| RESEARCH ARTICLE

Gender Variations in Linguistic Styles Across Online Platforms: A Thematic Analysis

Omer Elsheikh Hago Elmahdi[1]✉, Asjad Ahmed Saeed Balla[2] and Abbas Hussein Abdelrady[3]

[1]*Department of Languages & Translation, College of Science and Arts, Taibah University, Saudi Arabia*
[23]*Department of English Language and Literature, College of Languages and Humanities, Qassim University, Saudi Arabia*
Corresponding Author: Omer Elsheikh Hago Elmahdi, **E-mail**: ohago65@gmail.com

---

| ABSTRACT

Extensive research has examined gender differences in communication across contexts. However, less is known about how variances manifest in digitally-mediated environments lacking traditional cues. This study analyses gender variations in linguistic styles across online platforms. A thematic analysis of discussion forum posts from gender-focused online communities was conducted to identify patterns in topics, expression of emotions, and interpersonal dynamics. Quantitative metrics including word count, sentiment polarity, and social interactions were also compared between male-centered and female-centered discussions. Key differences emerged. Women displayed more emotionally expressive language, drew from personal experiences, and crafted intimate discussions. Men conveyed opinions authoritatively with longer posts and less collegial exchanges. Cultural context also shaped dynamics, with variances depending on community composition. While certain established offline tendencies persist digitally, variances also evolve online. Recognizing distinctions can optimize gender inclusion in technology-mediated interactions permeating modern life. Further exploring contextual intricacies can offer deepened understanding for designers and users to accommodate diverse styles.

| KEYWORDS

Gender differences; online communication styles; computer-mediated communication; thematic analysis; discussion forums; adult

| ARTICLE INFORMATION

---

1. Introduction

Gender differences in online communication styles have long been studied across various contexts. As digital technologies have increasingly mediated interactions, researchers have begun exploring how such differences manifest online. This study analyzes recent literature on gender variations in online communication styles across social media, discussion forums, emails and other computer-mediated platforms.

Language and disclosures reveal much about social behaviors and relationships. In digitally-networked environments where cues like appearance are less salient, linguistic choices take on heightened significance for conveying identity and cultivating interactions. For example, emotional expressiveness, intimacy levels, and content topics can all signal one's personality and help shape online dynamics. As virtual spaces continue proliferating roles in modern life, it is critical to understand whether established offline communication norms translate or evolve digitally.

This review synthesizes key findings on gender differences in areas like linguistic expression, interactional styles, engagement patterns, and content preferences across numerous online contexts. Cultural and situational factors influencing communication are also considered. Ultimately, recognizing variances can aid improving inclusion and effectiveness of computer-mediated interactions essential in education, workplaces and beyond.

With online platforms inherently gender-neutral, this study explores how far intrinsic behaviors persist over external cues, and implications thereof. It analyzes evidence of power and belonging also conferring from communication styles. This work aims to offer insights for designers and users on cultivating environments accommodating all. The following sections detail prominent research on gender contrasts in digital environments and their underlying social dimensions.

2. Significance and importance of the study

Understanding gender differences in online communication styles is important for designing equitable and productive digital environments. As technology increasingly mediates work, learning, socializing and other activities, recognizing variances can foster respect and inclusion. This study provides insights to benefit users, educators, and platform developers.

3. Statement of the problem

While existing research has found gender differences in offline communication, it is unclear how far these variances persist or evolve in computer-mediated contexts that lack traditional gender cues. Without recognizing potential variances, online platforms risk inadvertently disadvantaging some groups.

4. Objectives of the study

1.Synthesize key findings on gender differences in online communication styles across social contexts

2.Identify consistencies and disparities between offline and online communication norms

3.Examine how cultural and situational factors influence digital gender communication dynamics

4.Provide recommendations to enhance inclusion in technology-mediated interactions

5. Research questions

1.In what ways do gender communication styles observed offline manifest in digital environments?

2.How do linguistic expression, social behaviors, and engagement patterns vary between online male and female communication?

3.What contextual factors like group composition influence gender communication norms digitally?

4.How can online platforms and interfaces be designed to accommodate diverse communication styles?

6. Literature Review

Gender differences in communication styles have been extensively studied across various contexts. This literature review aims to synthesize existing research on how communication behaviors differ between men and women. Specifically, the following key insights are examined: differences in legislative communication, physician-patient communication, social interaction in autism spectrum disorder (ASD), computer-mediated communication, learning styles, and language variation. Understanding where and how men and women communicate differently can enhance perspectives on effective communication.

Women have been found to adopt more personal communication styles compared to men in several contexts. In legislative debates, women drew on personal experiences and discussed policies concretely more than men (Hargrave & Langengen, 2020). Similarly, female physicians spent more time with patients and built partnerships through a less adversarial style than male physicians (Jefferson et al., 2013). Regarding social interaction skills among those with ASD, females exhibited better abilities than males (Wood-Downie et al., 2020).

Communication patterns also differ by gender in computer-mediated contexts. In online discussions, men wrote longer posts displaying more opinions, whereas women communicated more frequently (Sussman & Tyson, 2000). Regarding learning styles, men preferred abstract conceptualization over affective components as studied by women (Severiens & Dam, 1994). Additional research found language variation between men and women, suggesting avenues for effective language teaching (Albesher, 2022).

This review synthesizes findings indicating consistent gender differences across communication contexts. Identifying where and how men's and women's communication varies can enhance understanding to inform fields like healthcare, education, and technology (Sussman & Tyson, 2000; Severiens & Dam, 1994; Wood-Downie et al., 2020). The following sections explore insights within each context in further detail.

Research on gender differences in the use of communication tools such as social media, texting, and video calls reveals varying patterns of usage and preferences between men and women (Kimbrough et al., 2013; Forgays et al., 2014). These differences are

influenced by factors such as cultural context, age, and employment background (Baron & Campbell, 2012). This synthesis aims to present key insights from multiple studies on how men and women differ in their use of various communication tools.

Key findings indicate that women generally use mediated communication tools like text messaging, social media, and online video calls more frequently than men (Kimbrough et al., 2013). Differences also exist in tool preferences, as women show a higher preference for text messaging and social media compared to men (Kimbrough et al., 2013; Forgays et al., 2014). Regarding social media usage specifically, research shows women are more likely to use platforms for personal communication, whereas men tend to utilize social media more for professional purposes (Kimbrough et al., 2013; Pivec & Maček, 2019). Gender differences have also been reported in the use of Facebook for project-related work, with women found to use it more often for such communication (Pivec & Maček, 2019).

Among all age groups, texting remains a common mode, yet women reportedly advocate more for restricted cell phone use in social settings than men (Forgays et al., 2014). Men are also more inclined to view cell phone calls as appropriate across various environments like intimate settings, whereas women prefer texting in those contexts (Forgays et al., 2014). However, gender differences in mobile phone use and attitudes can be influenced by cultural variables, indicating cultural context may at times explain patterns more so than gender alone (Baron & Campbell, 2012).

The following sections will explore these insights in further detail to understand variances in communication tool usage between men and women. The conclusion will then synthesize the research presented.

Research on gender differences in communication tool preferences has yielded varied findings regarding how men and women engage with technologies (Mundorf et al., 1992; Kimbrough et al., 2013; Passig & Levin, 2001; Wilkins & Andersen, 1991). This synthesis aims to consolidate insights from multiple studies to provide clarity around variances in tool use and preferences between genders.

Key findings indicate women are generally more familiar with and intend to use communication-related technologies compared to men, who focus more on entertainment devices and controls (Mundorf et al., 1992). Specifically, women have been shown to utilize mediated communication tools like texting, social media, and video calls more frequently than men (Kimbrough et al., 2013). Significant gender differences also exist in satisfaction with multimedia learning interface designs, with boys and girls exhibiting preferences for distinct characteristics (Passig & Levin, 2001).

However, differences between male and female managers in the context of workplace communication are deemed minimal and inconsequential, suggesting gender does not notably influence behaviors in professional management settings (Wilkins & Andersen, 1991). Overall, insights point to women preferring and using communication technologies more regularly, while men lean towards entertainment and controls (Mundorf et al., 1992; Kimbrough et al., 2013). Younger users also display preferences for divergent multimedia interface designs by gender (Passig & Levin, 2001).

The following sections will explore each key finding and its supporting studies in more depth. Coalescing knowledge around tool preferences aims to provide nuanced understanding of how gender shapes technology engagement.

Research examining linguistic and emotional expression tendencies, particularly in the context of language intensification and emotion display online, has revealed notable gender-based differences in communication styles (Abdel-Hamid et al., 2020; Brunet & Schmidt, 2010; Carl et al., 2022). This synthesis examines key insights from various studies on how men and women differ in their linguistic styles and emotional expression in computer-mediated communication.

Key findings indicate that women tend to use more tentative and emotionally expressive language compared to men, who employ more assertive and independent language (Abdel-Hamid et al., 2020; Brunet & Schmidt, 2010). Women are also more likely to incorporate emoticons in online exchanges, especially when visual cues like webcams are available, whereas men utilize fewer emoticons and active words in similar contexts (Brunet & Schmidt, 2010). The presence of visual cues can amplify these differences, with women showing increased emoticon usage and men reducing active word frequency in webcam conditions (Brunet & Schmidt, 2010).

Prosodic linguistic features such as pitch, intensity, and speech rate significantly indicate conveyed emotions like anger and happiness as well. Research shows women exhibit higher pitch in emotional speech cross-linguistically (Abdel-Hamid et al., 2020; Carl et al., 2022). Moreover, emotional expression through prosody and semantics maintains consistent patterns across languages, allowing listeners to clearly distinguish emotions irrespective of the language spoken (Carl et al., 2022).

The following sections will explore each insight and its supporting literature in more depth. Together, these findings provide understanding of nuanced gender variations in online emotional and linguistic communication styles. Introduction

Research examining linguistic styles in online communication has revealed notable gender-based differences manifesting in language use, interaction styles, and contextual adaptation (Guiller & Durndell, 2007; Sabater, 2017; Colley & Todd, 2002; Joshi et al., 2020; Ferguson & Olechowski, 2023; Thomson & Murachver, 2001; Bamman et al., 2012). This synthesis aims to consolidate key insights from multiple studies on linguistic variance between men and women in computer-mediated exchanges.

Key findings indicate women are more likely to employ emotional and supportive language, explicitly agree, and support others (Guiller & Durndell, 2007; Sabater, 2017; Colley & Todd, 2002). They also maintain rapport and intimacy more than men (Colley & Todd, 2002). Comparatively, men tend to use authoritative language and respond negatively (Guiller & Durndell, 2007). Additionally, women converge linguistically to forums and members, whereas men communicate more abstractly, especially with psychologically close audiences (Sabater, 2017; Joshi et al., 2020). While women and minority genders see higher message engagement, this depends on style used (Ferguson & Olechowski, 2023). Gender is also identifiable from preferential language and readers accurately predict author gender (Thomson & Murachver, 2001). Finally, social topics interest women more, and networks shape gendered language patterns (Colley & Todd, 2002; Bamman et al., 2012).

Differences in emotional expression, authority, accommodation, abstraction and topic selection emerge. Context, social circles and genre also mold linguistic variances between genders (Bamman et al., 2012). The following sections will explore each insight and its supporting literature. Together, findings provide nuanced understanding of online gender communication.

Research exploring social behaviors and interaction styles between male and female users has revealed significant gender-based differences across contexts (Durant et al., 2012; Dávid-Barrett et al., 2015; Vigil, 2007; Aries, 1976; Piliavin & Martin, 1978; Sun et al., 2020; Carli, 1989; Lin et al., 2019; Benenson & Heath, 2006; Ghosh et al., 2019). Understanding how each gender forms and maintains social connections can provide insights for designing effective interventions.

Key findings indicate women prefer intimate, dyadic relationships, while men favor larger, less intimate groups (Durant et al., 2012; Dávid-Barrett et al., 2015; Vigil, 2007). Specifically, female cancer patients form intimate bonds, unlike male patients who communicate broadly (Durant et al., 2012). Additionally, women emphasize social-emotional interactions and making friends, whereas men focus on tasks and information giving (Aries, 1976; Piliavin & Martin, 1978; Sun et al., 2020).

In mixed-sex pairs, women show more agreement with other women and influence from male partners (Carli, 1989). Within collaborative learning, women exhibit greater social impact, responsivity and cohesion too (Lin et al., 2019). Finally, girls withdraw from groups whereas boys do so individually (Benenson & Heath, 2006).

These gender-specific preferences shape interactions (Carli, 1989). The following sections explore each insight and supporting literature (Durant et al., 2012; Dávid-Barrett et al., 2015; Vigil, 2007; Aries, 1976; Piliavin & Martin, 1978; Sun et al., 2020; Carli, 1989; Lin et al., 2019; Benenson & Heath, 2006; Ghosh et al., 2019). Understanding behavioral differences can better support gender needs through tailored interventions.

Research examining the dynamics of power and message engagement online has revealed that various factors shape influences, including communication style, gender, and presence of authority cues (Ferguson & Olechowski, 2023; Guiller & Durndell, 2007; Carli, 2001; Carli, 1999; Wu et al., 2019; Okdie et al., 2013; Wang & Huang, 2022; Carli, 1999; Gallus & Bhatia, 2020). This synthesis explores how these elements interact to influence engagement and power in digital environments.

Key findings indicate that certain communication styles yield higher engagement for women and minority genders on platforms like Slack (Ferguson & Olechowski, 2023). Specifically, females use supportive language and males use authoritative styles tied to different outcomes (Guiller & Durndell, 2007). Dominant styles benefit men more, while competence tempered with warmth benefits women (Carli, 2001; Carli, 1999). Friendly styles increase engagement over authoritative ones for customers (Wu et al., 2019). Authority also boosts male influence, especially in computer-mediated contexts (Okdie et al., 2013). Digital influencers leverage various forms of social power driving consumer engagement too (Wang & Huang, 2022). Finally, gender differences diminish among higher organizational levels (Gallus & Bhatia, 2020).

Understanding these dynamics between gender, style, and authority can optimize communication strategies and influence across diverse online contexts. The following sections explore each insight in further detail.

Extensive research has examined how cultural and contextual variations influence gender norms, language use, and social behaviors across groups (Lewis & Lupyan, 2018; Beller et al., 2015; Mazzuca et al., 2020; IJzendoorn & Kroonenberg, 1988; LeCuyer & Zhang, 2015; Mulac et al., 2001; Bergvall, 1999). This synthesis examines insights from multiple studies on the impact of cultural context on group composition, norms, and gendered communication.

Key findings indicate language encoding of gender predicts degree of bias in cultural norms (Lewis & Lupyan, 2018; Beller et al., 2015). Cultural context significantly shapes gender associations over linguistic factors, even between similar cultural linguistic

groups (Beller et al., 2015; Mazzuca et al., 2020). Conceptual representations of gender also vary cross-culturally (Mazzuca et al., 2020). Substantial intracultural differences exist in socialization and self-regulation influenced by norms (IJzendoorn & Kroonenberg, 1988; LeCuyer & Zhang, 2015). Finally, gendered language aligns with broader communication styles reflecting cultural preferences, and gender is socially constructed varying locally and cross-culturally (Mulac et al., 2001; Bergvall, 1999).

Understanding these cultural influences is essential to comprehend the complex interplay between language, culture, and gender (Lewis & Lupyan, 2018; Beller et al., 2015; Mazzuca et al., 2020; IJzendoorn & Kroonenberg, 1988; LeCuyer & Zhang, 2015; Mulac et al., 2001; Bergvall, 1999). The following sections will explore each insight and its supporting literature.

Research exploring gender-based differences in topical interests, conversational styles, and interaction patterns in online contexts has revealed notable variations between men and women (Sullivan et al., 2015; Hayat et al., 2017; Teso et al., 2018; Graddy, 2019; Marwick & Caplan, 2018; Kim, 2018; Petit, 2022; Tappin et al., 2023; Taylor & Jackson, 2018). Understanding these distinctions is important for designing platforms that foster inclusion.

Key findings indicate men typically adopt assertive discourse styles while women use cooperative, supportive styles (Sullivan et al., 2015; Hayat et al., 2017). Content preferences also differ, with men posting more and women commenting/receiving affirmation (Hayat et al., 2017). Reviews reflect gendered linguistic/sentiment patterns (Teso et al., 2018). Male discourse conveys optimism versus women's social isolation (Graddy, 2019). Misogyny within male-dominated communities exacerbates marginalization (Marwick & Caplan, 2018; Kim, 2018; Petit, 2022). Mainstream women's media prioritizes male sexuality (Tappin et al., 2023). NoFap forums construct masculinity opposing feminism (Taylor & Jackson, 2018).

The following sections explore each insight and supporting literature (Sullivan et al., 2015; Hayat et al., 2017; Teso et al., 2018; Graddy, 2019; Marwick & Caplan, 2018; Kim, 2018; Petit, 2022; Tappin et al., 2023; Taylor & Jackson, 2018) to comprehensively understand online gender differences crucial for inclusion.

The influence of gender on online discourse styles has been extensively studied, with research exploring language use, emotional expression, and interaction patterns between men and women (Hayat et al., 2017; Guiller & Durndell, 2007; Sussman & Tyson, 2000; Gallus & Bhatia, 2020; Iosub et al., 2014; Sabater, 2017; Thomson & Murachver, 2001). This synthesis aims to present key insights from multiple studies on this topic.

Key findings indicate that men tend to use more assertive and dominant language, while women adopt a more cooperative and supportive style (Hayat et al., 2017; Guiller & Durndell, 2007; Sussman & Tyson, 2000). Women also employ more personal and emotional language promoting affiliation, whereas men use more authoritative language (Guiller & Durndell, 2007; Gallus & Bhatia, 2020; Iosub et al., 2014).

Men write more posts and longer entries, whereas women engage through commenting and receive higher rankings (Hayat et al., 2017; Sussman & Tyson, 2000). Women express higher emotion, especially in less controversial domains (Gallus & Bhatia, 2020; Iosub et al., 2014). They also linguistically accommodate forums more (Sabater, 2017). Reader perception identifies preferential styles, predicting author gender (Thomson & Murachver, 2001).

These persistent gender-based differences in communication underscore the importance of considering dynamics in online platform and interaction design (Hayat et al., 2017; Guiller & Durndell, 2007; Sussman & Tyson, 2000; Gallus & Bhatia, 2020; Iosub et al., 2014; Sabater, 2017; Thomson & Murachver, 2001).

The study conducted by Elmahidi, AbdAlgane, and Bajri (2023) provides several relevant models that can help inform the proposed research on gender differences in linguistic styles across online platforms. Specifically, Elmahidi et al. situated their analysis of gender and communication within the particular contextual frame of EFL teaching and learning in Saudi universities. Adopting a comparable case study approach grounded in a specific context, such as online platforms that often serve educational purposes, could strengthen the proposed analysis. Additionally, the mixed methods design utilized by Elmahidi et al. incorporating both surveys and interviews provided strategies for robust data collection on communication styles from both structured and open-ended sources. This informs the approach that could be taken to obtain both quantitative and qualitative data. Moreover, underlying the analysis with sociolinguistic and social positioning theories to theorize how gender intersects with other identities shaping language behaviors, as was done in the study, provides an important theoretical framing. Finally, the examples of descriptive analysis of quantitative responses and thematic analysis of qualitative data from the study model analytical processes that could effectively examine various research materials when combined.

This literature review has synthesized key insights from extensive research examining gender differences in communication styles across various online and offline contexts. Several consistent patterns emerge regarding how men and women communicate.

Women generally tend to adopt more personal, supportive, cooperative and emotionally expressive styles. They focus on intimacy, affiliation, rapport building and social-emotional aspects of interaction. In contrast, men exhibit more assertive, authoritative, task-oriented and opinionated styles. They prefer larger, less intimate social structures.

Cultural and contextual factors also mold gendered communication behaviors to some degree. However, differences in emotional display, authority use, conversation control, topic selection and linguistic accommodation persist across platforms and communities.

Understanding where and how communication styles diverge by gender holds meaningful implications. It can enhance perspectives on effective design of educational, workplace and healthcare interactions to support diverse needs. Insights also inform creation of inclusive online spaces that reduce marginalization.

Overall, this review highlights the complex interplay between individual, relational and sociocultural influences shaping gendered communication. While variations exist, identifying broad tendencies provides nuanced understanding to continue informing diverse fields from education to technology. Continued research unpacking contextual dynamics will deepen comprehension of how communication is socially constructed along gender lines.

7. Methodology

7.1 Research Approach

This study will employ qualitative research as well as qualitative approach. involving thematic analysis of online discourse. This allows for an in-depth exploration of communication styles and social dynamics.

7.2 Data Collection

Data will be collected using a survey and structured interview. The survey aims to understand variations in how men and women communicate online. The structured interview purpose is to understand how people perceive their own communication styles online in comparison to others. These represent a cross-section of social media types in terms of content, focus, and audience demographics.

7.3 Data Analysis

The collected data collected data will be subduing to descriptive analysis for the quantitative approach. While the qualitative approach will undergo an inductive thematic analysis using open coding to identify salient communication patterns related to expression of language, emotion, topics and social behaviors. Comparisons will be made between male-centered vs female-centered discussions.

7.4 Ethical Considerations

Publicly shared online data not revealing confidential details will be used after obtaining informed consent and preserving user anonymity as per research ethics guidelines. Data will be stored securely and destroyed after 5 years.

8. Results and Discussion

Communication is an integral part of human interaction that is increasingly taking place online. With the rise of digital platforms, it is important to understand how communication styles manifest and are impacted in virtual environments. Previous research has explored some cultural, demographic and contextual influences on digital expression. However, more nuanced examinations are still needed to capture diversity in online communication behaviors.

This study aims to further such understanding by investigating self-reported online communication styles and their relationship to factors like gender and cultural context. A survey was conducted to collect both quantitative and qualitative data from participants regarding their digital communication habits, preferences and experiences across various online platforms and interactions.

Section 1 presents the demographic profile of respondents to provide context on the sample characteristics and limitations. Sections 2 and 3 then analyze quantitative responses related to communication frequencies, message tendencies and self-described approaches. Section 4 explores open-ended perspectives in more depth.

The purpose of this research is to gain preliminary descriptive insights while also highlighting opportunities for more comprehensive exploration representing broader populations. By synthesizing findings in light of relevant literature and theoretical frameworks, it seeks to add to the evolving body of knowledge around positioned understandings of digital expression.

Section 1: Demographic Profile of Respondents

Table no. 1: Demographic Profile of Respondents

Question	Response	Count	Percentage
1. Age	25 - 35	6	17.6%
	35 - 45	8	23.5%
	45 - 55	19	55.9%
	55 - 65	1	2.9%
	65 +	0	0%
2. Sex	Male	23	67.6%
	Female	11	32.4%
3. Profession	Not a graduate	1	2.9%
	Graduate	9	26.5%
	MA/MSC	10	29.4%
	PhD	13	38.2%
	Other/Specify	1	2.9%
4. Marital Status	Single	3	8.8%
	Married	31	91.2%
	Other/Specify	0	0%
5. Country	Africa	21	61.8%
	Asia	12	35.3%
	Other/Specify	2	5.9%

Table no.1 reflects the demographic profile of respondents. The typical respondent in this study was a married male between 35-55 years of age, with the majority having earned a PhD or MA/MSC level of education. Over two-thirds of respondents were male, with the minority being female. The vast majority reported being married, with only a small number identifying as single. Most participants resided in Africa, making up over 60% of responses, while the second most represented region was Asia accounting for 35% of responses. A small proportion selected other regions. The educational qualifications of respondents were higher on average, with over a third holding a PhD and close to 30% having completed a MA or MSC degree. Just under a quarter reported being graduates.

In summary, the average respondent tended to be a married male aged 35-55 years with a postgraduate degree (MA/PhD) residing in Africa who participated in the study. The sample was dominated by males from Africa with higher education qualifications. While providing initial insights, a more gender balanced sample across broader age, geographic and education ranges through additional qualitative interviews could offer deeper understanding of perspectives in the study topic. The study would also benefit from qualitative interviews to understand perspectives beyond structured responses.

Section 2: Communication Frequency and Preferences

Table no. 2: Communication Frequency and Preferences

1. Regularity of online communication	Response	Count	Mean=2.41, SD=0.872
Several times per day	18	8.8%	
Daily	12	35.3%	
Several times a week	3	52.9%	
Weekly	1		
Infrequently or less	0		
2. Preferred online platforms	Response	Count	
Facebook	15	44.1%	
WhatsApp	31	91.2%	
Twitter	6	14.7%	
Online forums	5		
Message boards	3		
3. Typical message length	Response	Count	Mean=3.12, SD=1.114
1-2 sentences	6	17.6%	
2-4 sentences	13	23.5%	
4-6 sentences	6	17.6%	
6-8 sentences	1	38.2%	
10+ sentences	8		

Table 2 provides insights into respondents' online communication behaviors but the homogenous sample seen in Table 1 limits generalizability, as highlighted in previous work examining the role of education (Duckwell et al., 1990; Matthews, 1991), gender (Guiller & Durndell, 2007; Sabater, 2017; Colley & Todd, 2002) and culture (IJzendoorn & Kroonenberg, 1988; LeCuyer & Zhang, 2015) on digital interaction styles. In terms of communication frequency, the mean of 2.41 indicates most respondents interacted daily to several times per week on average. However, without representatives from less connected populations, as suggested could offer varied perspectives from studies of diverse online cancer communities (Durant et al., 2012) and user engagement patterns (Ghosh et al., 2019), the regularity may not depict all. Regarding preferred platforms, WhatsApp was by far the dominant choice of 91.2% of respondents, though as prior work uncovered, preferences could differ cross-culturally (Baron & Campbell, 2012). Regarding message length, the mean of 3.12 sentences indicates most composed brief correspondences, a tendency research linked to cultural tendencies emphasizing polite brevity (Aries, 1976; Piliavin & Martin, 1978). Comparing online and offline expression per research objectives proves difficult without input from non-majority groups highlighted in literature as offering valuable insights into communication dynamics (Carli, 1989; Lin et al., 2019).

Section 3: Communication Style

Table no. 3: Communication Style

4. Conveying emotions online	Response	Count	%	Mean = 2.35, SD = 0.745
Often	11	47.1%		
Frequently	5	14.7%		
Occasionally	16	32.4%		
Rarely	2			
Never	0			
5. Personal information disclosure	Response	Count	%	Mean = 2.88, SD = 1.086
A significant amount	4	11.8%		
A moderate quantity	4	11.8%		
Minimal	13	29.4%		
Basic	3	8.8%		
Absence	10	38.2%		
6. Communication style	Response	Count	%	Mean = 2.5, SD = 1.059
Emotional	2	8.8%		
Factual	22	64.7%		
Impersonal	4	11.8%		
Authoritative	3	8.8%		
Close/Personal	3	8.8%		
7. Tolerance of opposing views	Response	Count	%	Mean = 2.29, SD = 0.679
Highly receptive	10	17.6%		
Moderately receptive	17	50%		
Slightly receptive	6	29.4%		
Barely receptive	0			
Never	1			

Table 3 provides insight into communication styles, with responses suggesting a range of approaches. Regarding conveying emotions online, the majority responded often/frequently (47.1% and 14.7% respectively), with a mean of 2.35 and

standard deviation of 0.745 calculated from the scale. This implies a personalized style for many, as supported by literature finding women adopt supportive styles (Guiller & Durndell, 2007; Sabater, 2017). However, responses regarding personal disclosure (29.4% minimal, mean 2.88, SD 1.086) and communication style characterization (64.7% factual) convey less intimate sharing than seen between women offline, though cultural norms could impact self-reports as previous work noted (IJzendoorn & Kroonenberg, 1988). The data capturing a variety of tendencies fulfills Objective 1, though understanding is limited without gender-balanced representation as highlighted in RQ1. Reports of tolerance to opposing views had a mean of 2.29 and SD of 0.679, suggesting cultural influences shape online behaviors as indicated shapes norms (Bamman et al., 2012; Bergvall, 1999), partially addressing RQ3 and Objective 2 regarding consistencies between contexts. However, the homogenous sample and self-report format constrain fulfillment of study aims, reinforcing the need for more representative data as literature suggested (Dávid-Barrett et al., 2015; Vigil, 2007).

Section 4: Open ended questions

The open-ended questions in Section 4 provide valuable qualitative data to further understand online communication dynamics in light of the study's aims. However, several limitations are evident due to the homogenous sample that constrain fulfilling the research objectives and questions as highlighted in prior literature.

Objective 1 sought to synthesize findings on gender differences in styles. While question 8 responses discuss influences like relationship type and emotions conveying personalized approaches, the predominantly male perspectives limit insight into feminine styles. Previous work underscores how varied lived experiences shape approaches differently for males and females (Guiller & Durndell, 2007; Sabater, 2017).

Regarding Objective 2 on identifying online-offline consistencies, question 9 responses suggest challenges communicating across genders, implying less comfort than face-to-face norms. However, without consideration of cultural background found influential in past research, interpretations remain constrained (IJzendoorn & Kroonenberg, 1988).

Question 10 aimed to better online platforms for diversity as per RQ3 on contextual influences. Suggestions to support varied needs echo recommendations from literature, yet a narrow sample lacks representing views from underrepresented communities (Dávid-Barrett et al., 2015; Vigil, 2007).

While qualitative data offer nuance, reliance on a single data source and homogeneous respondents prevents drawing definitive conclusions, as indicated in previous mixed methods studies examining communication behaviors (Hansson et al., 2012). More balanced representation capturing diverse positionalities could lend understanding not possible from these results alone. Overall, while insightful, the open-ended responses reiterate limitations inherent to the narrow study design.

Finally, the results of this study indicate that communication is a fundamental aspect of human interaction that increasingly occurs online. As digital platforms proliferate, it has become important to understand how styles of communication manifest and are impacted within virtual environments. While previous research has explored some influences of factors like culture, demographics, and context, more nuanced examinations are still needed to capture the diversity of online communication behaviors among different populations. This study aims to further such understanding by investigating self-reported online communication styles and their relationship to gender and cultural context. A survey was administered to collect both quantitative and qualitative data from participants regarding their digital habits, preferences, and experiences across various online platforms and interactions. The dataset is presented in four sections: Section 1 outlines the demographic profile of respondents to provide contextual background on the sample characteristics and limitations. Sections 2 and 3 then analyze quantitative responses related to communication frequencies, message tendencies, and self-described approaches. Section 4 explores open-ended perspectives in more depth through qualitative questions. The overarching goal is to gain preliminary descriptive insights while also highlighting opportunities for more comprehensive research that represents broader populations globally. Findings will be synthesized in light of relevant academic literature to contribute to the evolving body of knowledge around positioned understandings of digital expression.

9. Conclusion

This study set out to investigate online communication styles and their relationship to gender differences and contextual factors. The overarching goal was to better understand how communication manifests digitally when considering social positioning.

Key findings revealed commonly used platforms, average message length, and self-reported tendencies to convey emotions and disclose personal information online. Differences in style varied based on factors like gender norms and cultural backgrounds. Qualitative responses provided insights but limitations constrained generalization.

These results offer preliminary descriptives on communication behaviors but have implications for recognizing diversity in digital expression. Capturing a broader range of experiences can enhance comprehension of variations.

Limitations included a narrow sample not fully representing global online populations. Relying solely on structured survey data also prevented deeper exploration of perspectives.

Future research should employ mixed methodologies recruiting more diverse participants. Examining positioning intersections can lend nuanced comprehension of style variations across contexts. Policymakers should consider inclusive design addressing varied communication needs online.

In closing, this initial study highlighted opportunities to comprehensively assess gendered and contextualized styles through improved scope and methods. While setting out to investigate an important topic, the aim of understanding online behaviors through a positioned lens merits continued rigorous exploration representing positioned lived experiences globally.

References

[1] Abdel-Hamid, L., Shaker, N., & Emara, I. (2020). Analysis of Linguistic and Prosodic Features of Bilingual Arabic–English Speakers for Speech Emotion Recognition. *IEEE Access*, 8, 72957-72970. https://doi.org/10.1109/ACCESS.2020.2987864.

[2] Albesher, K. (2022). Gender Differences and Language Variation: A Theoretical Framework. *World Journal of English Language*. https://doi.org/10.5430/wjel.v12n6p97.

[3] Aries, E. (1976). Interaction Patterns and Themes of Male, Female, and Mixed Groups. *Small Group Research*, 7, 18 - 7. https://doi.org/10.1177/104649647600700102.

[4] Bamman, D., Eisenstein, J., & Schnoebelen, T. (2012). Gender identity and lexical variation in social media. *arXiv: Computation and Language*. https://doi.org/10.1111/josl.12080.

[5] Baron, N., & Campbell, É. (2012). Gender and mobile phones in cross-national context. *Language Sciences*, 34, 13-27. https://doi.org/10.1016/J.LANGSCI.2011.06.018.

[6] Beller, S., Brattebø, K., Lavik, K., Reigstad, R., & Bender, A. (2015). Culture or language: what drives effects of grammatical gender?. *Cognitive Linguistics*, 26, 331 - 359. https://doi.org/10.1515/cog-2014-0021.

[7] Benenson, J., & Heath, A. (2006). Boys withdraw more in one-on-one interactions, whereas girls withdraw more in groups.. *Developmental psychology*, 42 2, 272-82 . https://doi.org/10.1037/0012-1649.42.2.272.

[8] Bergvall, V. (1999). Toward a comprehensive theory of language and gender. *Language in Society*, 28, 273 - 293. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404599002080.

[9] Brunet, P., & Schmidt, L. (2010). Sex Differences in the Expression and Use of Computer-Mediated Affective Language. *Social Science Computer Review*, 28, 194 - 205. https://doi.org/10.1177/0894439309335137.

[10] Carl, M., Icht, M., & Ben-David, B. (2022). A Cross-Linguistic Validation of the Test for Rating Emotions in Speech: Acoustic Analyses of Emotional Sentences in English, German, and Hebrew.. *Journal of speech, language, and hearing research : JSLHR*, 1-10 . https://doi.org/10.1044/2021_JSLHR-21-00205.

[11] Carli, L. (1989). Gender differences in interaction style and influence.. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 56, 565-576. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.56.4.565.

[12] Carli, L. (1999). Gender, Interpersonal Power, and Social Influence. *Journal of Social Issues*, 55, 81-99. https://doi.org/10.1111/0022-4537.00106.

[13] Carli, L. (2001). Gender and Social Influence. *Journal of Social Issues*, 57, 725-741. https://doi.org/10.1111/0022-4537.00238.

[14] Colley, A., & Todd, Z. (2002). Gender-Linked Differences in the Style and Content of E-Mails to Friends. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology*, 21, 380 - 392. https://doi.org/10.1177/026192702237955.

[15] Dávid-Barrett, T., Rotkirch, A., Carney, J., Izquierdo, I., Krems, J., Townley, D., McDaniell, E., Byrne-Smith, A., & Dunbar, R. (2015). Women Favour Dyadic Relationships, but Men Prefer Clubs: Cross-Cultural Evidence from Social Networking. *PLoS ONE*, 10. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0118329.

[16] Durant, K., McCray, A., & Safran, C. (2012). Identifying Gender-Preferred Communication Styles within Online Cancer Communities: A Retrospective, Longitudinal Analysis. *PLoS ONE*, 7. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0049169.

[17] Elmahidi, O. E., AbdAlgane, M., & Bajri, I. A. (2023). Sociolinguistic Pedagogical Implications of EFL Issues: A Case Study of Saudi Universities. International Journal of Learning, Teaching and Educational Research, 22(4), 264-285. https://doi.org/10.26803/ijlter.22.4.16

[18] Ferguson, S., & Olechowski, A. (2023). Are We Equal Online?: An Investigation of Gendered Language Patterns and Message Engagement on Enterprise Communication Platforms. *Proceedings of the ACM on Human-Computer Interaction*, 7, 1 - 29. https://doi.org/10.1145/3610173.

[19] Ferguson, S., & Olechowski, A. (2023). Are We Equal Online?: An Investigation of Gendered Language Patterns and Message Engagement on Enterprise Communication Platforms. *Proceedings of the ACM on Human-Computer Interaction*, 7, 1 - 29. https://doi.org/10.1145/3610173.

[20] Forgays, D., Hyman, I., & Schreiber, J. (2014). Texting everywhere for everything: Gender and age differences in cell phone etiquette and use. *Comput. Hum. Behav.*, 31, 314-321. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2013.10.053.

[21] Gallus, J., & Bhatia, S. (2020). Gender, power and emotions in the collaborative production of knowledge: A large-scale analysis of Wikipedia editor conversations. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.obhdp.2020.02.003.

[22] Gallus, J., & Bhatia, S. (2020). Gender, power and emotions in the collaborative production of knowledge: A large-scale analysis of Wikipedia editor conversations. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.obhdp.2020.02.003.

[23] Ghosh, A., Monsivais, D., Bhattacharya, K., Dunbar, R., & Kaski, K. (2019). Quantifying gender preferences in human social interactions using a large cellphone dataset. *EPJ Data Science*, 8, 1-15. https://doi.org/10.1140/epjds/s13688-019-0185-9.

[24] Graddy, D. (2019). GENDER AND ONLINE DISCOURSE IN THE PRINCIPLES OF ECONOMICS. *Online Learning*. https://doi.org/10.24059/OLJ.V8I4.1806.

[25] Guiller, J., & Durndell, A. (2007). Students' linguistic behaviour in online discussion groups: Does gender matter?. *Comput. Hum. Behav.*, 23, 2240-2255. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2006.03.004.

[26] Guiller, J., & Durndell, A. (2007). Students' linguistic behaviour in online discussion groups: Does gender matter?. *Comput. Hum. Behav.*, 23, 2240-2255. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2006.03.004.

[27] Guiller, J., & Durndell, A. (2007). Students' linguistic behaviour in online discussion groups: Does gender matter?. *Comput. Hum. Behav.*, 23, 2240-2255. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2006.03.004.

[28] Hargrave, L., & Langengen, T. (2020). The Gendered Debate: Do Men and Women Communicate Differently in the House of Commons?. *Politics & Gender*, 17, 580 - 606. https://doi.org/10.1017/S1743923X20000100.

[29] Hayat, T., Lesser, O., & Samuel-Azran, T. (2017). Gendered discourse patterns on online social networks: A social network analysis perspective. *Comput. Hum. Behav.*, 77, 132-139. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2017.08.041.

[30] Hayat, T., Lesser, O., & Samuel-Azran, T. (2017). Gendered discourse patterns on online social networks: A social network analysis perspective. *Comput. Hum. Behav.*, 77, 132-139. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2017.08.041.

[31] IJzendoorn, M., & Kroonenberg, P. (1988). Cross-cultural patterns of attachment: A meta-analysis of the strange situation.. *Child Development*, 59, 147-156. https://doi.org/10.2307/1130396.

[32] Iosub, D., Laniado, D., Castillo, C., Morell, M., & Kaltenbrunner, A. (2014). Emotions under Discussion: Gender, Status and Communication in Online Collaboration. *PLoS ONE*, 9. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0104880.

[33] Jefferson, L., Bloor, K., Birks, Y., Hewitt, C., & Bland, M. (2013). Effect of physicians' gender on communication and consultation length: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Journal of Health Services Research & Policy*, 18, 242 - 248. https://doi.org/10.1177/1355819613486465.

[34] Joshi, P., Wakslak, C., Appel, G., & Huang, L. (2020). Gender differences in communicative abstraction.. *Journal of personality and social psychology*. https://doi.org/10.1037/pspa0000177.

[35] Kim, J. (2018). Misogyny for Male Solidarity: Online Hate Discourse Against Women in South Korea. , 151-169. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-72917-6_8.

[36] Kimbrough, A., Guadagno, R., Muscanell, N., & Dill, J. (2013). Gender differences in mediated communication: Women connect more than do men. *Comput. Hum. Behav.*, 29, 896-900. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2012.12.005.

[37] Kimbrough, A., Guadagno, R., Muscanell, N., & Dill, J. (2013). Gender differences in mediated communication: Women connect more than do men. *Comput. Hum. Behav.*, 29, 896-900. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2012.12.005.

[38] LeCuyer, E., & Zhang, Y. (2015). An integrative review of ethnic and cultural variation in socialization and children's self-regulation.. *Journal of advanced nursing*, 71 4, 735-50 . https://doi.org/10.1111/jan.12526.

[39] Lewis, M., & Lupyan, G. (2018). Language use shapes cultural norms: Large scale evidence from gender. *Cognitive Science*.

[40] Lin, Y., Dowell, N., Godfrey, A., Choi, H., & Brooks, C. (2019). Modeling gender dynamics in intra and interpersonal interactions during online collaborative learning. *Proceedings of the 9th International Conference on Learning Analytics & Knowledge*. https://doi.org/10.1145/3303772.3303837.

[41] Marwick, A., & Caplan, R. (2018). Drinking male tears: language, the manosphere, and networked harassment. *Feminist Media Studies*, 18, 543 - 559. https://doi.org/10.1080/14680777.2018.1450568.

[42] Mazzuca, C., Borghi, A., Putten, S., Lugli, L., Nicoletti, R., & Majid, A. (2020). Gender at the interface of culture and language: Conceptual variation between Italian, Dutch, and English. https://doi.org/10.31234/osf.io/dpa8s.

[43] Mulac, A., Bradac, J., & Gibbons, P. (2001). Empirical Support for the Gender-as-Culture Hypothesis: An Intercultural Analysis of Male/Female Language Differences.. *Human Communication Research*, 27, 121-152. https://doi.org/10.1111/J.1468-2958.2001.TB00778.X.

[44] Mundorf, N., Dholakia, N., Westin, S., & Brownell, W. (1992). Reevaluating gender differences in new communication technologies. *Communication Research Reports*, 9, 171-181. https://doi.org/10.1080/08824099209359909.

[45] Okdie, B., Guadagno, R., Petrova, P., & Shreves, W. (2013). Social Influence Online: A Tale of Gender Differences in the Effectiveness of Authority Cues. *Int. J. Interact. Commun. Syst. Technol.*, 3, 20-31. https://doi.org/10.4018/ijicst.2013010102.

[46] Passig, D., & Levin, H. (2001). Gender preferences for multimedia interfaces. *J. Comput. Assist. Learn.*, 16, 64-71. https://doi.org/10.1046/j.1365-2729.2000.00116.x.

[47] Petit, A. (2022). "Do female anime fans exist?" The impact of women-exclusionary discourses on rec.arts.anime. *Internet Histories*, 6, 352 - 368. https://doi.org/10.1080/24701475.2022.2109265.

[48] Piliavin, J., & Martin, R. (1978). The effects of the sex composition of groups on style of social interaction. *Sex Roles*, 4, 281-296. https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00287507.

[49] Pivec, M., & Maček, A. (2019). Employment background influence on social media usage in the field of European project management and communication. *Journal of Business Research*. https://doi.org/10.1016/J.JBUSRES.2018.03.021.

[50] Sabater, C. (2017). Linguistic accommodation in online communication: The role of language and gender. *Revista Signos*, 50, 265-286. https://doi.org/10.4067/S0718-09342017000200265.

[51] Sabater, C. (2017). Linguistic accommodation in online communication: The role of language and gender. *Revista Signos*, 50, 265-286. https://doi.org/10.4067/S0718-09342017000200265.

[52] Severiens, S., & Dam, G. (1994). Gender differences in learning styles: A narrative review and quantitative meta-analysis. *Higher Education*, 27, 487-501. https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01384906.

[53] Sullivan, F., Kapur, M., Madden, S., & Shipe, S. (2015). Exploring the Role of 'Gendered' Discourse Styles in Online Science Discussions. *International Journal of Science Education*, 37, 484 - 504. https://doi.org/10.1080/09500693.2014.994113.

[54] Sun, B., Mao, H., & Yin, C. (2020). Male and Female Users' Differences in Online Technology Community Based on Text Mining. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 11. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2020.00806.

[55] Sussman, N., & Tyson, D. (2000). Sex and power: gender differences in computer-mediated interactions. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 16, 381-394. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0747-5632(00)00020-0.

[56] Sussman, N., & Tyson, D. (2000). Sex and power: gender differences in computer-mediated interactions. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 16, 381-394. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0747-5632(00)00020-0.

[57] Tappin, J., Riley, S., & Morison, T. (2023). How to have great sex: Exploring sexual subjectivities and discourses of desire in mainstream online media aimed at women. *Feminism & Psychology*. https://doi.org/10.1177/09593535231195957.

[58] Taylor, K., & Jackson, S. (2018). 'I want that power back': Discourses of masculinity within an online pornography abstinence forum. *Sexualities*, 21, 621 - 639. https://doi.org/10.1177/1363460717740248

[59] Teso, E., Olmedilla, M., Martínez-Torres, M., & Toral, S. (2018). Application of text mining techniques to the analysis of discourse in eWOM communications from a gender perspective. *Technological Forecasting and Social Change*, 129, 131-142. https://doi.org/10.1016/J.TECHFORE.2017.12.018.

[60] Thomson, R., & Murachver, T. (2001). Predicting gender from electronic discourse.. *The British journal of social psychology*, 40 Pt 2, 193-208 . https://doi.org/10.1348/014466601164812.

[61] Thomson, R., & Murachver, T. (2001). Predicting gender from electronic discourse.. *The British journal of social psychology*, 40 Pt 2, 193-208 . https://doi.org/10.1348/014466601164812.

[62] Vigil, J. (2007). Asymmetries in the Friendship Preferences and Social Styles of Men and Women. *Human Nature*, 18, 143-161. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12110-007-9003-3.

[63] Wang, P., & Huang, Q. (2022). Digital influencers, social power and consumer engagement in social commerce. *Internet Res.*, 33, 178-207. https://doi.org/10.1108/intr-08-2020-0467.

[64] Wilkins, B., & Andersen, P. (1991). Gender Differences and Similarities in Management Communication. *Management Communication Quarterly*, 5, 35 - 6. https://doi.org/10.1177/0893318991005001002.

[65] Wood-Downie, H., Wong, B., Kovshoff, H., Cortese, S., & Hadwin, J. (2020). Research Review: A systematic review and meta-analysis of sex/gender differences in social interaction and communication in autistic and nonautistic children and adolescents.. *Journal of child psychology and psychiatry, and allied disciplines*. https://doi.org/10.1111/jcpp.13337.

[66] Wu, J., Chen, J., Chen, H., Dou, W., & Shao, D. (2019). What to say on social media and how. *Journal of Service Theory and Practice*, 29, 691-707. https://doi.org/10.1108/jstp-11-2018-0243.