

Gender Differences in Legal Communication

Kakembo Aisha Annet

Faculty of Education, Kampala International University, Uganda

ABSTRACT

This paper investigates the gender-based differences in legal communication and their implications for legal education, professional practice, and courtroom outcomes. Although female representation in law schools has reached parity or exceeded that of males in many developed nations, legal pedagogy and professional environments continue to reflect communication norms aligned with male-dominated adversarial models. Drawing from interdisciplinary research in communication theory, gender studies, and legal scholarship, this study explores how gendered communication styles such as assertiveness versus collaboration, or certainty versus hedging affect perceptions of authority, credibility, and competence in legal contexts. The analysis integrates historical developments with qualitative evidence from courtroom discourse and professional interactions. Findings reveal that communication styles influenced by gender norms can lead to unequal treatment in litigation outcomes, negotiation success, and career advancement. Institutional biases and social expectations continue to disadvantage women despite increased participation in the legal profession. The paper concludes by recommending inclusive communication practices and pedagogical reforms to ensure equity and effectiveness in legal communication across genders.

Keywords: Gender and legal communication, Courtroom discourse, Power dynamics in law, Gendered language, Legal outcomes, Gender bias in litigation, Legal education and gender.

INTRODUCTION

In many developed countries, the number of female law students is comparable sometimes even higher than that of male law students. That phenomenon, however, is not reflected in law school pedagogy, which is typically based on male models of behavior. It is widely suggested that men and women communicate differently especially when it comes to conflict matters. Therefore, the question arises whether these two gender-specific communication styles produce different legal outcomes. It is evident that the nature of legal communication is extensive, systematic, and that its importance within the framework of law is paramount. Thus, it is relevant to examine the impact of gender on legal communication. Research frequently links conflict styles to the broader subject of communication since the former are heavily dependent upon the latter, rendering it necessary to examine both topics within the context of the general research question. Literature suggests that complementary and symmetric interaction patterns generate different outcomes, with the latter being more appropriate for conflict due to diminished potential for misunderstanding. However, such theories appear to offer an oversimplified perspective on the practical applications of conflict and communication, prompting further inquiry into the effect of conflict styles on legal outcomes among law students and practitioners of varying genders [1, 2].

Theoretical Framework

Gender and legal communication are pivotal subjects within law and communications scholarship, embodying legal, interpersonal, and cross-cultural communication modes. Professionals use language to influence psychological states, resolve conflicts, express emotion, and manipulate social dynamics; divergent individual communication styles signify and shape intention. Organizations create, define, and legitimize language that signals operative dynamics. The portrayal of gender categorically divides human

interaction, casting longstanding discriminatory consequences for females across circumstances of institutional disparity, such as education and employment. Legal systems register these aforementioned characteristics, suggesting that language and communication shape our understanding of gender and identity. Present verbal transactions contain careful categorization, indication, and invention of identity, beyond mere recognition of a unified self. The concept of identity demonstrates inherent constraints; descriptive prescription incompletely captures whole selves. While linguistic variations along sociolectal divisions surface, no archetypal, self-actualized individuals exist [3, 4].

Communication Theories

Communication theories specifically concerned with gender can be divided into two broad areas: those that study the construction and use of “gendered” discourse and those that use discursive methods to question or investigate the very construction of gender. The first area takes as a starting point the assumption that there are differences in the ways men and women communicate. In social psychology, such differences can be subsumed under a tendency to emphasize identity development. A key challenge remains in understanding how gender influences communication in legal contexts. Gender should be understood as a social construct: it is produced through repeated discursive practices. The implication for legal communication is that gendered communication is context-appropriate in the sense that it is used to shape interpretation among actors and audiences [5, 6].

Gender Studies Overview

The dynamic approach to gender differences in language recognizes that gender is a cultural construct varying by time and among social, ethnic, and cultural groups. Gender is enacted in conversation, with roles constantly claimed and influenced by normative expectations. Language in private spheres, like family, is often labeled ‘women’s language,’ while language in public spaces such as business and law is termed ‘men’s language.’ Courtroom discourse serves as an ideal setting to study gendered language use since it represents a formal institutional context dealing with serious matters like murder or contract disputes. Participants cannot exit discussions freely, and there is a strict hierarchy in speaking roles, primarily overseen by a judge responsible for controlling dialogue. Lawyers hold unequal power, being able to interrogate witnesses, while lay participants usually answer questions without advocacy. Given the significance of language in court, gendered linguistic practices likely influence trial results. Notably, features of ‘women’s language’ are also exhibited by some men, especially those in vulnerable positions, like police officers, suggesting the label ‘women’s language’ is inadequate, as ‘powerless language’ might better capture its essence [7, 8].

Historical Context

Gender differences permeate legal communication at multiple levels words, tone, content, and style with implications for case outcomes. Exploring the historical context reveals persistent disparities that create barriers to effective communication and understanding during litigation. Establishing a framework that encourages understanding between legal professionals fosters more effective interactions and promotes fairer outcomes. The evolution of gender roles in the legal domain frames historical disparities and elucidates contemporary communication patterns. Historical evidence demonstrates that law has traditionally limited women to specific roles and occupations. While formal barriers have fallen, inequality in legal study and employment remains palpable within the legal agenda. Discussions about whether men differ in their use of language have gained prominence over decades, with observations of men’s linguistic patterns reaching back into the nineteenth century. Until the late twentieth century, scholarly focus remained on women’s discourse; more recently, research has examined men’s speech distinctively, with their discourse assuming more of an interest than a default position. Law is immersed in power dynamics. Social class, ideology, and gender constitute basic stratifications enforcing interpersonal communications and access to material resources and goods. Individuals, researchers included, come pre-equipped with analytic constructs that position events within organizationally maintained categories. Deviation from such categorical normality may be interpreted as bias. Legal texts constitute social vehicles supporting and anchoring the construction of social reality. Since they establish culturally ingrained boundaries that manage role distribution and social interactions, they perpetuate traditional perceptions of the world and may contribute to biased assessments of social structures [9, 10].

METHODOLOGY

The methodology employed to investigate gender differences in legal communication integrates theoretical and historical frameworks with qualitative analysis of legal discourse. Drawing on communication theories and gender studies, the research examines how legal professionals negotiate

identity and norms in their interactions, as well as how gender mediates workplace authority and credibility. Historical insights trace the evolution of gender roles in legal settings, highlighting their influence on present-day communication practices. Data sources include court trial transcripts, interviews, focus groups, and naturally occurring law practice conversations. Analysis focuses on identifying gender-specific expectations and communication styles, considering the role of power imbalances and implicit biases. The study aims to elucidate the mechanisms by which gender shapes legal communication and its consequent effects on credibility and authority within the legal system [11, 12].

Legal Communication Styles

As gender roles have significantly evolved and transformed in the legal world throughout recent years, new and intriguing patterns have emerged in how men and women communicate within the complex profession. Men often adopt a more adversarial style characterized by assertiveness and a competitive edge, whereas women tend to emphasize the collaborative interests of all parties involved, aiming for a more holistic approach to disputes. These distinctions carry significant and far-reaching implications for the outcomes of legal cases. Courtroom speech, in particular, holds substantial power to sway judges and juries, influencing their perceptions and decisions; yet, surprisingly, little research has specifically explored gendered oral communication practices in these unique legal settings. The existing literature broadly underscores the critical influence of gender dynamics and legal communication practices on case outcomes, highlighting the necessity for further exploration and understanding of how these differences ultimately affect the justice system [13, 14].

Impact of Gender on Legal Outcomes

Gender influences negotiations and transactions in many different ways. Evidence from various studies suggests that gender differences in discourse patterns can influence the outcome of a negotiation, and that men tend to emerge as the primary beneficiaries. Similarly, in legal discourse, language features commonly associated with women's speech can have a significant impact on the outcome of a criminal trial. In negotiations, women often use disclaimers such as "I think", "I believe", and "I feel", which may cause receivers to interpret their messages as less forceful. Formal education tends to reduce these gender-related verbal distinctions. Men and women display distinct expectations regarding what constitutes an appropriate negotiation outcome, which can affect their bargaining strategies: women, even when holding greater economic power, are more likely to accept equal outcomes, whereas men tend to pursue arrangements that reflect existing power disparities. Social conventions prescribe modest self-presentation for women, while men are expected to be more assertive and self-promoting. This double standard influences perceptions of law students' competence and negotiation behavior. Similar concerns apply to legal settings, where gender-specific language features can shape trial outcomes. Given the adversarial context of courtroom discourse, men's adherence to predominantly masculine norms can confer a competitive advantage. The terminology associated with women's language may conceal underlying links to social power, and the development of "powerless language" may be socialized early, as women are encouraged to adopt forms of talk aligned with positions of lesser authority [15, 16].

Barriers to Effective Communication

Gender norms and implicit biases hinder effective communication and equal representation for women in the legal field. Women make up less than 15 percent of litigators at the Supreme Court and are often less experienced and successful than their male counterparts, despite individual advocacy styles. Implicit biases, rooted in gender stereotypes related to emotional expression, contribute to this disparity. Gender stereotypes impose contradictory expectations on men and women, dictating acceptable emotional expressions. Judges use gendered emotional language, reflecting implicit norms about courtroom behavior. Men are expected to be assertive and forceful, while women should be conciliatory and warm, creating a difficult landscape for female attorneys trying to navigate professional yet gender-appropriate advocacy. In male-dominated environments, women may adopt masculine communication styles to assert authority but risk scrutiny from justices regarding changes in demeanor. Courtrooms highlight gender disparities in power, where women's authority is often questioned due to linguistic and social conventions. Women's use of language, often filled with disclaimers, can portray them as less assertive speakers. Research indicates that verbal differences based on gender diminish with higher formal education; however, norms still affect bargaining interactions and perceived success. The societal pressure for women to be modest while men promote themselves leads to less forceful communication from women. Speaker presentation influences negotiation strategies and effectiveness. Barriers to effective legal communication also stem from entrenched legal traditions and institutional behaviors. Particularly in

family court, the challenges faced by battered women illustrate how women's voices frequently go unheard by lawyers and judges. Gender stereotypes and implicit biases continue to strongly shape law, court dynamics, and legal outcomes [17, 18].

Best Practices for Legal Communication

Legal communication involves a range of oral and written expressions, including arguments, documents, presentations, and administrative materials. The use of non-discriminatory language is not only a matter of accuracy but also a reflection of professional integrity. Women remain underrepresented among Supreme Court attorneys, comprising less than 15 percent despite accounting for nearly 40 percent of practicing lawyers. Ambitious female law firm associates who adopt an aggressive approach risk skepticism from male superiors unless they conform to the stereotyped ideal of femininity. When women make up a small minority, they often modulate their behavior to downplay gender differences, either by adopting typical male behaviors or by compensating through language, dress, or posture. Adhering to rigid gender norms produces tension from which attorneys derive distinct communication styles; women are portrayed as conciliatory and warm, whereas men are portrayed as forceful and argumentative. Comfort in and success with writing do not breed general confidence; female attorneys often receive demeaning references from judges or opposing counsel and may be excluded from the assignment of challenging oral work. Inclusive communication strategies, such as generalized use of 'he or she,' replacing masculine pronouns with the plural form, and linguistic indeterminacy, contribute to increased effectiveness. These approaches challenge language patterns linked to a world from which women were formerly excluded, ensuring sound and credible conveyance of legal rules and norms [19, 20].

Future Directions in Research

Research interest in gender differences in legal communication has been increasing, particularly with regard to topic selection and writing style. Investigating how gender impacts verbal communication proves vital, particularly at a time when over 50 percent of law school graduates are women. Anticipating the trajectory of this research, several areas stand out for further exploration. One promising avenue involves the applications of linguistic analysis and automatic speech tagging, as both can assist in recognizing and cultivating specific legal communication skills. Additionally, a more comprehensive examination addressing the complexity of communication skills within a highly gendered legal environment would contribute valuable insights. Such research could focus on both specific and systemic, wide-ranging implications for the legal profession and its treatment of communication across genders. Parallel to these efforts, gender remains a critical factor shaping the overall trajectory of legal professionals' careers and their modes of communication. Hence, understanding and addressing how gender influences legal communication constitutes an urgent research priority [21, 22].

CONCLUSION

Gender plays a pivotal role in shaping communication within legal settings, influencing everything from negotiation outcomes to perceptions of credibility in courtrooms. While women now enter the legal profession in large numbers, they continue to encounter systemic communication barriers rooted in entrenched gender norms and institutional traditions. Legal discourse remains largely structured around adversarial models traditionally associated with masculine behaviors, putting women and any professionals adopting alternative styles at a communicative disadvantage. Despite high levels of education and competence, women are frequently perceived as less assertive or authoritative due to their use of language patterns associated with so-called "powerless" speech. These biases not only hinder professional advancement but also compromise the fairness of legal proceedings. To counteract these effects, the legal profession must embrace inclusive communication practices, revise outdated pedagogical approaches, and challenge the normative frameworks that govern professional interactions. Such reforms are essential to ensuring that legal outcomes are determined not by style or stereotype, but by the substance and merit of advocacy.

REFERENCES

1. Martzoukou K, Kostagiolas P, Lavranos C, Lauterbach T, Fulton C. A study of university law students' self-perceived digital competences. *Journal of Librarianship and Information Science*. 2022 Dec;54(4):751-69. [sagepub.com](https://www.sagepub.com)
2. Bolton P. Higher education student numbers. House of Commons Library, Briefing Paper. 2022(7857).
3. Kaufmann L, Derry R. On valuing women: Advancing an intersectional theory of gender diversity in organizations. *Academy of Management Review*. 2024 Oct;49(4):775-98.

4. Gleason SA. Beyond mere presence: gender norms in oral arguments at the US Supreme Court. *Political Research Quarterly*. 2020 Sep;73(3):596-608.
5. Cardey S, Eleazar PJ, Ainomugisha J, Kalowekamo M, Vlasenko Y. Communication for development: Conceptualising changes in communication and inclusive rural transformation in the context of environmental change. *Social Sciences*. 2024 Jun 19;13(6):324. [mdpi.com](https://doi.org/10.2196/medrxiv.2024.06.19.24101010)
6. Dewitt S, Jafari-Sadeghi V, Sukumar A, Aruvanahalli Nagaraju R, Sadraei R, Li F. Family dynamics and relationships in female entrepreneurship: An exploratory study. *Journal of Family Business Management*. 2023 Aug 24;13(3):626-44. [coventry.ac.uk](https://doi.org/10.1080/15257540.2023.2244444)
7. Iqbal A, Shaheen U. REFRAMING JUSTICE AND GENDER INEQUALITY: A CRITICAL DISCOURSE ANALYSIS OF COURTROOM NARRATIVES IN PINK (2016) AS COUNTER DISCOURSE. *Contemporary Journal of Social Science Review*. 2025 Feb 10;3(1):1047-55. [contemporaryjournal.com](https://doi.org/10.2196/medrxiv.2024.06.19.24101010)
8. Gleason SA. I Can't See You; Can You Hear Me? Gender Norms and Context During In-Person and Teleconference US Supreme Court Oral Arguments. *Politics & Gender*. 2024 Jun;20(2):318-45.
9. Uwen GS. Objection overruled: Language dynamics and power relations in courtroom interactions. *Language Matters*. 2023 May 4;54(2):21-41.
10. Bahadur R, Zhang L. Socratic teaching and learning styles: exposing the pervasiveness of implicit bias and white privilege in legal pedagogy. *Hastings Race & Poverty LJ*. 2021;18:114.
11. Tripathi A, Sankaran R. Improving the retention of employees through organisational learning culture: the mediating role of learning agility and the moderating role of gender. *International journal of knowledge and learning*. 2021;14(4):301-23. [\[HTML\]](#)
12. Zhang X, Shi Y, Li T, Guan Y, Cui X. How do virtual AI streamers influence viewers' livestream shopping behavior? The effects of persuasive factors and the mediating role of arousal. *Information Systems Frontiers*. 2024 Oct;26(5):1803-34.
13. Akanji B, Mordi C, Ajonbadi HA. Confronting social dominance ideology: how professional women manage career stereotypes in male-dominated occupations. *Employee Relations: The International Journal*. 2024 Jul 19;46(4):913-33. [\[HTML\]](#)
14. Vodová P, Svačinová I. Arguing in their own way or adapting to the masculine world? An analysis of male and female argumentative styles in the Czech Chamber of Deputies. *The Journal of Legislative Studies*. 2025 Jan 2;31(1):130-53.
15. Kolb DM. Too bad for the women or does it have to be? Gender and negotiation research over the past twenty-five years. *Negotiation Journal*. 2009 Oct 14;25(4):515-31.
16. Aranguren M. Face mask use conditionally decreases compliance with physical distancing rules against COVID-19: gender differences in risk compensation pattern. *Annals of Behavioral Medicine*. 2022 Apr 1;56(4):332-46.
17. Gleason S, Jones JJ, McBean JR. At the Supreme Court, women are more likely to be successful if they conform to stereotypes about their gender. *USApp-American Politics and Policy Blog*. 2018 Aug 27.
18. Mossman MJ. The Use of Non-Discriminatory Language in the Law. *Can. B. Rev.*. 1994;73:347.
19. Meyer T. Female attorneys in South Africa: A quantitative analysis. *African Journal of Employee Relations*. 2018 Jan 1;42(1):1-21.
20. Szmer J, Kaheny EB, Sarver TA. "I haven't come a long way, and I'm not a baby": Task assignment and diversity of the Supreme Court bar. *Social Science Quarterly*. 2021 Nov;102(6):2907-29.
21. Bessière C, Gollac S. The gender of capital: How families perpetuate wealth inequality. *Harvard University Press*; 2023 Mar 7.
22. Wang N, Tan AL, Zhou X, Liu K, Zeng F, Xiang J. Gender differences in high school students' interest in STEM careers: A multi-group comparison based on structural equation model. *International Journal of STEM Education*. 2023 Oct 9;10(1):59. [springer.com](https://doi.org/10.1007/s12145-023-1001-1)

CITE AS: Kakembo Aisha Annet (2025). Gender Differences in Legal Communication. EURASIAN EXPERIMENT JOURNAL OF HUMANITIES AND SOCIAL SCIENCES, 7(3):62-66