”
The Stamp Act, 1899	Various provisions: “he shall be liable”
The Registration Act, 1908	Sections 32, 34: “he shall appear”
The Environment Conservation Act, 1995	Section 7: “he shall be punished”
The Anti-Terrorism Act, 2009	Section 6: “he commits an offence”
The Right to Information Act, 2009	Sections 8, 9: “he shall request information”
The Public Servants (Retirement) Act, 1974	Use of “he” for public officials

Effect on Women Rights and Structural Inequality

The construction of the legal subject is done symbolically through the use of language to create a type of exclusion in terms of language

usage. The legal subject according to the theory of jurisprudence is the person among the law and to whom it is applied, and under which it gives us the right to do (Popovych, 2023). When the statutes are repeatedly using masculine pronouns like he or male coded occupation names, they project the legal subject as masculine. Even though women can be formally integrated using interpretive devices, the linguistic designation still makes men the normative right-owners and women the derivative or exceptional players in the legal system (Elewa & El-Farahaty, 2022).

There is practical implementation of this positioning, which is symbolic. Those actors in law such as judges, lawyers, administrators, law enforcers, interpret and apply law by use of language. Once legal documents reiterate control, agency, and decision-making masculine-fashion, they strengthen the unconscious attitudes that men are inherently the bearers of the law, and women are client or subordinates. In addition, symbolic exclusion also affects participation of women in the legal system. According to the feminist legal scholars, recognition plays a central role in legal empowerment. When women do not identify themselves linguistically as self-reliant legal subjects, their statements may be viewed as the less valid in both social and institutional terms (Dang, 2024).

The effects of gendered legal language on the rights of women are based on three inseparable assumptions, which include constitutional, international, and theoretical assumptions. To begin with, constitutionally, the principle of equality before the law contradicts the symbolic exclusion. Article 27 of the constitution of Bangladesh is the guarantee of equality, and Article 28 prohibits discrimination on the basis of sex. This recognition is undermined by the implicit privilege of a male legal identity by the use of gendered statutory terminology. Secondly, The Committee on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women has made it very clear that the perceptions of discrimination include not only the explicit exclusions, but also structural and symbolic ones, which support inequality (Modeawi et al., 2024). Gendered legal language is also a form of indirect discrimination, in that it perpetuates the standards

of patriarchy in the legal system, where the law seems substantively neutral. Third, theoretically, the feminist legal theory and critical discourse analysis prove that language is a place of power. Law does not just govern society but it creates the social meaning (Smejkalová, 2023). The law reproduces gender hierarchies and makes male dominance normative and objective by continually aligning the legal authority with the masculine (Decoster, 2025). This subverts the subjectivity of the law of women in the sense of their position as autonomous, self-sufficient rights-holders, thus supporting structural inequality.

In 2023 the High Court Division on mother as sole legal guardians challenge the long and historical administrative and statutory practices that had assumed the role of fathers as the default guardian of children. The name of the father was regularly introduced into official records, thus, a patriarchal assumption that was embedded in legislative and administrative language. Also, the Rule Nisi of the High Court regarding the Section 19(b) of the Guardians and Wards Act, 1890 to (2024) questioned the compatibility of the colonial guardianship guidelines with the constitutionally assured equality concepts in Articles 26, 27 and 28 of the BD Constitution. Though the court address it as constitutional inconsistency not languishing barriers, but it is a shed light on how structural imbalances remained embedded in the text of the statutes.

The gendered language culture spills over to the overall bureaucratic culture. Such expressions like the chairman, unknowingly used to show that the domain of decisions and power is decided by men (Archer & Kam, 2022). Such linguistic bias eventually solidifies the patriarchal hierarchies that exist in institutions and, as a result, women are deterred by not seeking leadership roles or even demanding their rights (Bailey, Dovidio, & LaFrance, 2021).

Bangladesh's Obligations under CEDAW

By ratifying the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women (CEDAW) in 1984, Bangladesh has

confirmed its stand to eliminate any form of discrimination against women in all fronts including the legal systems, policy making and administration of policies. The article 2 of CEDAW places a specific obligation on State Parties to: undertake full-scale and systematic reforms to amend or abolish existing legislation, laws and regulations, traditional norms and prevailing practices that encourage gender-based discrimination against women.

Despite the fact that Bangladesh has made a reservation to certain provisions of the Convention on the Elimination of all Forms of Discrimination against Women (CEDAW), especially on the matters of family law (Article 2) and on personal status (Article 16), the reservations are limited and not enough to justify linguistic discrimination that propagates the systemic inequalities. The perpetuation of gendered statutory terminology is not consistent with the intent of the Article as well as the text itself since Article 2 requires states to implement proactive measures to eliminate discrimination in the instruments of law as well as in practice.

Further, the General Recommendation No. 25 (2004) and the later recommendations by CEDAW support the need to ensure gender-neutral development of legislations. States are urged to examine and rewrite existing laws, and see that the language that is used in the legislation, in administration and other regulations that are passed to the population should not unwillingly give privileges to men and disadvantage women. The inability to embrace gender-neutral standards of drafting continues to create symbolic and structural inequalities, which only limits the practical realisation of constitutional and human-rights of women.

As it stands, Bangladesh has a threefold burden of duties in reference to the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women (CEDAW) on gendered language. To ensure true equality, it is important to ensure that linguistic discrimination is properly addressed as the CEDAW as well as the Articles 27 and 28 of the Bangladesh constitution have a constitutional obligation to gender equality.

Comparison of Gender-Neutral Drafting Standards

The international legislative drafting conventions, as well as the law creating commissions of many countries, have actively used gender-neutral terms in order to promote equality and prevent implicit bias in written law (Pennisi, 2022). The aim of these reforms is to eliminate gendered assumptions that have characterized past laws, assumptions that place men as legal subjects of normativity and women and other gendered identities in the language fringe.

Experts within the international organizations and legislative offices (United Nations (1999), Guidelines for Gender-Inclusive Language. Firstly, they suggest to substitute gender specific terminologies with non-gender terms. Such as Instead of using chairman or policeman, the writers of the legislation use such terms as chair, chairperson, police officer. Secondly, they can replace gender-specific pronouns. In this instance, where no mention of gender is made, and it is irrelevant, the contemporary drafting guiding principles indicate that gendered pronouns (e.g. he, she, or the compound he/she) must be avoided and that, in their place, the antecedent noun (e.g., the applicant) should be repeated or gender-neutral pronouns like the plural they should be employed. Thirdly, using plural forms or noun repetition should be a good practice. The plurality of the words, which include the pronouns like employees instead of the gendered pronouns like he or she, completely destroys the usage of the gendered pronouns. In cases where one cannot avoid using the pronouns, restating the noun articulation- e.g. the officer, the officer- is better to create clarity without being biased. Fourthly, avoiding unnecessary gender references: The irrelevant gendered assumptions that do not concern the substantive provision must be eliminated. An example is the wording of the sentence that requires a person to file his/her appeal in 30 days, as opposed to he must file his/her appeal... since it does not make the assumption that the person is gender specific.

Such methods are familiar to the authoritative guides on drafting, such as those published by the international labour organization and the parliamentary law offices of governments such as New Zealand

and Canada. Canadian principles in the drafting of legislation explicitly support the use of gender-neutral language and offers enumerated lexicographic alternatives to established gendered language e.g. firefighter instead of fireman (Revell & Vapnek, 2020). The Parliamentary Counsel Office of New Zealand also gives advice to drafters confirming the usage of gender-neutral terms, including chair, and opposes the use of he or she, but rather the guidance recommends the use of terms like the member or rephrasing of clauses to avoid the use of gender-based language (Revell & Vapnek, 2020). These jurisdictions show how re-constructions of the words of the law can be achieved without making any change in the legal meaning although such re-constructions have far reached consequences in terms of equity.

Findings of the study

The following are the summarized findings:

- A. Statutory language is biased to male individuals, using masculine pronouns, gendered titles as well as Patriarchal premises.
- B. The language in issue has an influence over judicial interpretation, administrative implementation and institutional culture, thus circularizing structural inequities.
- C. Women are symbolically and materially subject in the law, and this limitation restricts their access to justice and the utilization of their rights.
- D. The language of legislation in Bangladesh does not meet the requirements of the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women (CEDAW) and is still in the same position with the rest of the world where the language used in legislation is gender neutral.

Recommendations

A. Legislative Reform: Any existing laws should receive a systematic analysis and, as a result, be revised to eliminate gender

language, such as masculine pronouns and titles that are male-cantered. This is because such revisions are aimed at ensuring that the legal texts are not overly patriarchal and that they indicate gender equality.

B. Gender-Neutral Drafting Guidelines: Drafting manuals should also be introduced by the government immediately and give a clear indication on the use of inclusive and neutral language. Such guidelines would allow the people who draft statutes to write rules that would not implicitly favor the male point of view.

C. Institutional Capacity Building: Training should be provided to the judges, lawyers, legislative drafters, and public officials on the ways in which gendered legal language is used to influence interpretation, administrative practice, and legal recognition of women, which reduces the unconscious institutional bias.

D. CEDAW Compliance Review: Bangladesh should also periodically review its legislations to find cases of linguistic discrimination and hence meets its reporting duties in the Convention towards the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women (CEDAW). This type of systematic review will make sure that the statutory language is coordinated with international obligations to get rid of the discrimination of women.

Conclusions

This paper concludes that gendered language is deeply rooted in the laws of Bangladesh through the continued use of masculine pronouns, male-dominated occupational titles, and other assumptions based on patriarchy in the drafting of statutes. These forms of linguistic practices are not just symbolic; they actively bring about structural inequality by creating men as default legal subjects and women as secondary or exceptional legal subjects. Consequently, the gendered statutory language impacts judicial reasoning, administrative practice, institutional culture and pragmatic access of women to justice.

The study also demonstrates that such a legislative trend is not in line with the constitutional guarantees of equality found in Articles 27 and 28 of the Constitution of Bangladesh, as well as the international commitments of Bangladesh under the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women (CEDAW) particularly Article 2. In comparison to jurisdictions like Canada and New Zealand, it is shown that gender-neutral legislative drafting is a feasible and effective way of ensuring substantive equality. This study, therefore, suggests systematic review and amendment of the current laws to eliminate the gendered language, adoption of official guidelines of gender-neutral drafting, sensitization of the judiciary and administrative systems regarding the language bias and regular review of the compliance of the law in line with the CEDAW requirements. Legal language reform is thus critical to not only an inclusive lawmaking process, but also to enhance the equal legal status of women in Bangladesh.

References

- Akpanke, A., & Mohammed, A. (2025). Language and Gender in Legal Contexts. *Idosr Journal of Arts and Management*. <https://doi.org/10.59298/idosrjam/2025/101.202400>.
- Archer, A., & Kam, C. (2022). She is the chair(man): Gender, language, and leadership. *The Leadership Quarterly*. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2022.101610>.
- Bailey, A., Dovidio, J., & LaFrance, M. (2021). “Master” of None: Institutional Language Change Linked to Reduced Gender Bias. *Journal of experimental psychology. Applied*. <https://doi.org/10.1037/xap0000326>.
- Dang, M. (2024). Applying Feminist Legal Principles to Achieve Gender Equality in Vietnam’s Labor Legislation. *Cogent Social Sciences*, 10. <https://doi.org/10.1080/23311886.2024.2350566>.
- Decoster, A. (2025). Masculinity as Property: Toward a New Legal Theory on the Interaction Between Men, *Masculinities and Law*. <https://doi.org/10.63028/10067/2140830151162165141>.
- Elewa, A., & El-Farahaty, H. (2022). Linguistic Gender Forms and Deontic Modality in Islamic Legal Translation: A Corpus-Based Study. *Corpus*

- Pragmatics*, 6, 225 - 247. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s41701-022-00119-6>.
- Fatima, A., Arslan, M., & Latif, T. (2025). Gender Representation in Language of Constitutions: A Cross-Cultural Corpus Assisted Critical Discourse Analysis. *Journal of Asian Development Studies*. <https://doi.org/10.62345/jads.2025.14.1.143>.
- Finley, L. (1989). Breaking Women's Silence in Law: The Dilemma of the Gendered Nature of Legal Reasoning. *Notre Dame Law Review*, 64, 886-910.
- Flora, H., & Aspan, H. (2025). Legal Feminization: Dissecting Gender Inequality in Judges' Decisions in Sexual Violence Cases. *Journal of Strafvingordering Indonesian*. <https://doi.org/10.62872/y6p4jb16>.
- Hasan, M. (2023). An Analysis of Bangladesh's Progress Toward Establishing Gender-Neutral and Pro-Women Islamic Family Law. *SSRN Electronic Journal*. <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.4369991>.
- Hossain, L., & BinteRashid, R. (2000). No Paradise yet: Women and Child Custody Laws in Bangladesh.
- Kline, E. (2023). Stolen Voices: A Linguistic Approach to Understanding Implicit Gender Bias in the Legal Profession. *UCLA Women's Law Journal*. <https://doi.org/10.5070/1330161545>.
- Lombardo, E., & Meier, P. (2019). The Significance of Symbolic Representation for Gender Issues in Politics. *NORA - Nordic Journal of Feminist and Gender Research*, 27, 231-244. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08038740.2019.1660404>.
- Mahajan, M., & Joshi, A. (2025). Gender Neutrality in Legislation: A Step Towards Equality or an Overlooked Necessity? *International Journal of Leading Research Publication*. <https://doi.org/10.70528/ijlrp.v6.i6.1619>.
- Modeawi, M., Geregbia, J., Bindo, G., Ngbolua, J., & Mawunu, M. (2024). Violation of the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Violence Against Women: A Case of Flagrancy in Kisangani City (Tshopo Province), DR Congo. *Humanities & Language: International Journal of Linguistics, Humanities, and Education*. <https://doi.org/10.32734/awr41691>.
- N., U. (2025). The Relationship between Language, Power, and Law. *Newport International Journal of Current Issues in Arts and Management*.

<https://doi.org/10.59298/nijciam/2025/6.1.128133>.

- Pennisi, G. (2022). Legislative Drafting and Gender: Some Linguistic Insights into English and Italian. *The Theory and Practice of Legislation*, 10, 305 - 321. <https://doi.org/10.1080/20508840.2022.2139042>.
- Popovych, T. (2023). The Concept of Duty as an Element of the Legal Status of a Person. *Analytical and Comparative Jurisprudence*. <https://doi.org/10.24144/2788-6018.2023.06.123>.
- Ren, J. (2024). The Role of Law Under the Social Structure. *Journal of Education, Humanities and Social Sciences*. <https://doi.org/10.54097/a5535h97>.
- Revell, D., & Vapnek, J. (2020). *Gender-Silent Legislative Drafting in a Non-Binary World*. 48, 103-148.
- Smejkalová, T. (2023). Case Law and Collective Construction of Meaning. *Utrecht Law Review*. <https://doi.org/10.36633/ulr.833>.
- Storme, B., & Storme, M. (2025). Feminization is More Gender-Fair Than Neutralization: Evidence from Gender-Stereotyped Contexts. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology*. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0261927x251349151>.