

Tailoring Theoretical Lens and Nudging Bourdieu's Cultural Capital on Gender and Academic Performance

Muhammad Shoaib ^a

Abstract: This paper has been designed to analyze theoretical insights into gender-based academic performance in higher education through the lens of Bourdieu's cultural capital theory. A systematic approach to review the published and available documents in online databases. The researcher reaches the point of saturation by browsing 68 published documents. These documents have been selected using the inclusion criteria on gender differentials in academic performance in higher education. The study findings outline that biological differences are less likely to affect the performance of female and male students rather than shaped by cultural differences. Females' deprivation of education was due to the traditional and cultural practices in male hegemonic society. The study concludes that the difference in educational performance among female and male students in higher education is not linked with biological characteristics. It has roots in the difference of psycho-social, socio-economic, and cultural factors of socialization among female and male students.

Keywords: Gender, Academic Performance, Cultural Capital, Higher Education, Sociology

Introduction

Educational performance has always been an inspirational source of scholarship within the sociology of education (Powell et al., 2019; Shoaib et al., 2024). However, recently the debate on educational performance has acquired a renewed toll of gender differentials (Shoaib, 2024c; Shoaib et al., 2024b). It has been observed that female candidates tend to significantly outperform male students (Shoaib, 2024a, 2024b). Males' underperformance has an attenuating effect on their economic participation while educationally outperforming females might not opt for joining the labor force (Okpara et al., 2005; Rehman et al., 2013; Shoaib et al., 2024a). Apart from this applied concern about educational performance, the question of gender-based differences in educational performance has its intrinsic worth in the field of educational sociology (Shoaib et al., 2024).

There are plenty of studies on the gender-related differences in higher educational performance in Western society (Anwar et al., 2024; Arshad et al., 2024a, 2024b). One stream of researchers highlights the differences in the selection of subjects and consequent career paths (Anwar et al., 2024; Duffy et al., 2001; Frosh et al., 2003). Most of the foundational studies tend to describe female outperformance in terms of socialization differences, communication practices, and learning methods (Ali et al., 2024; Shoaib et al., 2024). It is assumed that females are socialized to adopt caring roles (Shoaib et al., 2023; Shoaib et al., 2023; Steinmayr & Spinath, 2008), which demand good interpersonal and communicational skills (Frijters et al., 2019; Shoaib et al., 2023; Shoaib et al., 2023). Ultimately, this training places female students in an advantaged position (Cheraghi & Schøtt, 2015; Shoaib et al., 2023). Most of these kinds of studies are built upon the assumptions of gender role theory (Shoaib, 2023a, 2023b).

The Data and Methods

This article has been based on a systematic approach to review the secondary data published and available in online databases. This paper has not been based on the primary data or meta-data as used in explanatory research. The criteria for the selection of different studies have been based on the topic and theories linked with the research topic of gender differentials in academic performance and the theories linked with the main theme

^a Associate Professor, Department of Sociology, University of Gujrat, Gujrat, Punjab, Pakistan.
Email: shoaibsoc@uog.edu.pk

of the paper. The online databases include ScienceDirect, Scopus, Web of Science, JSTOR, Emerald, Elsevier, SpringerLink, ProQuest, Wiley, Tylor & Francis, Sage, Ebrary, EBSCOHOST, and APA PsycArticles, etc. The researcher keeps reviewing the articles and theories using the mentioned databases until reaching the point of saturation. The researcher reaches the point of saturation by browsing 68 published documents. Further, these research documents have also been verified from Google Scholar.

Results and Discussion

This section provides theoretical insights into gender differentials in academic performance in higher education through the lens of Bourdieu's cultural capital theory. The theories on gender and academic performance in higher education are; biological determinism, psychological determinism, sociological approaches, and post-structuralist perspective.

Biological Theoretical Explanation

Biological determinism implies that social behavior is an outcome of biological dissimilarities among boys and girls (Aluja-Fabregat et al., [2000](#); Murphy & Hall, [2011](#)). Hence, the famous debate related to nature versus nurture biological determinism tends to accentuate the role of nature in explaining human behavior (Tang et al., [2010](#)). For instance, in explaining the role of elderly females in the moral upbringing of their children and grandchildren, this paradigm may be explained that, after a period of fertility, females have menopause where their sexual desires are attenuated and moral desires are amplified through a biological process. Hence, moral socialization is a result of these biological instincts rather than social pressures or norms. Similarly, this biological determinism approach argues that the female and male basis of differences is based on God's gifted intelligence and skills. Moreover, this biological differential approach to studying academic performance in tertiary education has also been used in the fields of sociology, education, anthropology, and psychology (Shoaib et al., [2022](#); Shoaib et al., [2022](#); Shoaib et al., [2022](#)).

Moreover, biological proponents argue that females and males have physiological differences (Maccoby, [1999](#)). Furthermore, males have high reasoning and cognitive skills as compared to females. Therefore, male students outplay females in tertiary educational examinations. Likewise, this approach also segregates the educational performance of female students in arts and male students in science disciplines (Clarke, [2010](#)). This argument is also linked with Hedges & Nowell ([1995](#)) that female students are strong in verbal and gesture learning. On the other side based on reasoning skills, male students perform better in engineering and science. Furthermore, males are considered physically strong as compared with females which results in better results in reasoning skills (Halberstam, [2019](#)). Studies also point out that females are passive and males are enthusiastic (Andreano & Cahill, [2009](#); Halpern, [1997](#)). Therefore, female performance in education is linked to their body characteristics. Consequently, they can't perform the daring type of work including studying science subjects and outdoor activities in normal life. Similarly, learning abilities are linked with their menstruation period.

On the contrary, female students outshining males in tertiary education based on socio-cultural and study environments including other linked factors rather than biological determinism's view (Anwar et al., [2022](#); Mariam et al., [2022](#); Shoaib et al., [2022](#); Shoaib et al., [2022](#)). It is a gaudily clearer picture from the previous review of the developed, developing, and Muslim world that female students are performing better not only at school, and college, and also at a higher educational level (Shoaib & Ullah, [2021a](#), [2021b](#); Ullah & Shoaib, [2021](#)). It also opens a new discussion among research scholars that biological differences are not valid factors of females lagging in educational examinations (Shoaib et al., [2021](#); Shoaib et al., [2021](#); Shoaib et al., [2021](#)). Moreover, it favors the argument that gender is a socially constructed phenomenon and that differences between female and male educational performances are based on femininity and masculinity rather than biological differences (Francis, [2006](#); Shoaib et al., [2021](#)). Socio-cultural and socio-religious factors of female education had not been considered with serious concerns (Shoaib et al., [2021](#); Shoaib et al., [2021](#)). Relatively, it was assumed based on biological deterministic factors that males are more intellectual and better performers than females (Fausto-Sterling, [2008](#); Shoaib et al., [2021](#)). Likewise, there was a debate between non-academic and academic circles in the light of gender differentials in academic performance in education (Shoaib, [2021](#); Shoaib et al., [2021](#)). It is pertinent here to mention that deterministic factors on gender differentials in educational performance have added a major contribution to the subject under discussion (Ahmad et al., [2021](#); Ahmad et al., [2021](#); Shoaib et al., [2020](#); Shoaib & Ullah, [2019](#)). The forthcoming debate sheds light on the psychological, sociological, and post-structuralist perspectives on gender differentials in academic performances in higher education.

Psychological Theoretical Explanation

Under the umbrella term of psychological determinism, researchers entertain those social-psychological conceptions, which are retained as paramount determinants of social behaviors and socially significant aggregate trends such as gender differences in educational achievement. Sigmund Freud being the flag bearer of psychological determinism holds that while male and female children have a comparably similar early socialization; the identity construction is still more problematic for the males. In fact, unlike females, males have to abandon many "ticklish" norms of early socialization to acquire the true masculine identity. This kind of complex, being the dual track of normative and deviant behaviors, places males in a disadvantaged position as compared to females. According to psychological determinism, secondary socialization at school cannot escape the identity crisis of early socialization; this may explain why females are more conformist students as compared to males.

The theory of psychodynamics given by Freud (1977) also focuses on family factors that contribute to individual personality development including gender identities. Therefore, the primary interaction of children starts with their parents. Based on interaction, a child tries to develop the imaginary aspects of society in the mind. Hence, this theory describes that the building of femininity and masculinity for both girls and boys is linked with the mothers. Mothers start early socialization of their children based on their familial cultural aspects (Grusec, 2011b). The differences between femininity and masculinity are started by the treatment of mothers to their girl and boy children (Hess & Shipman, 1965). The girl child is treated based on feminine characteristics including obeying and being shy in front of others (Grusec, 2011a). While a boy child is treated based on masculine characteristics including encouragement to do the daring type of activities (Block, 1973). Likewise, the color of dresses and toys for girls and boys differ in their early age and are linked with their parents, especially mothers' selection (Jadva et al., 2010; Pomerleau et al., 1990). Consequently, the treatment of a mother to a girl and boy child results in differences in gender identities in their later ages.

A social learning theory explains the development of gender identity. The main proponents of the social learning approach are Bandura & Walters (1977). This theory is also linked with behaviorism and conditioning behavior given by Burchard & Tyler (1964). This approach elaborates that learning is based on the concept of reward and punishment similar to the carrot and stick method. As behavior followed by appreciation and acceptance is likely to be repeated again and again. However, disapproved behavior is likely to be modified and changed accordingly or not repeated based on criticism. Therefore, the parental and familial approach differentiates between the behavioral performance of girls and boys in their early ages. In families, behavior based on gender differences among girls and boys is taught to their children. Furthermore, social learning theory is also in line with the modeling approach and imitation principle. In a family, a girl child prefers to follow the mother, and a boy child prefers to imitate the father. This assumption of the theory is evident that familial background and parental involvement have given space to girl child education. This argument is also supported by the results of Young (2016) that girls are more supported to achieve education that was restricted previously. In addition, female students are getting more support from parents and teachers to get an education and the previous notion of educational restriction has been abandoned (Gurian, 2010). They are also getting appreciation and acceptance from parents which results in their better performance in examinations.

A cognitive development theory by Piaget (1972) and Erikson (1994) also asserts that girl and boy children learn through interaction and try to develop their stages of personality. They try to develop their gender identity starting their sensorimotor stage of personality development to the formal operational stage of personality. During these stages of personality development, girls and boys learn differently to play with toys, recognize objects and symbols, and the ability to analyze the objects logically in later stages. This primary learning in femininity and masculinity develops an opinion about gender differences that may not change over time. Moreover, children achieve internal motivation and try to develop and learn the role of their gender (Halpern, 1997). These roles are linked as feminine and masculine are reflected by society. Further, it is pertinent to mention here that girls' learning and role performance are linked with obedience, shyness, care, submissiveness, household activities, and emotional attachment (Clausen, 1966). Contrary to this, boys' learning is linked with being daring, outdoor activities, normality, and rough behavior (Erikson, 1994). These learning differences result in gender differentials for females and males in the public domain. Similarly, parental dealing and learning environments create differences among females and males in educational performance in examinations (Anwar et al., 2013; Bindu & Thomas, 2006; Shoaib et al., 2012; Shoaib et al., 2012). In the current situation of educational performance, female students are outscoring males in educational examinations not only at schools and colleges but also at the tertiary level. The primary learning and socialization that is developed

at home by parents provide space for girls. Hence, this favorable socialization to females results in their better performance in higher education. Moreover, female students are more competing with their counterparts in learning efforts and parental support as compared to the past.

Sociological Theoretical Explanation

Many sociologists have studied the process of gender socialization and identified differences between female and male behaviors. The process of socialization starts with birth when the family treats a child according to his or her sex in a potentially different way. The socialization of gender roles begins in delivery rooms including a blue dress for boys and a pink dress for girls (Block, [1973](#); Dumais, [2002](#)). Baby enters a world that is updated with language and symbols which shapes its conception of gender stereotypes and gender roles (Gurian, [2010](#)). The language used in a family mostly centers on physical characteristics and themes for boys as agility and strength while appropriate language for girls used by a family might be daintiness, expressivity, and address affection (Grusec, [2011b](#)). Such boundaries become the identity standards, and context is used to compare the self to others. The literature on gender role socialization, the mechanisms and procedures that differentiate acceptable behavior for females and males, and the evolvement of behavior over time. Therefore, these differences in socialization result in gender differentials in academic performance in education.

Post-structuralist Perspective

This perspective on gender role socialization is in direct contrast with more determinist schools of thought from the formative period of social sciences such as biological and psychological determinism. Inspired by ethnomethodology proponents of this school of thought, West & Zimmerman ([2009](#)) believe that gender roles are to be performed by conscious actors who are playing the script provided to them by the interactional situation. Hence, actors can actively do and undo their roles. Hence, this perspective would construct the gender gap in education not as "given" or "situated" as in the case of psychoanalysis but rather more "interactional" and "fluid" as typical of interactionism.

It is pertinent here to mention that girls and boys learn different feminine and masculine identities as per cultural theories based on gendered socialization (Clausen, [1966](#)). Moreover, society provides the lens to perform behavior and roles for each gender (Howard & Hollander, [1997](#)). Likewise, these gendered roles result in providing a clearer picture of the individual to see and analyze the social world. Furthermore, it inhabits each gender, and children perform different activities in their lives that suit their gender (Martin & Ruble, [2004](#)). It illustrates as per the above-mentioned gender identity development approaches, it justifies that the educational performance of females and males is not based on biological determinism. It has been challenged by the performance of female students in developed, developing, and Muslim world countries. However, based on the social construction approach and psychological determinism, the male was dominated in the past in cultural and value structural contexts. Equal space was not provided to females in the past (Lerner, [2005](#)). Moreover, the liberal feminist approach asserts that several societies in the past did not deal with females and males equally but discriminated against females. As per the researcher's understanding, the biological deterministic approach to provide an argument that male students outshine females in the examination was based on biological differences is not valid. It is pretty good to develop the argument that females' underperformance in the past was based on their early unfavorable socialization and gender identity differences starting from their homes. Moreover, their household activities and work burden of child care and familial chores were the main reasons for lagging in educational performance. Gradually, the feminist approach contributed to remove educational barriers for females. But still, the situation of female education in the developed and developing world is not similar. It is pertinent here to mention that females in the developing world are still facing barriers to access to education such as familial value system and gender identity matters.

Likewise, biological determinism, psychological determinism, learning approach, and personality development along with cultural theories provide insight into differences among girls and boys. It includes biological, psychological, role, and cultural differences in learning and developing gender identities. In the early times, boys were preferred by parents and provided more space for education as compared to girls. They performed better than girls based on favorable environment and learning opportunities (Lytton & Romney, [1991](#)). However, as this space and opportunity are provided to girls in learning and education, they are performing better than boys not only at schools and colleges but also at the university level (Dumais, [2002](#)). Currently, female students are not only in competition but also outnumbering and outscoring male students in the examination at the tertiary level. Consequently, it is pertinent here to mention that the performance in the

examination is not only linked with biological determinism but also with the psychological and socio-cultural domains.

Gender-Based Theoretical Explanation

Gender is socially constructed and it is equally supported by social constructionists, feminists, and gender-related theorists (Marecek et al., 2004). According to social constructionists, no other characteristic exists than femininity and masculinity (Harris, 1991). It reveals that gender is not natural or inherited but rather socially learned behavior. Moreover, the social construction of gender is found different in different societies. As many components affect gender in comparison to biological construction (Pomerleau et al., 1990), it is pertinent to identify that if gender is constructed socially then feminine and masculine characteristics may change. It is, further, argued that a man may possess feminine and a woman may possess masculine characteristics because of social and cultural construction rather than biological and sex variance (Stets & Burke, 2000). Hence, when a society lacks a balance of gender power it may produce more variations of masculinity and femininity. In compliance with the study, the Researcher argues that variation in academic performances of female and male students at the tertiary level is directly linked with the polarity of gender differences. Halberstam (2019) identify that variation in feminine and masculine characters does not exist in the West. That's why female students compete with male students in almost all fields, generally, and in education, particularly.

Feminism proponents believe that equal rights and opportunities for females and males in a masculine structure. They demand social equality regardless of sex (Acker, 1987). So, they attracted the attention of the world towards the differences created in femaleness and maleness in society. In the United States, the first wave of feminism formally intended the Seneca Falls Convention in 1848 to highlight the issues of gender inequality in society (Rampton, 2015). It is pertinent here to mention that Elizabeth Cady Stanton drafted the Seneca Fall Declaration. Whereas, the second wave began in the 1960s and continued into the 1990s. It focused the equal education for all and civil rights. Such as Gerhard (2001) conceded that the second wave was persuaded in the light of the Education Act of 1944 and this act was conferred to provide social equality and education regardless of gender. Many of these popular feminist women were born between the fourth and fifth decades of the twentieth century. By realizing the need for female education, they raised their voice and ultimately opened the way for equal education for all particularly female education in the masculine structure of the society. Furthermore, the third wave of feminism (the mid-1990s) focused on the perceived failures of the second wave and challenged the definitions of femininity. The main focus of the third wave was to see females' lives as intersectional; class, gender, nationality ethnicity, etc., are all significant factors in discussing feminism (Drucker, 2018). Thus, it has been argued that the third wave also rejected the notion of biological differences among females and males and pointed out that there are other factors including class, national, and ethnic identity to define femininity. Moreover, the fourth wave of feminism (beginning about 2012) also started with the movement of the 'Metoo Movement' and 'The Time Up Movement' demanding equality in education along with previous main issues.

In compliance with the hegemonic masculine structure of society, several feminist voices came into existence to support women's participation in different arrays of life. Among them, radical feminists emerged in the sixth decade of the twentieth century. Moreover, they argued that masculine effects are not limited to the family level but also prevail over and affect almost all other social institutions (Acker, 1987). Furthermore, the feminists argued that the male hegemony and masculine structures are major components of women's subjugation, generally in society and, particularly, in education. In the past, the failure of females in every single life was more likely associated with their biological and sexual variations while the feminine and masculine factors were not considered. Currently, feminists argue that variations of feminine and masculine are mainly because of male hegemonic values and culture. As the females and males were dealt with in different ways which created a clear rift in gender construction, it prevailed in every field including education.

Rose (1993) asserted that the major reason for the feminine and masculine variation is the male hegemonic structure of society. The argument is, further, supported by Cole, (2017) that the predominant masculine structure is indebted to family and culture that drive social inequalities in society and hence education. As a result, gender differences are not due to sex differences but rather male hegemonic culture of the society. Consequently, it is pertinent to mention the differences between females and males in educational performance in the context of the culture are important. As the concern of cultural viewpoint in my study, similar findings have been reported in the empirical review that, previously, female and male educational performances were more likely linked with biological variations but, later on, in a gender-neutral culture females started performing

better in examinations. Hence, it is argued that biological differences are less likely to affect the performance of female and male students rather they are shaped by cultural differences. Accordingly, depriving females of education was due to the traditional and cultural practices in male hegemonic society. Moreover, feminist proponents raised their voices to provide equal opportunities for females to get an education and perform equally with males.

To insert the assertion of Cole, (2017), it is pertinent to mention here that female and male students are equal by birth and no difference makes one preferable over the other which affects the performance. It is, further, strengthened that, instead of a lack of interest in education and cultural differences, innate factors are less likely to affect the performance of females. Female and male students are, after birth, socialized to seek and adjust to the environment provided by society. Along these lines, they develop imagery of social roles and responsibilities that affect them throughout their later life. It is, certainly, argued that variations in females and males are prevailing and more susceptible to influence the differences in their educational performance in examinations. At this point, the gendered academic performances and underachievement of females in education are more likely associated with the poor and traditional practice of socialization. As a consequence, the argument is also found in my study where the underperformance of female students is more likely associated with poor socialization and residence as girls in rural areas still underperform than girls in the urban centers. As in the West, gender is no longer an indicator of performance while female students achieve better scores in the examination as compared to males.

Similarly, it is also found that the difference between feminine and masculine characteristics also defines the choices and interests of female and male students. Similarly, Lips (2016) also found that female students from traditional rural areas are not getting better grades based on the cultural milieu of that society where femininity is less likely privileged. Likewise, Gilmore (1990) also argued that culture plays an important role in constructing the feminine and masculine traits in society and such traditional practices are the main reasons for female students' underperformance. Based on the above findings, in my study, the female students from urban areas outplay males. This is mainly based on the traditional socialization threat that weakens the males to participate in education. On the assumption that awareness is concerned, in many rural areas' female students are now seeking opportunities for study. They are now equipped due to transition and exceeding the males in education. In the same way, Ortner (1972) also argued that females have been kept inferior by males based on cultural practices. It is however believed that no one is born with occupational specialization, but relatively society and culture create the differences. It is concluded from the above discussion of the feminist assertions that gender is mainly influenced by the masculine culture of society. Females are mainly disturbed by male perspectives as they dominate every walk of life. Males design and execute policies in almost every sphere of life. Owing to this, females have been subjugated and kept at the margins in every field in the past. Males were getting education and outperforming females while females were excluded from education.

Bourdieu's Cultural Capital Theory

Bourdieu is perhaps the best known among sociologists for a comprehensive theoretical lens to explore the complex social structures of society. The main theoretical tools of Bourdieu are habitus, fields, and different forms of capital. The purpose of developing a theoretical insight is to understand concepts and how these are used in the educational achievements of students coming from a rural and urban background and performing differently. However, it is pertinent to interpret the theoretical lens of Bourdieu to acknowledge his stance on sociological concerns. Moreover, concepts of Bourdieu are analogous to explain the conditioning of students towards learning and achievements.

Bourdieu's major theoretical work is habitus. The conditioning that is associated with a particular class of conditions of existence produces habitus, a system of strong, permutable nature, structured constructs to work as developing structures, as principles that produce and accumulate practices and represent which is adopted objectively to seek outcome assuming presupposed results or without showing mastery skills to operate and achieve (Bourdieu, 1990). Habitus describes the structure of education embodied by the students. It is internalized and adopted by the students which are inculcated, initially, by parents and, later teachers. However, the setting is either rural or urban. Despite the differences in the available social structures i.e., rural and urban schools, colleges, and universities, students tend to pursue the dispositions, perceive the external world, and act accordingly to meet the expectations.

Furthermore, it is believed that the behavior of students is not determined by the educational institutions but rather by the social structure, rural and urban society, where they were born, breaded, and socialized. Thus, the primary habitus of students induced in childhood is more durable to learn behaviors regarding social structure rather than learned at a later stage. For example, gender, a primary habitus learned, always remains the same. Bourdieu asserted that habitus is not the only product of social structure rather reproduces structure simultaneously. Habitus can shape and produce practice or practices in any given conditions (Bourdieu, 1983). It is, further, elaborated in the study context that students from rural and urban backgrounds may bring changes to certain behaviors to ensure coexistence and avoid maladjustment in a new setting. After spending some time, students from rural backgrounds adopt the new environment and gradually become part of the new structure and perform better.

Habitus has also been elaborated in connection with capitals. So, the researcher is cognizant of discussing the field of education to magnify the outcomes that grew out of the connection between habitus and fields. The actions are the result of interrelations of habitus, fields, and capitals. However, practice doesn't originate itself but developed out of the interrelationship of habitus, fields, and capitals (Bourdieu, 1990). While fields indicate how actions, attitudes, and knowledge are produced, and circulated by the actors to possess the knowledge, resources, and important state positions by dominating and monopolizing such capitals (Schwartz, 1997). Hence, fields make particular arrangements through any type of capital consisting of dominant and subordinate positions (e.g. urban-rural schools and colleges). Educational institutions vary in rural and urban areas and students from rural areas are supposed to join public schools while urban students have a variety of schools in the private sector. This strife may lead to differences in the educational achievements of students in tertiary education. Fields do not exist without capital. Various forms of fields and capital exist.

Bourdieu has given four forms of cultural capital i.e., economic, cultural, social, and symbolic (Bourdieu, 1986; Jenkins, 2014; Webb et al., 2002). Here, it deals with cultural capital that further exists in three forms. i.e., embodied, objectified, and institutionalized. The first type of capital is embodied which exists in the form of inherent qualities found in the physical and cognitive abode of humans i.e., body and mind, the second form is objectified exists in the form of material goods i.e., journals, books, pictures, dictionary, instrumental and mechanical nature. The third form is institutionalized educational qualifications.

The researcher employed the theoretical lens of Bourdieu in research to explain the diversified dispositions found among the students toward education. As Bourdieu argues social structures embody the habitus and individuals act according to the conditioned dispositions i.e., individuals learn the behavior (habitus) and practice in a field (education) showing the strong disposition of cultural capital (Bourdieu, 1983). Students are normally conditioned to these dispositions to lead towards their educational achievements, shaped by the social structure of the society following the cultural competence of a particular social structure where s/he is socialized. Similarly, Bourdieu explains the role of habitus between structure and agency so that individuals may learn day-to-day routine behaviors and practice to establish, produce, and promote actions using capitals (Bourdieu, 1990).

Researchers found that students from both rural and urban areas have different characteristics and act according to the learned behaviors in the setting of urban and rural social structures. It is observed that urban and rural structures have a profound impact on the exposition of behavior among students in education. Cultural capital is "what makes the games of society . . . something other than a game of chance". The diversity in the achievements of the students refers to cultural capital that demonstrates the high status of those who possess it.

The schools endow and reinforce cultural ability. It is transmitted by higher socio-economic status (SES) parents which eternalize the respective social advantages. Objectified represents the resources of education at home like reading materials and learning facilities) as well as cultural resources like literature and artworks. The learners who are from privileged backgrounds learn the values, perceptions, dispositions, knowledge, and skills from the teachers as they value such resources at the educational institutions. Embodied capital represents various characteristics of students associated with privileged SES families. This sort of resource is helpful in academic achievements. These are dispositions of significant norms, behaviors, and choices about academia and capabilities to prove skills. All of these traits are transferred through schooling while teachers expect students to come up with advanced skills to represent capabilities. Researchers have examined embodied cultural capital using different variables, namely cultural participation, reading habits, parents' child trust, excitement and demands, parental home, and school involvement. Institutionalized capital comprises general and particular

appreciation through certificates, degrees, and rewards the students receive in the academic journey through hard work and passion.

Scholars across the globe have identified cultural capitals as a source of success and recognition as well as they have sorted out the factors contributing to the achievement of students. There is evidence indicating that cultural capital forms although interrelated to each other yet they are different in terms of possession of every form carry different impacts on the lives of the possessors. Huang & Liang, (2016) compared the relationship between all three types of cultural capital and the success of students. However, different researchers examined a small number of variables (parental education, parental expectations, parental reading, and book possession) corresponding to types of cultural capital.

The researcher focused on knowing the gender gap while comparing the strengths to find the nexus between the three forms of capital and their relevance to the achievements of students. It has been discussed that either there is a need to analyze the syntax of cultural capital in a circumscribed way or draw a broader perspective in terms of contribution including language and cognition, seeking knowledge and strengthening skills, and measuring and revisiting the evaluation benchmarks in schools (Lareau & Weininger, 2003). However, the results have been mixed.

Researchers have examined relationships of cultural capital and achievements of students which varies from student to student and place as well (e.g., student sex, grade levels, SES), national contexts, and achievement domains. Again, the evidence is mixed concerning grade levels: Aschaffenburg & Maas, (1997) unveiled more educated students tend less propensity to achievement in education due to cultural contribution. Nonetheless, (Andersen & Hansen, 2012) exposed class and gender inequalities in the achievements of students in secondary schools in Norway due to grammar and uncertain logical arrangements. As for SES, the theory of social reproduction that assumes people who possess high SES levels will possess high cultural capital while they transcend to the successors to contain the hegemony (J. Huang, 2013; Marks & McMillan, 2003). The teachers believe that students who possess this cultural capital will be intelligent and contribute to social reproduction (Kingston, 2001). Contrarily, proponents of cultural mobility theory believed that students from low-income families not having cultural capital can easily learn the cultural codes of education and can avail such cultural resources in academic careers.

The nexus of cultural capital and achievements of students has been evaluated based on an indifferent education system, property, money, and social status possessed by the person in society. In such a case, success in achievement is affected by those who possess more. Consequently, cultural capital is achieved in daily routine even from the interaction of parents and children; the higher the cultural capital higher the achievement.

The social reproduction theory of Bourdieu presents the interrelationship of education, family, and social status (Bourdieu & Passeron, 1977). Education is the main source of social inequalities and subversion. In this process, cultural capital has a pivotal role because the inequalities in the cultural capital refer to an imbalance in the social class. Such inequalities flourish in educational institutions such as schools and teachers which are also sources when explaining the role in pedagogic activities/roles that give rise to the perpetuation of classes by expounding the rich. They encourage the learners by rewarding the haves of such capital and discouraging or degrading the have-nots. Therefore, schools serve as the main source of reproduction and omission.

The cultural capital denotes the coding culture supported by parents which is transmissible as well as the practices capable of a transmissible. It contains a body of aesthetic codes, conditionings, and habituations transferred to learners through internalization by socializing or through the inherent transfer of cultural traits. It shows the status of the class or the actors' location from various walks of life. It expedites the naturalization of structural possession (Bourdieu & Passeron, 1977). Family refers to class by its habitus. The cultural resource of only the middle or elite class can become a valuable *capital* in society. In 'highbrow' culture, knowledge and possession are unevenly found in class and education which is declared as legitimate. Distinctions and privileges are awarded to the possessors. Other capitals like human, social economic, and cultural capital invoke the unequal social fabric of society. This highbrow is induced in school systems unevenly (Bourdieu & Passeron, 1977).

Children of rich people are recognized. The teachers recognize this advantage of students and exclude those who lack such cultural capital. Their pedagogic actions cause them to take part in a competitive mechanism that values based on cultural capital. Moreover, their pedagogic actions are considered meritocratic and legitimate. Therefore, elite culture seems to be contrary to the deprived or underprivileged (Bourdieu & Passeron,

1977). Due to unusual assessments, the teachers are biased when they grade the educational performances of the students as they recognize the competencies of the elite, not their scholastic performances. In this way, the schools serve as a source of specific intergenerational social mobility and outcomes.

Conclusion

Based on the above discussion, it concludes that biological differences are less likely to affect the performance of female and male students rather than shaped by cultural differences. Accordingly, females' deprivation of education was due to the traditional and cultural practices in male hegemonic society. Moreover, feminist proponents raised their voices to provide equal opportunities for females to get an education and perform equally to males. The researcher argues that girls' lagging in the past was based on traditional cultural practices and normative value structures of society. Thus, culture and society both created an inappropriate environment for females to learn and come up with better opportunities. Females were born and treated differently to develop different images of society. At this point, the researcher argues that no one is born a genius but rather socialized and prepared in a particular socio-economic environment. It is concluded from the above discussion that gender is mainly influenced by the masculine culture of society. Females are mainly disturbed by male perspectives as males dominate in every walk of life. Males design and execute policies in almost every sphere of life. Owing to this, females have been subjugated and kept at the margins in every field in the past. Simultaneously, males got an education and outperformed females while females were excluded from education. It is hence argued that masculine and cultural differences have a pivotal role in socializing the girls for education and competition of males rather than innate differences.

To summarize the discussion as per the theories to study gender and education, females were deprived in the past based on cultural practices and normative value structure of the societies. As access and cultural practices provided a gap to females, they try to perform not only at the school and college level but also at the university level. Therefore, the researcher argues that females were not supported by their families and cultural practices for education. The proponents of feminism struggled for female education, and space was provided. Currently, female students are outshining males in examination results almost at all levels. Therefore, the performance of female male students in education is not linked with biological determinism and inborn characteristics. Based on the above empirical and theoretical review, the researcher argues that the difference in educational performance among female and male students at the tertiary level is not linked with biological characteristics. It has roots in the difference of psycho-social, socio-economic, and cultural factors of socialization among female and male students. It is important here to mention that the researcher opted for the theory of Bourdieus' Cultural Capital Theory. The main theoretical tools of Bourdieu are habitus, fields, and different forms of capital. The researcher applied the concept of cultural capital, i.e. economic, cultural, social, and symbolic. The data presented above are full of the assertion that the behavior of students is not determined by the educational institutions but rather by the social structure, rural and urban society, where they were born, bred, and socialized. Thus, the primary habitus of students induced in childhood is more durable to learn behaviors regarding social structure rather than learn at a later stage.

References

- Acker, S. (1987). Feminist theory and the study of gender and education. *International review of education*, 33(4), 419–435. <https://doi.org/10.1007/bf00615157>
- Ahmad, J., Ahmad, A., Shoaib, M., & Shaukat, B. (2021). Public Library Online Information Resources to Library Patrons during COVID-19 Pandemic: A Case of Higher Education Institutions. *Library Philosophy and Practice*, 1–14. <https://digitalcommons.unl.edu/libphilprac/6147>
- Ahmad, J., Shoaib, M., & Shaukat, B. (2021). Academic Library Resources and Services at Higher Education Institutions during COVID-19 Pandemic: A Case of Students' Satisfaction. *Library Philosophy and Practice*, 1–17.
- Ali, R., Zaman, M. A., & Shoaib, M. (2024). Trends of Research Visualization of Gender Inequality, Equality, and Equity: A Bibliometric Analysis from 1981 to 2020. *Pakistan Journal of Law, Analysis and Wisdom*, 3(8), 237–252. <https://pjlw.com.pk/index.php/Journal/article/view/v3i8-237-252>
- Aluja-Fabregat, A., Colom, R., Abad, F., & Juan-Espinosa, M. (2000). Sex differences in general intelligence defined as g among young adolescents. *Personality and individual differences*, 28(4), 813–820. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0191-8869\(99\)00142-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0191-8869(99)00142-7)
- Andersen, P. L., & Hansen, M. N. (2012). Class and cultural capital—The case of class inequality in educational performance. *European sociological review*, 28(5), 607–621. <https://doi.org/10.1093/esr/jcr029>
- Andreano, J. M., & Cahill, L. (2009). Sex influences on the neurobiology of learning and memory. *Learning & memory*, 16(4), 248–266. <http://www.learnmem.org/cgi/doi/10.1101/lm.918309>
- Anwar, B., Shoaib, M., & Javed, S. (2013). Women's autonomy and their role in decision making at household level: a case of rural Sialkot, Pakistan. *World Applied Sciences Journal*, 23(1), 129–136. <https://10.5829/idosi.wasj.2013.23.01.13040>
- Anwar, B., Shoaib, M., & Mustafa, R.-e.-. (2022). Factors Influencing Students' Willingness to Use Academic Library after COVID-19 Lockdown. *International Information & Library Review*, 35(2), 136–142. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10572317.2022.2089528>
- Anwar, B., Shoaib, M., & Shahid, U. (2024). Academic Performance of the Students in Higher Education in Pakistan: The Role of Information and Communication Technology. *Pakistan Social Sciences Review*, 8(2), 472–482. [https://doi.org/10.35484/pssr.2024\(8-II-S\)41](https://doi.org/10.35484/pssr.2024(8-II-S)41)
- Anwar, B., Shoaib, M., Zaman, M. A., & Arshad, H. K. (2024). English Language Learning Practices in Classroom Environment: A Systematic Review. *Pakistan Journal of Law, Analysis and Wisdom*, 3(7), 267–284. <https://pjlw.com.pk/index.php/Journal/article/view/v3i7-267-284>
- Arshad, H. K., Anwar, B., & Shoaib, M. (2024a). Nexus of Classroom Environment and English Language Learning Skills in Higher Education in Pakistan. *Qlantic Journal of Social Sciences*, 5(3), 58–67. <https://dx.doi.org/10.55737/qjss.336091511>
- Arshad, H. K., Anwar, B., & Shoaib, M. (2024b). Teaching Spaces in Pakistan: A Case of English Language Learning Skills at Tertiary Level. *Qlantic Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities*, 5(3), 71–80. <https://doi.org/10.55737/qjssh.579341510>
- Aschaffenburg, K., & Maas, I. (1997). Cultural and Educational Careers: The Dynamics of Social Reproduction. *American Sociological Review*, 62(4), 573–587. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2657427>
- Bandura, A., & Walters, R. H. (1977). *Social learning theory (Vol. 1)*. New York: General Learning Press.
- Bindu, P., & Thomas, I. (2006). Gender differences in emotional intelligence. *Psychological studies-university of calicut*, 51(4), 261–268.
- Block, J. H. (1973). Conceptions of sex role: Some cross-cultural and longitudinal perspectives. *American Psychologist*, 28(6), 512–526. <https://psycnet.apa.org/doi/10.1037/h0035094>
- Bourdieu, P. (1983). The field of cultural production, or: The economic world reversed. *Poetics*, 12(4–5), 311–356. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0304-422X\(83\)90012-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/0304-422X(83)90012-8)
- Bourdieu, P. (1990). *The logic of practice*. California: Stanford University Press.

- Bourdieu, P., & Passeron, J.-C. (1977). *Reproduction in society, culture, and education*. London: Sage Publications Ltd.
- Burchard, J., & Tyler, J. V. (1964). The modification of delinquent behaviour through operant conditioning. *Behaviour Research and Therapy*, 2(2-4), 245-250. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0005-7967\(64\)90028-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/0005-7967(64)90028-2)
- Cheraghi, M., & Schøtt, T. (2015). Education and training benefiting a career as entrepreneur. *International Journal of Gender and Entrepreneurship*, 7(3), 321-343. <https://doi.org/10.1108/ijge-03-2013-0027>
- Clarke, E. H. (2010). *Sex in Education: General Book*.
- Clausen, J. A. (1966). Family structure, socialization, and personality. In *Review of child development research* (Vol. 2, pp. 1-53). USA: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Cole, M. (2017). *Education, equality and human rights: issues of gender, 'race', sexuality, disability and social class*. New York: Routledge.
- Drucker, S. A. (2018, April 27). *Betty Friedan: The Three Waves of Feminism*. Ohio Humanities.
- Duffy, J., Warren, K., & Walsh, M. (2001). Classroom interactions: Gender of teacher, gender of student, and classroom subject. *Sex roles*, 45(9-10), 579-593. <https://link.springer.com/article/10.1023/A:1014892408105>
- Dumais, S. A. (2002). Cultural capital, gender, and school success: The role of habitus. *Sociology of education*, 75(1), 44-68. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3090253>
- Erikson, E. H. (1994). *Identity and the life cycle*. USA: W. W. Norton & Company, Inc.
- Fausto-Sterling, A. (2008). *Myths of gender: Biological theories about women and men*. New York: Basic Books.
- Francis, B. (2006). *The nature of gender*. In C. Skelton, B. Francis, & L. Smulyan (Eds.), *The Sage handbook of gender and education* (pp. 7-17). California: Sage Publication Ltd.
- Freud, S. (1977). *Introductory lectures on psychoanalysis*. New York: Liveright Publishing.
- Frijters, J. C., Brown, E., & Greenberg, D. (Eds.). (2019). *Gender Differences in the Reading Motivation of Adults with Low Literacy Skills*. USA: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Frosh, S., Phoenix, A., & Pattman, R. (2003). Taking a stand: Using psychoanalysis to explore the positioning of subjects in discourse. *British Journal Of Social Psychology*, 42(1), 39-53. <https://doi.org/10.1348/014466603763276117>
- Gerhard, J. (2001). *Desiring revolution: second-wave feminism and the rewriting of twentieth-century American sexual thought*. United States: Columbia University Press.
- Gilmore, D. D. (1990). *Manhood in the making: Cultural concepts of masculinity*. United States: Yale University Press.
- Grusec, J. E. (2011a). Socialization processes in the family: Social and emotional development. *Annual review of psychology*, 62(1), 243-269. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.psych.121208.131650>
- Gurian, M. (2010). *Boys and girls learn differently! A guide for teachers and parents* (2nd ed.). USA: John Wiley & Sons.
- Halberstam, J. (2019). *Female masculinity* (20th ed.). USA: Duke University Press.
- Halpern, D. F. (1997). Sex differences in intelligence: Implications for education. *American Psychologist*, 52(10), 1091-1102. <https://psycnet.apa.org/buy/1997-30052-008>
- Harris, A. (1991). Gender as contradiction. *Psychoanalytic Dialogues*, 1(2), 197-224. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10481889109538893>
- Hedges, L. V., & Nowell, A. (1995). Sex differences in mental test scores, variability, and numbers of high-scoring individuals. *Science*, 269(5220), 41-45. <https://www.science.org/doi/abs/10.1126/science.7604277>
- Hess, R. D., & Shipman, V. C. (1965). Early Experience and the Socialization of Cognitive Modes in Children. *Child development*, 36(4), 869-886. <https://doi.org/10.2307/1126930>
- Howard, J. A., & Hollander, J. A. (1997). *Gendered situations, gendered selves: A gender lens on social psychology* (Vol. 2). California: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers Inc.

- Huang, H., & Liang, G. (2016). Parental cultural capital and student school performance in mathematics and science across nations. *The Journal of Educational Research*, 109(3), 286–295. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00220671.2014.946122>
- Huang, J. (2013). Intergenerational transmission of educational attainment: The role of household assets. *Economics of Education Review*, 33, 112–123. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.econedurev.2012.09.013>
- Jadva, V., Hines, M., & Golombok, S. (2010). Infants' preferences for toys, colors, and shapes: Sex differences and similarities. *Archives of sexual behavior*, 39(6), 1261–1273. <https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s10508-010-9618-z>
- Jenkins, R. (2014). *Pierre bourdieu (First ed.)*. New York: Routledge.
- Kingston, P. W. (2001). The Unfulfilled Promise of Cultural Capital Theory. *Sociology of Education*, 74, 88–99. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2673255>
- Lareau, A., & Weininger, E. B. (2003). Cultural capital in educational research: A critical assessment. *Theory and society*, 32(5–6), 567–606. <https://link.springer.com/article/10.1023/B:RYSO.0000004951.04408.bo>
- Lerner, G. (2005). *The majority finds its past: Placing women in history*. USA: The University of North Carolina Press.
- Lips, H. M. (2016). *A new psychology of women: Gender, culture, and ethnicity (Fifth Ed.)*. Long Grove, IL: Waveland Press, Inc.
- Lytton, H., & Romney, D. M. (1991). Parents' differential socialization of boys and girls: A meta-analysis. *Psychological bulletin*, 109(2), 267–296. <https://psycnet.apa.org/buy/1991-15054-001>
- Maccoby, E. E. (1999). *The two sexes: Growing up apart, coming together (Vol. 4)*. London, England: Harvard University Press.
- Marecek, J., Crawford, M., & Popp, D. (2004). On the construction of gender, sex, and sexualities. *The psychology of gender*, 2, 192–216. <https://works.swarthmore.edu/fac-psychology/615>
- Mariam, S., Anwar, B., & Shoaib, M. (2022). English for Specific Purposes: An Evaluation of 8Th Class Textbook of English. *Jahan-e-Tahqeeq*, 5(2), 112–119. <https://www.jahan-e-tahqeeq.com/index.php/jahan-e-tahqeeq/article/view/631>
- Marks, G. N., & McMillan, J. (2003). Declining inequality? The changing impact of socio-economic background and ability on education in Australia. *The British journal of sociology*, 54(4), 453–471. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-4446.2003.00453.x>
- Martin, C. L., & Ruble, D. (2004). Children's search for gender cues: Cognitive perspectives on gender development. *Current directions in psychological science*, 13(2), 67–70. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.0963-7214.2004.00276.x>
- Murphy, N. A., & Hall, J. A. (2011). Intelligence and interpersonal sensitivity: A meta-analysis. *Intelligence*, 39(1), 54–63. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.intell.2010.10.001>
- Okpara, J. O., Squillace, M., & Erundu, E. A. (2005). Gender differences and job satisfaction: a study of university teachers in the United States. *Women in Management Review*, 20(3), 177–190. <https://www.emerald.com/insight/content/doi/10.1108/09649420510591852/full/html>
- Ortner, S. B. (1972). Is female to male as nature is to culture? *Feminist studies*, 1(2), 5–31. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3177638>
- Piaget, J. (1972). *The Psychology of the Child*. New York: Basic Books.
- Pomerleau, A., Bolduc, D., Malcuit, G., & Cossette, L. (1990). Pink or blue: Environmental gender stereotypes in the first two years of life. *Sex roles*, 22(5–6), 359–367. <https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/bf00288339>
- Powell, J. J., Merz-Atalik, K., Ališauskienė, S., Brendel, M., Echeita, G., Guðjónsdóttir, H., . . . Óskarsdóttir, E. (2019). *Teaching Diverse Learners in Europe: Inspiring Practices and Lessons Learned from Germany, Iceland, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Spain and Sweden*. London: SAGE.
- Rampton, M. (2015, October 25). *Four Waves of Feminism*. Pacific magazine.

- Rehman, K., Rehman, Z., Saif, N., Khan, A. S., Nawaz, A., & Rehman, S. (2013). Impacts of job satisfaction on organizational commitment: a theoretical model for academicians in HEI of developing countries like Pakistan. *International Journal of Academic Research in Accounting, Finance Management Sciences*, 3(1), 80–89. <http://creativecommons.org/licences/by/4.0/legalcode>
- Rose, G. (1993). *Feminism & geography: The limits of geographical knowledge*. United States: University of Minnesota Press.
- Schwartz, D. (1997). *Culture and Power: The Sociology of Pierre Bourdieu*. Chicago: Univ. In: Chicago Press.
- Shoaib, M. (2021). *Sociological Analysis of Teachers Perspectives on Students Academic Performance in Higher Education in the Punjab*. [PhD Thesis]. International Islamic University Islamabad, Central Library.
- Shoaib, M. (2023a, September 22). Galvanising Bourdieu's typology with Pakistani education and social class. *The Nation*, 4.
- Shoaib, M. (2023b, December 05). *Gender Differences in Academic Performance*. The Nation.
- Shoaib, M. (2024a, January 09). *Gender Disparity in Education*. The Nation.
- Shoaib, M. (2024b). Gender Diversity and Inclusion in Higher Education in Pakistan. *Pakistan Journal of Law, Analysis and Wisdom*, 3(1), 207–222. <https://pjlw.com.pk/index.php/Journal/article/view/v3i1-207-222>
- Shoaib, M. (2024c). Gendering Bourdieu's Cultural Capital in Higher Education in Pakistan. *Pakistan Journal of Law, Analysis and Wisdom*, 3(2), 265–278. <https://pjlw.com.pk/index.php/Journal/article/view/v3i2-265-278>
- Shoaib, M., Abdullah, F., & Ali, N. (2020). Library Resources and Research Environment in Higher Education Institutions: Students' Satisfaction. *Library Philosophy and Practice*, 1–18. https://digitalcommons.unl.edu/libphilprac/4768/?utm_source=libphilprac
- Shoaib, M., Abdullah, F., & Ali, N. (2021). A Research Visualization of Academic Learning Skills among Students in Higher Education Institutions: A Bibliometric Evidence from 1981 to 2020. *Library Philosophy and Practice*, 5579, 1–34. <https://digitalcommons.unl.edu/libphilprac/5579>
- Shoaib, M., Ahmad, A., Ali, N., & Abdullah, F. (2021). Trend of Research Visualization of Learning, Classroom, and Class Participation in Higher Education Institutions: A Bibliometric Analysis from 2001 to 2020. *Library Philosophy and Practice*, 5743, 1–26. <https://digitalcommons.unl.edu/libphilprac/5743>
- Shoaib, M., Ali, N., Anwar, B., & Abdullah, F. (2022). Library services and facilities in higher education institutions during coronavirus disease (COVID-19) in Pakistan. *Journal of Information Science*, 1–14. <https://doi.org/10.1177/01655515221141035>
- Shoaib, M., Ali, N., Anwar, B., Rasool, S., Mustafa, R.-e., & Zici, S. (2021). Research Visualization on Teaching, Language, Learning of English and Higher Education Institutions from 2011 to 2020: A Bibliometric Evidences. *Library Philosophy and Practice*, 5677, 1–27. <https://digitalcommons.unl.edu/libphilprac/5677/>
- Shoaib, M., Ali, N., Anwar, B., & Shaikat, B. (2021). Plotting the Literature on Learning Outcomes and Academic Performance in Higher Education from 2001 to 2020: A Scientometric Analysis. *Library Philosophy and Practice*, 5919, 1–24. <https://digitalcommons.unl.edu/libphilprac/5919/>
- Shoaib, M., Ali, R., & Akbar, A. (2021). Library Services and Facilities in Higher Education Institutions in Pakistan: Satisfaction of Patrons. *Library Philosophy and Practice*, 1–19. <https://digitalcommons.unl.edu/libphilprac/6721/>
- Shoaib, M., Ali, S. R., & Abbas, Z. (2024). Self-Fulfilling Prophecy of Learning Skills Among Students in Higher Education. *Pakistan Journal of Law, Analysis and Wisdom*, 3(7), 164–177. <https://pjlw.com.pk/index.php/Journal/article/view/v3i7-164-177>
- Shoaib, M., Anwar, B., & Mustafa, R.-E.-. (2022). Moral Literacy and Islamic Values among Students at Tertiary Level. *Al-Āfāq Islamic Research Journal*, 2(2), 1–11. <http://alaafaqjournal.com/index.php/alaafaq/article/view/67>

- Shoaib, D. M., Anwar, D. B., & Rasool, D. S. (2022). Factors Affecting EFL Teaching Skills at Higher Education Institutions in Pakistan: An Analysis of Teachers' Perspective. *Pakistan Journal of Language Studies*, 6(1), 1-15. <https://pjls.gcuf.edu.pk/index.php/pjls/article/view/156>
- Shoaib, M., Fatima, U., & Jamil, R. (2021). Academic Library and Students' Learning at University Level: Nothing is Pleasanter than Exploring a Library. *Library Philosophy and Practice*, 1-19. <https://digitalcommons.unl.edu/libphilprac/7014/>
- Shoaib, M., Iqbal, S., & Tahira, G. (2021). Digitalization of Academic Libraries in Higher Education Institutions during COVID-19 Pandemic. *Library Philosophy and Practice*, 1-15. <https://digitalcommons.unl.edu/libphilprac/6376/>
- Shoaib, M., Munir, A., Masood, M., Ali, Q., & Sher, F. (2012). Education as a Source of Child Health Care Practices: A Case of Mothers in Tehsil Kharian, Gujrat-Pakistan. *World Applied Sciences Journal*, 19(5), 754-761. <https://www.cabidigitallibrary.org/doi/full/10.5555/20123356349>
- Shoaib, M., Mustafa, R.-E.-., & Hussain, K. G. (2022). Revisiting Classroom Environment and Academic Performance of the Students in Higher Education Institutions. *Pakistan Journal of Social Research*, 4(3), 969-986. <https://doi.org/10.52567/pjsr.v4i03.1279>
- Shoaib, M., Mustafa, R.-E.-., & Hussain, K. G. (2023). Citing the Empirical Shreds of Electronic Evidence on Pedagogical Skills Employing Bibliometric Analysis from 2001- 2020. *Pakistan Journal of Social Research*, 5(2), 1050-1062. <https://pjsr.com.pk/wp-content/uploads/2023/06/104.-Vol.-5-No.-2-June-2023-Shoaib-Raza-E-Mustafa-Hussain-Citing-the-Empirical-Shreds-of-Electronic-Evidence-on-Pedagogical-Skills.pdf>
- Shoaib, M., Naseer, A., & Naseer, N. (2023). Family Pressure, Social Media Influence, and COVID-19 Vaccination Hesitancy among Students at Higher Education in Pakistan. *Pakistan Journal of Law, Analysis and Wisdom*, 2(3), 295-307. <https://heinonline.org/HOL/LandingPage?handle=hein.journals/pknjlolw2&div=149&id=&page=>
- Shoaib, M., Rasool, S., & Anwar, B. (2021). Evaluating Research Support Facilities to University Students during COVID-19. *Library Philosophy and Practice*, 4953(1), 1-18. <https://www.proquest.com/openview/d609f4a5dfddf242facdaafdfa8bf79d/1?pq-origsite=gscholar&cbl=54903>
- Shoaib, M., Rasool, S., Anwar, B., & Ali, R. (2023). Academic library resources and research support services to English teachers in higher education institutions. *Journal of Electronic Resources Librarianship*, 35(1), 17-27. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1941126X.2023.2165240>
- Shoaib, M., Saeed, Y., & Cheema, S. N. (2012). Education and Women's Empowerment at Household Level: A Case Study of Women in Rural Chiniot, Pakistan. *Academic Research International*, 2(1), 519-526. [http://www.savap.org.pk/journals/ARInt./Vol.2\(1\)/2012\(2.1-51\).pdf](http://www.savap.org.pk/journals/ARInt./Vol.2(1)/2012(2.1-51).pdf)
- Shoaib, M., Shehzadi, K., & Abbas, Z. (2023). Contemporary Research on Learning Spaces and Teacher Effectiveness in Higher Education. *Pakistan Journal of Law, Analysis and Wisdom*, 2(03), 352-369. <https://heinonline.org/HOL/LandingPage?handle=hein.journals/pknjlolw2&div=155&id=&page=>
- Shoaib, M., Shehzadi, K., & Abbas, Z. (2024a). Inclusivity and Teachers' Aptitude in Higher Education in Pakistan. *Pakistan Journal of Law, Analysis and Wisdom*, 3(6), 219-237. <https://pjlw.com.pk/index.php/Journal/article/view/v3i6-219-237>
- Shoaib, M., Shehzadi, K., & Abbas, Z. (2024b). Inclusivity, Teacher Competency, and Learning Environment at Higher Education: Empirical Evidences. *Pakistan Journal of Law, Analysis and Wisdom*, 3(5), 244-261. <https://pjlw.com.pk/index.php/Journal/article/view/v3i5-244-261>
- Shoaib, M., Tariq, M., Shahzadi, S., & Ali, M. (2022). Role of Academic Libraries in Online Academic Activities during COVID-19 Outbreak at Tertiary Level: A Library is a Thought in Cold Storage. *Library Philosophy and Practice*, 1-19.

- https://openurl.ebsco.com/EPDB%3Agcd%3A12%3A17165772/detailv2?sid=ebsco%3Aplink%3Ascholar&id=ebsco%3Agcd%3A161168404&crl=c&link_origin=scholar.google.com
- Shoaib, M., & Ullah, H. (2019). Female and Male Students' Educational Performance in Tertiary Education in the Punjab, Pakistan. *Pakistan Journal of Social Issues*, X(1), 83-100. <https://uog.edu.pk/downloads/journal/X/5.pdf>
- Shoaib, M., & Ullah, H. (2021a). Classroom Environment, Teacher, and Girl Students' Learning Skills. *Education and Urban Society*, 53(9), 1039-1063. <https://doi.org/10.1177/00131245211001908>
- Shoaib, M., & Ullah, H. (2021b). Teachers' perspectives on factors of female students' outperformance and male students' underperformance in higher education. *International Journal of Educational Management*, 35(3), 684-699. <https://10.1108/IJEM-05-2020-0261>
- Shoaib, M., Usmani, F., & Abdullah, F. (2023). Plotting The Literature On Social Work Education From 1971-2020: A Scientometric Analysis. *Pakistan Journal of Social Research*, 5(2), 1347-1360. <https://pjsr.com.pk/wp-content/uploads/2023/07/134.-Vol.-5-No.-2-June-2023-Shoaib-Usmani-Abdullah-Plotting-the-Literature-on-Social-Work-Education-From-1971-2020.pdf>
- Shoaib, M., Zaman, M. A., & Abbas, Z. (2024). Trends of Research Visualization of Gender Based Violence (GBV) from 1971-2020: A Bibliometric Analysis. *Pakistan Journal of Law, Analysis and Wisdom*, 3(7), 203-216. <https://pjlw.com.pk/index.php/Journal/article/view/v3i8-203-216>
- Steinmayr, R., & Spinath, B. (2008). Sex differences in school achievement: What are the roles of personality and achievement motivation? *European Journal of Personality: Published for the European Association of Personality Psychology*, 22(3), 185-209. <https://doi.org/10.1002/per.676>
- Stets, J. E., & Burke, P. J. (2000). Femininity/masculinity. In E. F. Borgatta & R. J. V. (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of sociology (Montgomery ed., pp. 997-1005)*. New York: Macmillan.
- Tang, C., Eaves, E., Ng, J., Carpenter, D., Mai, X., Schroeder, D., . . . Haier, R. (2010). Brain networks for working memory and factors of intelligence assessed in males and females with fMRI and DTI. *Intelligence*, 38(3), 293-303. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.intell.2010.03.003>
- Ullah, H., & Shoaib, M. (2021). Trend of Research Visualization of Sociology of Education from 2001 to 2020: A Bibliometric Analysis. *Library Philosophy and Practice*, 1-24.
- Webb, J., Schirato, T., & Danaher, G. (2002). *Understanding bourdieu (First ed.)*. Washington, DC: Sage Publicatins Ltd.
- West, C., & Zimmerman, D. H. (2009). Accounting for doing gender. *Gender Society*, 23(1), 112-122. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0891243208326529>
- Young, Z. P. (2016). Gender and development. In J. Steans & D. Tepe (Eds.), *Handbook on Gender in World Politics*. UK: Edward Elgar Publishing Limited.