Pakistan Languages and Humanities Review
www.plhr.org.pk

RESEARCH PAPER

Negotiating between Gender and Leadership Identity: A Discursive Analysis of Workplace Meetings

Atia Anwer Zoon * 1 Dr. Nighat Ashfaq 2

1. Assistant Professor, Department of English, Federal Urdu University, Islamabad, Pakistan
2. Professor, Department of English, National University of Modern Languages (NUML), Islamabad, Pakistan

Introduction

This article explores how male and female leaders discursively construct and negotiate between their gender and leadership identity as they chair meetings in their workplaces. Discourse, gender and leadership are concepts which have solicited particular attention and generated research debates in the recent decades (Baxter, 2010; Holmes, 2006; Schnurr, 2009).Adopting discourse approach, the focus of this research has been on how leadership is achieved within discourse (Fairhurst& Uhl-Bien, 2012.The discourse based studies of identity construction adopt a social constructionist stance where the focus of analysis is the coming into being of identity

through the use of discursive strategies and linguistic means (Fairhurst, 2007).Leadership identity is one such identity which is negotiated and constructed discursively within the constraints and organizational culture of individual workplace.

The second important aspect of identity which this paper explores is gender identity and how leaders effectively negotiate between their gender identity and leadership roles. In discourse based studies, like the current study, the emphasis is put on diverse, flexible and context responsive ways in which individuals perform gender in various situations and settings (Holmes & Marra, 2010).Language takes the center stage in the discursive performance of identity. While constructing their gender identities in interaction, individuals draw on various discourse styles and discursive features which may be indexed as gendered.

Workplaces are located within the wider socio-cultural system which has its own set of cultural norms which may have an impact on how individuals interact in their professional settings. Desai et al. (2014) and Madden (2011) point that in patriarchal and traditional social setups, the impact of prevailing gender norms and stereotypes is so widespread that it restrains women from leadership positions by limiting their roles within the domain of homemaking and family care.

Manzoor (2015) highlights that although many women have entered higher education institutions, it cannot be claimed with certainty that they will be able to sustain and succeed in the mainstream leadership roles. Despite all the challenges, when women in Pakistani social set up make it to the leadership positions and claim leadership roles, it becomes even more pertinent to explore how they discursively manage and negotiate the often conflicting demands of their gender identity and their professional roles.

The current study adopts a social constructionist and discourse analytical perspective to explore how leaders in academic settings of Pakistan discursively accomplish their gender and leadership identities. The study is underpinned by Butler (1990) theory of gender performativity which conceptualizes identity as a process and a performance and not as a predetermined static category. According to Butler (1990) social, gender and professional identities of individuals are established within discourse as individuals engage in various discursive practices. According to her theory of performativity the power and agency lie within discourse and not outside. These theoretical and analytical perspectives are well suited for the current study because they provide a dynamic and flexible analytical lens for looking into the construction of identities within discourse.

Literature Review

The research grounded in discourse analysis sees gender and leadership as a process or a performance enacted within discourse. By adopting discourse perspective, this research is specifically interested in the language of doing leadership and its intersection with gender (Holmes, 2006; Baxter, 2010, Schnurr,

2010).The discursive perspective conceptualizes leadership as a transformative process and highlights more dynamic and interactional features of leadership (Bass, 1998).

Leadership is viewed as a gendered concept working along the binary categories of masculine and feminine (Marra et al., 2006). Historically the leadership roles have been dominantly occupied by men, hence the masculine model of leadership along with features of discourse indexed as features of masculine style are still valued and are used to measure competence in leadership (Rojo& Esteban, 2005).Women leaders in patriarchal social setups (like Pakistan in this case) have to deal with constraints as they are required to balance between their gender identity and their professional roles. They are expected to perform their professional role as effective leaders while maintaining societal norms about being a good woman (Morley & Crossouard, 2016; Oplatka, 2006).

The interactions taking place within workplace settings are deeply embedded in the wider socio-cultural context because individuals do not operate in a social vacuum. Taking into account the relevance of broader socio-cultural context as an important factor, the research conducted in various contexts has investigated the role of socio-cultural norms and their implications for men and women who hold leadership positions. Hoyt and Murphy (2016) explored how stereotypes affected women leaders. They found that women do not fit into stereotypical notions of leadership because of typical feminine traits.

Eagly and Chin (2010) elaborate that women have to effectively negotiate between their gender identity and leadership roles because they are expected to maintain a feminine identity of being polite, indirect and friendly and approach leadership in a masculine way by being assertive and direct. Shah and Shah (2012) point out that cultural norms and stereotypes are propagated and reinforced in society through gendered discourses about masculine leadership and the masculine model of performing leadership. Such discourses are manipulated to keep women silent and invisible.

To the best of this researcher's knowledge, there are very few studies conducted in Pakistani context which explore the discursive construction of identity through textual, visual and media discourses. Khan, & Ali, (2016) analyzed the written texts of male and female students and explored how they constructed their gender identity through written discourse. Salam (2020) study focused on how Pakistani women constructed their gender identity on Facebook. By analyzing the visual and linguistic resources used by these women on their Facebook timelines, this study concludes that they effectively utilized discursive means to display their desired gender identities. Shah, Pillai, & Sinayah (2020) study examined the link between code switching and identity by analyzing the discursive practices of students and lecturers in a multilingual academic setting in Pakistan. The study concludes that individuals who are socialized in a multilingual environment construct hybrid identities through their linguistic choices hence establishing the

significant role of language in the construction of identities. Umar & Rasul (2015) based their research on Pakistani print advertisements. Their study offers insight into the construction of gender identities through graphical representations and linguistic choices. The study finds that the portrayal of masculine and feminine identities aligns with stereotypical models of male and female identity. Qadir, & Riaz, (2015) study is also significant as it highlights the constitutive potential of language and the role it plays in construction and negotiation of identities. Their study is based on data from political talk shows of Pakistani channels and the study explores how Pakistani female politicians construct their gendered political identity in the talk shows.

The above studies are based on data from Pakistan's context and they adopt a discourse approach to the construction of identity, but they are exclusively focused on gender identity of individuals and do not take into account the intersection of gender with leadership identity. The research on discursive construction of identities in workplace settings is an under researched area in the non- Western contexts especially such studies of workplace contexts are almost non-existent in Pakistan. Hence, this paper attempts to fill the above mentioned research gap by investigating the negotiation of gender and leadership identities in the selected Pakistani academic settings.

Material and Methods

The data for this article has been taken from the selected public sector universities of Rawalpindi and Islamabad-Pakistan. The data has been collected through observations and audio-recordings of workplace department meetings chaired by male and female heads of departments. The researcher took observation notes while observing the meetings on semi-structured observation sheets developed on the basis of detailed literature review. The audio-recorded data of meetings has been transcribed using intelligent transcription.

Since this study is focused on the gendered aspect of leadership identity, the sample has been carefully chosen to capture the gender dynamics of leadership. One of the selected universities is a gender segregated all male setup and the other selected university is a women university having predominantly females in positions of authority. The analysis focuses on the interactional styles of two male heads of departments from an all-male set up and two female heads of department from a predominantly female university set up. The researcher has used purposive sampling technique for selecting the participants. The sample comprises of male and female leaders characterized as (1) having a PhD degree (2) working as assistant professor, associate professor, and full professor (3) is head of department (4) and have at least two years' experience of working in university's leadership position.

Ethical Considerations

The researcher sought prior written permission from management of each university for collection of required data. Written permission was also sought from

the meeting chair of each meeting for being observed and recorded. The researcher also sought verbal consent from participants of the meeting. The researcher used pseudonyms in the data analysis to ensure the anonymity and confidentiality of meeting chairs and participants.

Parameters for Analysis of Data

The data analysis of this paper is based on the discursive parameters drawn from Holmes (2001, 2006).These parameters have been established and listed as widely cited features of masculine and feminine interactional styles on the basis of extensive research on workplace data (Baxter, 2010; Schnurr, 2009; Holmes, 2006; Holmes & Stubbe, 2003).

According to theses parameters, the feminine interactional style is characterized by a people-process orientation, collaborative and facilitative discussions, indirect structures, and supportive team interaction. By contrast, the masculine discourse style is characterized by task-outcome orientation, autonomous and assertive decision making, direct ways of getting things done, and competitive team discussions (Holmes 2000, 2006). These features of discourse are not only indexed for gender but also for leadership speech styles. The parameters provide a useful lens for exploring how male and female leaders construct gender and professional identities by adopting discursive strategies from masculine and feminine speech styles (Holmes & Stubbe, 2003).

Results and Discussion

In this section the discussion and analysis focus on selected extracts which typify how two male and two female leaders integrate the competing demands of their gender and leadership identity. The analysis focuses on important aspects of their leadership performance namely getting things done which in these extracts includes dealing with   academic and administrative decisions as heads.

Meeting Extract No.1

Context: This extract has been taken from a departmental meeting held in a women university. As the department is hosting an international conference, the main agenda of this particular meeting is planning and preparation of city tour and cultural night for the conference guests. The head of all organizing committees gives suggestions during the meeting and seeks final decision from the meeting chair Dr. Salma. This excerpt exemplifies the various ways in which Dr. Salma communicates decision sand gives directives and orders for getting things done.

Analysis of meeting extract no.1

Dr. Ahmad, who is a senior male faculty and head of organizing committee, opens the meeting by using an indirect and inclusive pronoun *let's discuss* and

invites discussion from the meeting participants about city tour and cultural evening for conference guests. In response the meeting Chair Dr. Salma asks two direct and unmitigated questions *where do you want to take? How many people will be there?* Adopting a consensus oriented approach Dr. Ahmed replies by saying *whatever you people decide.* It is important to note at this point that Dr. Salma does not invite discussion from other meeting participants but adopting an assertive and authoritative leadership style so far she keeps the meeting floor to herself and responds to Dr. Ahmad. She uses a direct and unmitigated *No* to convey her disagreement with Dr. Ahmad as she does not appreciate the idea of taking international guests on city tour due to security concerns. She starts her assertion in an individualistic manner by saying *in my opinion* followed by an inclusive pronoun *We will arrange* but the use of inclusive *WE* is not based on well discussed consensus but a unilateral assertion of authority on behalf of the whole team. Moving further, Dr. Ali, the other senior male faculty, responds to the meeting chair by giving his point of view using an indirect and impersonal structure by saying that *conference guests from outside would want to see the city.* Dr. Salma responds to his indirect suggestion by giving direct and unmitigated directives as she says *keep it for presenters-forget about the participants-only for presenters.* Sidra, a senior female faculty member, raises point about arrangement of dinner for the conference presenters. She uses inclusive *we* and an interrogative *what about that?* to indirectly seek meeting chair's verdict on the arrangement of dinner. Dr. Salma responds by giving a direct and assertive verdict *everything will be done inside the university premises* .Dr. Ali again raises a point here in the same indirect and impersonalized structure *generally it is arranged in nearby hotels.* The important point to note is that Dr. Salma does not even respond to Dr. Ali's point, neither does she invite any discussion. It seems that she considers her statement as the final verdict. Instead of responding to Dr. Ali, she rather concludes the discussion and wraps up by referring to further actions to be taken. She closes her remarks by giving unmitigated directives *you take prior consent from them- rest we will manage.*

Discussion

The above analysis highlights that the discourse features and strategies used by Dr. Salma clearly demonstrate a masculine way of performing leadership. Her discursive behavior is stereotypically masculine as she uses unmitigated structures for refusals and disagreements, direct interrogatives, firm and unmitigated directives, and imperatives. The micro-analysis of Dr. Salma's discursive style indicates that she adopts authoritative style in performing leadership and positions herself as an autonomous head. She takes a transactional approach as she gives firm directives for getting things done. She holds the meeting floor most of the time and does not invite discussion for building consensus. She rather takes a task-oriented approach and gives directives for getting things done. Hence, the analysis reveals that she enacts her leadership role in predominantly masculine way by employing features of discourse indexed along the masculine end of spectrum. Dr. Salma's discursive style can be termed as autocratic because she communicates her final decisions autonomously and does not invite questions or seek agreement. Although

she uses inclusive pronoun *we,* it refers to her assertion as a leader on behalf of the whole team and does not seem to indicate group inclusion or solidarity. By using discursive strategies like unmitigated directives and the use of imperatives she displays her power and authority, adopting discursive behaviors which align with masculinity. She negotiates her gender identity by employing features of discourse which are associated with masculinity. Since the discourse features used by Dr. Salma are features of masculine style, it can be argued that she constructs her gender identity as rather masculine. The above analysis also points out another important dynamics of meeting interaction where the two male participants of meeting use indirect, inclusive and impersonalized structures for giving suggestions and disagreements which are features of discourse indexed as feminine. So the analysis reveals that the discursive style of the female meeting chair as well as the senior male participants does not show compliance to the normative styles of interaction.

Meeting Extract No.2

Context: This brief excerpt has been taken from a departmental meeting held in a public sector women university. In this extract the female chair of the meeting Dr. Asia communicates with her department faculty members about   dealing with the class rooms access issue of a wheel chair bound student. All participants of the meeting are female faculty members of the concerned department.

Analysis of meeting extract no.2

This analysis focuses on the discursive style of female head Dr. Asia and explores the discourse features employed by her to enact her leadership role. She adopts a collaborative discursive style in the very start and begins by using inclusive pronouns *let's discuss* and *WE also have full financial support.* The use of solidarity oriented pronoun *let's* and *WE* indicates her team oriented leadership style which is a discursive signal that the matter under discussion will be handled as a team. She continues with the same collaborative discursive style by using inclusive pronoun *WE* and *US* to indicate that as head she is considerate about the fact that any decisions about managing with the students access to class rooms will directly affect the faculty members. When one of the junior faculty member asks questions *isn't it dangerous mam? to* raise concern about moving the student to classrooms downstairs , Dr. Asia does not take her question as a threat to her authority. She quickly shifts to individualistic discourse strategy and uses an *I* statement while responding to her question *it is dangerous -I don't want that actually.* By switching from inclusive *we* to individualistic *I* she gives explanation about the measure she has taken to ensure student's safety, which indicates that she takes responsibility as head that she doesn't want to take any risk and put herself and her team in danger. Moving further, she again uses a combination of individualistic *I-**I** have requested the university(administration)* and inclusive *us-they should give **us** ground floor,* structures for explaining the measures which she has taken as head to communicate related concerns to the higher authorities. The use of *I* statements by her is not for evoking her authority and power as head, but for taking responsibility on behalf of her team.

Discussion

The above analysis highlights that Dr. Asia draws on inclusive and team oriented discourse features which are typically indexed as features of feminine discourse style. She performs her leadership role as an egalitarian and consensus oriented leader who values the buy-in and support of her team for the departmental decisions which she takes as a head. Her discursive style is characterized by inclusive and solidarity oriented pronouns *we* and *us* which contribute to a collaborative and person-oriented discursive style. Her style of interaction indicates that she values team supportiveness and team cooperation in doing leadership. Her discursive style indicates compliance to a stereotypical feminine style of interaction which she employs effectively for taking her team into confidence.

Meeting Extract No.3

Context: This excerpt has been taken from a department meeting held in a gender segregated all-male setup. The meeting is chaired by Dr. Nasir and the main agenda of meeting is allocation of visiting courses to faculty for the upcoming semester. The meeting participants include seven male faculty members.

Analysis of meeting extract no.3

This analysis explores the discourse features adopted by Dr. Nasir for enacting his leadership role as meeting chair. In the beginning of the meeting, he starts with unmitigated imperatives and positions himself as an authoritative head. He uses three imperative structures in row to give directives for course allocation *be careful this time- you can only take one seminar each-nobody should take two.* His way of enacting leadership is in compliance with a typical masculine style of interaction as he uses unmitigated imperatives to assert his authority. Moving further Dr. Nasir continues with the same discursive strategies giving unmitigated directives and instructions which position him as an assertive team leader. Adopting an assertive and direct discursive approach, he uses an imperative, an unmitigated firm directive, and an individualistic *I* statement, *You people see it, tell the department in advance,, there should be no issue like past, I will not reduce your workload* which are all features of discourse coded as stereotypically masculine.

Moving further, we notice the use of inclusive pronoun *WE* twice *we will arrange. So that we engage.* The overall pattern of discursive features and the leadership style adopted by Dr. Nasir shows that the use of inclusive *WE* is not for seeking suggestions or building team consensus as there is no discussion or debate generated. Even the use of inclusive *WE* refers to Dr. Nasir's authority as head. Moving further he again employs direct structure *whatever commitment you plan to make-let us know in advance –alright?* to continue with his instructions and directives. As he closes the directive with *alright*, it seems that he is making sure that the team members have well received his instruction. In the same para, he becomes even more assertive as he issues direct and unmitigated warning saying *otherwise you will have to face, not the rest.* He warns his faculty members to stand by the commitments which

they make otherwise they will be held accountable in case of non-compliance. Here his discursive style becomes confrontational which is associated with masculine style of interaction. He indirectly invokes his authority as an autonomous leader who will hold his faculty accountable for their abidance by commitments and rules.

Discussion

The analysis highlights that Dr. Nasir employs features of discourse from masculine end of the spectrum and performs leadership in compliance with his gender identity. He constructs his leadership identity by adopting typical masculine discursive style employing features of discourse coded as masculine. For example, , the use of direct structures for giving orders and instructions, the use of imperatives and unmitigated directives, the use of I statements, and use of direct and unmitigated warning are all discursive strategies which characterize a stereotypical masculine style of interaction.

Meeting Extract No.4

Context: This excerpt has been taken from departmental meeting held in a gender segregated all male setup. The main agenda of the meeting is course allocation and hiring of visiting faculty for the upcoming semester. The meeting is chaired by male head of department Dr. Asim.

Analysis of meeting extract no. 4

This analysis focuses on the discursive style adopted by Dr. Asim while chairing meeting in a masculine community of practice. In the opening sentence Dr. Asim starts by the sentence *before* **WE** *formally allocate these courses, as it happens always* which signals his approach for allocation of courses. The use of **WE** and the following sentence indicate that he will adopt an inclusive and consensus based approach for allocation of courses. In the following sentence he refers to all the participants of meeting as his *colleagues* which is a lexical choice used to show that he considers himself as part of the team orienting to a collaborative leadership style. So the opening para of meeting shows that Dr. Asim does not invoke his authority as head but orients to more team oriented discursive style.

Moving further, by using discourse features particularly solidarity oriented pronouns *WE will sort it out together-we Will decide it among ourselves-will ask for suggestions from one another* he emphasizes team cooperation and consensus. He adopts a facilitative discourse style and uses depersonalized discursive structures to stress punctuality and commitments from the faculty members. Instead of taking an assertive approach characterized by imperatives and direct structures he takes a relationally oriented approach and uses indirect and impersonal passive structures to mitigate the direct impact of instructions which he is communicating as he says *coming to class on time, it has only to be reiterated as a routine.*

When Dr. Asim talks about hiring visiting faculty for the extra courses, he uses a series of inclusive pronouns to express that hiring of visiting faculty will be a consultative and collaborative process *we will have interviews, in consultation with you, we will discuss, we will call, we will allocate courses.* Instead of taking decisions unilaterally, he makes it a consultative process. It can be noticed that throughout this conversational sequence Dr. Asim adopts a feminine style of interaction. He uses impersonal structures and passive voice to attenuate the directness of his instructions. The analysis of this excerpt highlights that Dr. Asim is consistently using discursive strategies which position him as a relationally oriented leader who takes a person's oriented approach for getting things done from his team members.

Discussion

The above analysis reveals that Dr. Asim adopts a discursive style which resists the typical masculine model of performing leadership. He effectively negotiates between his leadership role and masculine identity by drawing on non-confrontational and collaborative features of discourse which mainly include solidarity oriented pronouns WE and US, passive, mitigated and depersonalized structures for instructions. By drawing on discourse features coded as feminine and by performing leadership on a feminine model, Dr. Asim challenges the traditional conception of leadership. The discursive resistance manifested in his interactional style is important for transforming the ways in which leadership can be discursively negotiated and accomplished beyond the normative patterns of discourse.

Conclusion

The above analysis and discussion encapsulates the various discursive ways in which male and female leaders negotiate route between different and sometimes conflicting sets of socio-cultural expectations about their gender identity and requirements of their leadership roles. The analysis reveals that since these individuals are in leadership positions, they have the authority and potential to forge hybridized identities, contesting the normative associations of discursive styles and transforming the perceptions of leadership and gender identity. The analysis of one male and female leader whose discursive style resists the normative associations of discourse features and gender stereotypes highlights that through their discursive behaviors they skillfully enact their complex and diverse leadership roles. They challenged the established stereotypes and normative conception of leadership. On the other hand, one male and one female leader display conformity to the normative patterns by performing leadership in accordance with normatively male and female discourse styles. By conforming to the normative style of doing leadership, their discursive style reinforced the dichotomously gendered display of leadership. It may be concluded that in some contexts and settings the normatively masculine and feminine discourse styles may be the most effective and desired way of getting things done and accomplishing leadership goals.

On the basis of above analysis it can be concluded that the discursive style of male and female leaders cannot be neatly differentiated into masculine and feminine

style of interaction. Both males and females who are in position of authority have to show contextual sensitivity and discursive flexibility for managing the dual demands of a convincing professional identity and an acceptable gender identity.

Both males and females resist the normative perceptions of masculine and feminine discursive styles as they use such discourse features for doing leadership which are not congruent with their gender. The analysis concludes that by doing so they challenged the stereotypical gendered speech norms for performing leadership.

The analysis concludes that the aspects of conformity and resistance indicate flexibility and diversity in the various ways in which leadership is performed by male and female leaders. The analysis concludes that these aspects of leadership have the potential to de-stabilize essentialist notions of exclusive feminine and masculine leadership styles. By revealing the intra-gender differences in the enactment of leadership, such studies have the potential to weaken the dichotomous conceptions of leadership.

The analysis concludes that as male and female leaders adopt discourse features which are not congruent with their gender, their discursive behavior contributes to 'de-gendering' of discourse strategies as mentioned by Holmes (2006, p.67). Here the current research reinforces the important finding highlighted by Holmes (2006, p.67) that discourse features are "tools of leadership discourse, and not exclusively of male or female discourse". This finding is significant for bringing in alternative and flexible models of performing leadership where discursive features are employed as linguistic resources accessible to both male and female leaders.

Taking a discourse approach this paper has analyzed the performance of leadership and construction of gender and professional identity. However it must be noted that due to scope limitations, the findings cannot be considered generalizable to other individuals, contexts or settings. In addition, caution must be exercised to conclude that male and female leaders are completely free to employ discourse features to perform leadership. Hence, the constraining force of socio-cultural norms must also be taken into consideration.

In contexts like Pakistan, where the discursive construction of leadership and gender identities is an under researched area, more research is needed to investigate the intersection and complexities of leadership and gender in workplace. Taking into account the socio cultural contexts and the organizational settings in which male and female leaders interact, further research needs to be conducted which looks at how gender and the professional identities of leaders intersect.

References

Bass, B.M. (1998). *Transformational Leadership: Industrial, Military, and Educational Impact*. London and Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Baxter, J. (2010). *The Language of Female Leadership*: Palgrave Macmillan.

Butler, J. (1990). *Gender Troubles: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity*. New York: Routledge.

Desai, S. D. Chugh, D. & Brief, A. P. (2014). The implications of marriage structure for men's workplace attitudes, beliefs, and behaviors toward women. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 59(2), 330-365.

Eagly, A. H. & Chin, J. L. (2010). Diversity and leadership in a changing world. *American psychologist*, 65(3), 216-224

Fairhurst, G. T. & Uhl-Bien, M. (2012). Organizational discourse analysis (ODA): Examining leadership as a relational process. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 23(6), 1043-1062.

Fairhurst, G. T. (2007). *Discursive leadership: In conversation with leadership psychology.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Holmes, J. (2001). *An Introduction to Sociolinguistics*, 2nd ed, London: Longman.

Holmes, J. (2003). 'Social Constructionism', in W.J. Frawley (ed.) *International Encyclopedia of Linguistics,* Vol. 4, 2nd edn, pp. 88–91. New York: Oxford University Press.

Holmes, J. (2006*). Gendered Talk at Work: Constructing Gender Identity through Workplace Discourse*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Holmes, J. & Stubbe, M. (2003). *Power and Politeness in the Workplace: A Sociolinguistic Analysis of Talk at Work*. Pearson: London.

Holmes, J. & Marra, M. (2010). *Femininity, feminism and gendered discourse. In Femininity, Feminism and Gendered Discourse: A Selected and Edited Collection of Papers from the Fifth International Language and Gender Association Conference* (IGALA5). UK: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.1-18.

Hoyt, C. L. & Murphy, S. E. (2016). Managing to clear the air: Stereotype threat, women, and leadership. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 27(3), 387-399.

Khan, K. R. & Ali, S. S. (2016). Construction Of Gender Identity Through Written Discourse. *Pakistan Journal of Gender Studies*, 12(1), 87–100.

Madden, M. (2011). Gender Stereotypes of Leaders: Do They Influence Leadership in Higher Education?. *Wagadu: A Journal of Transnational Women's & Gender Studies,* 9, 55-88.

Manzoor, S. (2015). The impact of indigenous culture on female leadership in Pakistan. *International Journal of Organizational Leadership*, 4, 414-429.

Marra, M. Schnurr, S. & Holmes, J. (2006). Effective leadership in New Zealand workplaces: Balancing gender and role. In Baxter, Judith (ed.) *Speaking Out* (pp. 240-260). Palgrave Macmillan, London.

Morley, L. & Crossouard, B. (2016). Women's leadership in the Asian Century: doesexpansion mean inclusion? Studies in Higher Education, 41(5), 801-814

Oplatka, I. (2006). Women in educational administration within developing countries: Towards a new international research agenda. Journal of Educational Administration, 44(6),604-624

Rojo, L. M. & Esteban, C. G. (2005). The gender of power: The female style in labour organizations. In *Feminist Critical Discourse Analysis* (pp. 61-89). Palgrave Macmillan, London.

Salam, R. (2020). Compliance and resistance: An investigation into the construction of gender identities by Pakistani women on Facebook, *Asian Journal of Women's Studies,* 26(4), 503-527

Schnurr, S. (2009). *Leadership Discourse at Work: Interactions of Humour, Gender and Workplace Culture*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Schnurr, S. (2010). Decision made–let's move on: Negotiating gender and professional identity in Hong Kong workplaces. *Language in its Socio-cultural Context,* 111-136.

Shah, M. Pillai, S. & Sinayah, M. (2020). Identity Construction through Code-Switching Practices at a University in Pakistan. *GEMA Online Journal of Language Studies*, 20, 1-17.

Shah, S. & Shah, U. (2012). Women, educational leadership and societal culture. *Education Sciences,* 2(1), 33-44.

Talbot, M. (2010). *Language and Gender: An Introduction*. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.

Umar, M. Rasul, S. (2015). Gender Representation And Identity Construction In Pakistani Print Advertisements Of Clothing Brands: A Socio- Semiotic Analysis, *Pakistan Journal of Gender Studies*, 11(1). 87–112

Qadir, S. A., & Riaz, F. (2015). Gendered Political Identity Construction in Pakistani Television Talk shows, *FWU Journal of Social Sciences*, 9(1), 20-28.