

A Pragmatic Analysis of Verbal Violence in the Classroom: From the Perspective of Teacher-Student Communication

Zhuxuan Zhang¹, Wenguo Zhang^{1*}

¹ College of Foreign Studies, Guilin University of Technology, Guilin, China

Email Address

809725744@qq.com (Zhuxuan Zhang), 185576928@qq.com (Wenguo Zhang)

*Correspondence: 185576928@qq.com

Received: 3 May 2025; Accepted: 28 May 2025; Published: 10 June 2025

Abstract:

Verbal violence is a prevalent issue in social life. The phenomenon of verbal violence in the classroom, due to its inherent aggressiveness, tends to trigger numerous chain reactions. As a form of violent behavior, classroom verbal violence can easily cause severe psychological and mental harm to individuals. Meanwhile, it also affects the psychological well-being of students throughout their school life and learning process. By collecting corpus of verbal violence in the communication between teachers and students and conducting pragmatic analysis, this study explores the pragmatic principles involved in classroom verbal violence. The aim of this study is to deepen the public's understanding of this easily overlooked phenomenon of verbal violence in the classroom, reduce or avoid the occurrence of verbal violence, improve the relationship between teachers and students, and enable students to have a more enjoyable learning and living experience at school.

Keywords:

Classroom Verbal Violence, Pragmatic Analysis, Pragmatic Principles

1. Introduction

Education is an endeavor dedicated to imparting knowledge, cultivating wisdom, and nurturing the mind—all of which rely on the indispensable bridge of language. However, language is a double-edged sword; its misuse can inevitably inflict harm. As the esteemed educator Sukhomlinsky profoundly observed, “Every word spoken by an educator must be carefully weighed and deliberated. Empty rhetoric, monotonous lecturing, rigid dogmatism, or emotionally charged and neurotic language all hinder the normal development of students’ convictions.” A nationwide survey conducted by the “China Children’s Safety Initiative” among 1,170 children across 29 provinces, municipalities, and autonomous regions revealed that “verbal harm” ranked as the top concern, with 81.45% of respondents identifying it as the most urgent issue requiring resolution. In recent years, the introduction of disciplinary regulations in primary and secondary schools has led to a decline in physical punishment by teachers. However, the problems associated with verbal discipline

remain a pressing yet often overlooked challenge. At the primary school level, where students' cognitive abilities are still developing and their behavioral norms are in the formative stage, teachers frequently employ verbal reprimands to fulfill their educational duties and correct misconduct. While the majority of educators act with sound intentions and employ pedagogically appropriate methods, deviations from professional norms in instructional attitudes or verbal expressions among a subset of teachers have contributed to the prevalent incidence of verbal violence. Due to the inherent power imbalance in traditional teacher-student dynamics, students subjected to such verbal aggression often lack avenues for emotional release. Consequently, they may internalize their distress or resort to extreme reactions, leading to academic disengagement, diminished mental well-being, or even physical health repercussions. This phenomenon reflects not only a failure in classroom communication but also a profound societal concern. Lessons drawn from passive resistance to verbal violence must now galvanize proactive efforts to develop effective strategies for alleviating students' psychological distress and fostering healthier educational interactions.

2. Literature Review

Classroom verbal violence, as a prominent manifestation of institutional verbal aggression in educational settings, constitutes a form of discursive practice wherein educators employ sarcastic, demeaning, or threatening speech acts that inflict psychological harm on learners. Empirical studies within the Chinese context reveal that such linguistic violence emerges from complex interplay between pedagogical approaches, sociocultural norms, and institutional power structures. The prevailing authoritarian classroom dynamic, reinforced by examination-oriented educational policies, has normalized teachers' deployment of verbally aggressive strategies—often rationalized as behavioral correction or classroom management, yet demonstrably detrimental to learners' psychological well-being and academic engagement. From a pragmatics perspective, this phenomenon can be productively analyzed through dual theoretical lenses. Grice's Cooperative Principle framework exposes how teachers' violations of conversational maxims—particularly through quality breaches (e.g., hyperbolic or sarcastic utterances) and relation violations (e.g., irrelevant personal attacks) — constitute pragmalinguistic markers of abusive discourse. Complementarily, Brown and Levinson's Face Theory illuminates the sociopragmatic dimensions, where educators' face-threatening acts systematically damage students' positive face needs (through esteem-diminishing remarks) and negative face needs (via freedom-constraining threats), thereby disrupting the fundamental conditions for equitable classroom interaction.

Recent applied linguistic research has extended this theoretical foundation through empirical investigations. Fu's critical discourse analysis identified recurrent patterns of verbal violence across different school contexts, tracing their origins to both macro-level educational policies and micro-level teacher cognition. Wang's corpus-based study of physical education classrooms revealed significant correlations between teachers' aggressive speech acts and students' decreased verbal participation. Particularly noteworthy are Wu and Xu's findings regarding the development of language anxiety among young learners exposed to negative evaluative language, suggesting long-term acquisitional consequences. Wen's ethnographic work further underscores the importance of centering student voices in understanding the lived experiences of classroom verbal violence and its impact on learner identities.

3. Manifestations of Classroom Verbal Violence

3.1. Definition of Verbal Violence

Verbal violence refers to the perpetrator's use of mocking, disparaging, or abusive language characterized by humiliation, aggression, and discrimination, resulting in severe short-term or long-term psychological harm to the victim, falling within the domain of emotional abuse. In interpersonal communication, most individuals who employ verbal violence exhibit psychologically unhealthy or suboptimal mental states, while those who habitually engage in such behavior demonstrate significant psychological imbalance. Certain perpetrators of verbal violence justify their actions through a self-perceived position of power superiority over their victims, a dynamic particularly evident in teacher-student relationships.

3.2. Manifestations

Classroom verbal violence occurs specifically within teacher-student interactions. Dan Olweus defines teacher verbal violence as educators' repetitive use of harmful language or demonstration of sarcastic and condescending attitudes toward students [1]. Teacher verbal violence is not limited to specific linguistic forms; rather, any verbal behavior that exerts substantial negative impact or control over others may constitute verbal violence. Li Haiyun conceptualizes teacher verbal violence as encompassing both overt verbal attacks and covert attitudes of neglect or isolation [2]. While scholars vary in their precise definitions, consensus exists that teacher verbal violence includes both audible components (e.g., insults, sarcasm) and inaudible elements (e.g., hostile body language). For the purposes of this study, we define teacher verbal violence as: educators leveraging their professional authority and positional power to inflict, through various linguistic means (including verbal, paralinguistic, and written communication), psychological harm that exceeds students' emotional tolerance thresholds. Nie Guilan further categorizes teacher verbal violence into deliberate insults, unconscious verbal habits, and excessive criticism. Guo Congcong proposes a four-type classification system [3], which this study adopts for pragmatic analysis:

- a. Sarcastic/Mocking Type: Pedagogical situations where teachers employ hyperbolic analogies, exaggerated criticism, or demeaning humor toward students.
- b. Abusive/Insulting Type: Educational contexts featuring crude, malicious, or overtly hostile language directed at students.
- c. Dogmatic/Judgmental Type: Routine professional interactions where teachers make absolute, subjective pronouncements about students' capabilities or behaviors.
- d. Threatening/Punitive Type: Instructional scenarios involving explicit warnings of punishment or actual punitive declarations.

3.3. Pragmatic Analysis of Classroom Verbal Violence

Pragmatic principles constitute fundamental guidelines that interlocutors should observe to maintain successful verbal communication, including but not limited to the Cooperative Principle and Politeness Principle. Violent language tends to provoke conflict and frequently manifests through conversational disruptions (e.g., interruptions, topic deviations), thereby violating the Cooperative Principle [4]. Given

its inherently aggressive nature, violent language also systematically breaches the Politeness Principle during implementation.

4. Violations of the Cooperative Principle

H.P. Grice formulated the Cooperative Principle (CP) with its four attendant maxims—Quality, Quantity, Relation, and Manner [5], which serve as fundamental guidelines for successful conversational interaction. The CP posits that interlocutors must mutually adhere to these maxims to facilitate effective communication. However, real-world discourse often involves deliberate violations of these maxims for specific communicative purposes, manifesting through untruthful statements, vacuous remarks, exaggerations, or unnecessarily verbose expressions [6].

This principle becomes particularly salient when examining verbal violence scenarios. During instances of domestic verbal violence, the aggressor persistently employs hostile language while the victim either remains silent or experiences conversational interruptions, resulting in unilateral rather than cooperative discourse. Similarly, classroom verbal violence exhibits identical pragmatic characteristics—the teacher (as aggressor) dominates the interaction through verbal attacks while the student (as victim) is either silenced or interrupted, thereby creating another manifestation of non-cooperative communication.

4.1. Case Study 1: Sarcastic/Mocking Type

Context: A academically average student seeks clarification from the teacher during class:

Student: “Teacher, I don’t quite understand this problem. Could you explain it?”

Teacher: “Wasn’t this just covered in class? Is your brain just for storing water?”

Student: “I genuinely didn’t understand. Could you go over it again?”

Teacher: “If you can’t solve such a simple problem, I wonder how you even got admitted to this school.”

Student: “I’ll study harder later. Could you just explain the solution steps now?”

Teacher: “Never mind. You probably wouldn’t get it even if I explained. Ask your classmates instead.”

In Case Study 1, the teacher’s communication with the student clearly violates several maxims of Grice’s Cooperative Principle. Firstly, the maxim of quantity is breached, as the teacher fails to provide any meaningful or sufficient information to help the student solve their problem. The response lacks the necessary content to address the student’s academic concerns. Secondly, the maxim of relation is also violated. When the student raises a question in class seeking help, the teacher responds with a sarcastic remark—“Is your brain filled with water?”—which deviates from the core issue and dismisses the student’s genuine need for support. Lastly, the maxim of manner is disregarded through the teacher’s use of aggressive and humiliating language. Comments such as “You can’t even solve such an easy question—how did you even get admitted to this school?” and “Even if I explain it, you probably won’t understand” are vague, unfriendly, and damaging to the student’s self-esteem. Such responses not only create a hostile learning environment but also discourage the student from asking questions in the future.

4.2. Case Study 2: Verbal Abuse and Insult

Context: After an exam, a student, whose academic performance has been relatively unstable, visits the teacher's office to discuss their thoughts and feelings regarding the recent test.

Student: "Teacher, I didn't do well on this exam again."

Teacher: "With your level, isn't doing poorly just normal?"

Student: "I really studied hard this time. It's just that some questions were beyond the scope."

Teacher: "Studied hard? I didn't see any sign of that. With your study methods and efficiency, any review is useless! You might as well transfer to another class—I can't teach you."

Student: "Could you please tell me where I went wrong, so I can improve next time?"

Teacher: "There's no point in improving. You're not capable of learning anything. Just give up."

In this case, the teacher's responses clearly violate Grice's Cooperative Principle. The use of exaggerated remarks such as "any review is useless" and "transfer to another class" represents overgeneralization and a lack of factual accuracy, thus breaching the maxim of quality. Furthermore, when the student seeks constructive feedback for future improvement, the teacher digresses from the topic and instead resorts to personal attacks, thereby violating the maxim of relation. The teacher's harsh tone and insulting language throughout the conversation cause the student to feel dismissed and invalidated. Although the student initially intended to engage in a dialogue for academic progress, the teacher's repeated denials lead the student to question their own abilities and self-worth, severely undermining their motivation. Such communication also breaches the maxim of manner due to its ambiguity, harshness, and offensiveness. Overall, the teacher, acting as a verbal aggressor, inflicts significant psychological harm on the student through sustained verbal abuse, adversely affecting both the student's behavior and mindset.

5. The Politeness Principle

To complement Grice's Cooperative Principle, British linguist Geoffrey Leech proposed the influential Politeness Principle, which plays a vital role in pragmatics. Its primary function is to ensure that communication is conducted in a courteous manner, reflecting each party's desire to be respected during verbal interaction[7]. Although Leech systematized the principle, earlier scholars such as Erving Goffman, Penelope Brown, and Stephen Levinson had already addressed politeness phenomena, particularly through the concept of "face theory". Discussions on politeness in verbal communication inevitably involve the notion of "face". In this regard, verbal violence in the classroom—characterized by its aggressive, dismissive, and exclusionary nature—essentially constitutes an infringement upon the interlocutor's face.

5.1. Case One: Dogmatic Assertion Type

Context: A student explains their tardiness to the teacher.

Student: I'm sorry for being late, teacher. I was helping a classmate carry some things. It won't happen again.

Teacher: Say no more. I already know you're the type who never follows the rules.

Student: That's not true, you've misunderstood me. I didn't do it on purpose.

Teacher: Misunderstood? I've seen plenty of students like you—always making excuses and never reflecting on themselves. Are you planning to come up with a better excuse next time?

Student: I admit I was wrong today, but the task was assigned by the class, and I was only slightly late.

Teacher: No more explanations! If you're late again, I'll contact your parents and have them discipline you properly. Don't give me any more excuses.

In this case, the teacher's response blatantly violates the Politeness Principle, particularly by infringing upon the student's negative face—the individual's desire to be unimpeded and free from coercion. The teacher immediately interrupts the student with "Say no more," thereby denying the student's right to provide a full explanation. This abrupt dismissal strips the student of the opportunity to elaborate on their circumstances. Furthermore, the teacher's statement "I already know you're the type who never follows the rules" is a sweeping generalization that transforms a specific behavioral incident into a judgment of character. By labeling the student with phrases like "your type," the teacher applies stigmatizing language that groups the student into a stereotypically disobedient category. Such a critique is not only unfounded but also laden with prejudice, denying the student the chance to defend themselves or present valid reasons for their behavior.

The teacher's use of threatening language—e.g., "If you're late again, I'll contact your parents"—further compounds the violation. Rather than engaging in a constructive dialogue, the teacher imposes psychological pressure and external consequences, leveraging authority to suppress the student's autonomy. This coercive approach limits the student's freedom of choice and silences their voice.

Moreover, the teacher's remarks also severely damage the student's "positive face"—the desire to be appreciated and respected. The characterization of the student as "undisciplined" and "always making excuses" targets the student's moral integrity rather than addressing the specific behavior. Such comments are deeply humiliating and entirely dismissive of the student's dignity. The Politeness Principle emphasizes the need for mitigated speech when criticizing others in order to minimize threats to their positive face. However, in this case, the teacher employs sarcasm and condemnation, thereby escalating the verbal aggression. By reducing a behavioral mistake to a character flaw, the teacher denies the student any opportunity for acknowledgment or redemption, posing a severe threat to their positive self-image.

5.2. Case Two: Threat and Punishment Type

Context: A student explains why they failed to complete a homework assignment.

Student: Teacher, I'm sorry I didn't finish the homework today. Please let me explain.

Teacher: From your attitude, it's clear you're not serious about learning.

Student: That's not true. I was sick yesterday and couldn't finish it. I promise to make it up after school today.

Teacher: Sick? You? Don't make excuses. You're just lazy. Keep this up, and I'll fail you at the end of the semester!

Student: I really know I was wrong. I'll make sure to finish it on time next time.

Teacher: How many times have I heard you say that? If it happens again, just stay home and don't come to school!

In this case, the teacher's threatening and dismissive language constitutes a serious violation of the Politeness Principle, infringing upon both the "negative face" and "positive face" needs of the student. First, the teacher undermines the student's negative face by using threats and authoritarian commands. Statements like "I'll fail you at the end of the semester" and "Just stay home" are overtly coercive, leveraging institutional power to eliminate the student's autonomy. The teacher disregards the student's circumstances and offers no space for choice or discussion, reducing the student to a powerless position within the interaction.

Furthermore, the teacher systematically denies the student's explanations and proposals. Although the student attempts to justify their behavior—"I was sick yesterday"—the teacher dismisses this with "You're just lazy," invalidating the student's account and stripping them of their right to defend themselves. The teacher also ignores the student's constructive attempt to resolve the issue—"I promise to make it up after school"—and instead issues arbitrary judgments that lack empathy or understanding. This approach negates the student's voice and erodes their agency in the communicative process.

Secondly, the dialogue demonstrates a blatant disregard for the student's "positive face". The teacher's sarcastic tone and accusatory language belittle the student's sincerity and efforts to make amends. Phrases such as "You? Sick?" and "Don't make excuses" convey distrust and mockery, reducing the student's apology and willingness to improve to mere pretense. The teacher's continued threats not only ignore the student's repentance but also increase their psychological burden. Such remarks strip away the student's motivation and foster feelings of humiliation and helplessness. Ultimately, the student is denied both recognition and respect, which may result in emotional distress and a diminished attitude toward learning.

The verbal violence in this interaction, driven by the teacher's denial, threats, and personal attacks, severely undermines the student's sense of dignity. Repeated violations of both positive and negative face needs not only damage the student-teacher relationship but also risk long-term psychological and academic consequences for the student.

6. Strategies for Resolving Verbal Violence in Teacher-Student Communication

Verbal violence in the classroom is not solely the result of actions by a single party. Rather, it arises from the interaction between both the perpetrator and the victim. Therefore, effectively mitigating classroom verbal violence necessitates improvements from both sides. The abuse of authority by the aggressor and the passive responses of the victim jointly contribute to the emergence of verbal aggression, which in turn exerts profound negative effects on teacher-student

relationships, the classroom atmosphere, and students' psychological well-being. Hence, resolving verbal violence requires joint efforts in enhancing the behaviors and capacities of both parties.

6.1. Victims: Enhancing the Ability to Cope with Verbal Violence

6.1.1. Strengthening Psychological Resilience

Verbal abuse often inflicts psychological harm on victims, potentially damaging self-esteem, fostering self-doubt, or leading to resistance toward the learning environment. It is therefore crucial to cultivate students' emotional regulation skills and psychological resilience. Equipping students with strategies to cope with verbal aggression can help mitigate the accumulation of negative emotions and promote mental well-being.

6.1.2. Improving Communication and Expressive Skills

Victims often find themselves at a disadvantage due to inadequate communication skills or weak verbal responsiveness, which may further provoke the aggressor's hostility. To address this, students should be encouraged to develop assertive yet respectful communication skills, avoiding both passive silence and impulsive reactions that may escalate conflict. Educators should guide students in responding to unfair treatment with reasoned and respectful language, thereby fostering constructive teacher-student interactions. At the same time, enhancing students' awareness of classroom rules and encouraging self-discipline can help prevent conflicts triggered by rule violations. Positive reinforcement strategies should be used to shape students' behavior and reduce latent tensions within the classroom.

6.2. Perpetrators: Improving Language Use and Instructional Approaches

6.2.1. Enhancing Linguistic Competence and Expressive Techniques

Teacher discourse plays a central role in classroom interaction, and verbal aggression often stems from inappropriate language use during episodes of emotional dysregulation or misuse of authority. Professional development programs focusing on teachers' language literacy are therefore essential. Such training should equip educators with appropriate communicative strategies to avoid using insulting, threatening, or sarcastic language. A pedagogy of "gentle criticism" should be promoted, wherein constructive feedback is given, such as saying, "Let's try approaching this problem from a different perspective," instead of, "Why do you always get this wrong?"

6.2.2. Strengthening Emotional Regulation

A significant trigger for verbal aggression in classrooms is teachers' inability to manage their own emotions. Thus, implementing emotional regulation training is vital. Teachers should learn to recognize, manage, and regulate their emotions effectively, ensuring personal frustrations are not projected onto students. Stress-relief mechanisms such as reflective teaching practices and collegial emotional support systems can be integrated into daily instruction to reduce teacher burnout.

6.2.3. Reforming Educational Philosophy and Fostering Egalitarian Teacher-Student Relationships

The traditional concept of “teacher authority” often leads educators to rely excessively on their status to maintain classroom discipline, sometimes through verbal aggression. In the context of modern education, this paradigm must shift. Teachers should be encouraged to build democratic and harmonious relationships with students, grounded in mutual respect and understanding. An education philosophy centered on the student—treating learners as equal interlocutors rather than mere recipients of instruction—should be promoted to reduce the incidence of verbal violence.

7. Conclusions

In the context of contemporary education, fostering a healthy and harmonious verbal environment in the classroom has become a critical concern. The language used by teachers not only affects students’ academic performance but also has a profound impact on their psychological development and personality formation. Therefore, regulating and optimizing classroom discourse is of utmost importance. In particular, addressing verbal aggression requires a comprehensive understanding of its “soft harm”—its latent negative impact on students’ self-esteem and self-confidence. By improving teachers’ language competence, optimizing teacher-student interaction patterns, and strengthening students’ resilience and communication abilities, classroom verbal violence can be effectively mitigated. The classroom of the new era should be grounded in respect, employ constructive discourse as a communicative bridge, support students’ healthy growth, foster a positive classroom culture, and contribute to the overall enhancement of teaching quality.

Conflicts of Interest

The author declares that there is no conflict of interest regarding the publication of this article.

Funding

This work was supported by the Innovation Project of Guangxi Graduate Education: Research and Practice of Human-machine Collaborative Translation Teaching for MTI Education in Polytechnic Universities in the Context of Large Language Models.

References

- [1] Olweus, D. Bullying of students by teachers. Unpublished manuscript. The HEMIL Center, University of Bergen, Norway, 1996.
- [2] Li, H.Y.; Fu, M. An Exploration of Verbal Violence by Primary and Secondary School Teachers. *Contemporary Educational Theory and Practice*, 2017, 12, 11-15.
- [3] Guo, C.C. The Relationship Between Senior Primary Students’ Tolerance to Teachers’ Verbal Violence and Aggressive Behavior: The Moderating Role of Self-Esteem. Jinzhou: Bohai University, 2020.
- [4] Chen, Luying. An Analysis of Verbal Violence in Family Language. Xiamen University, 2018.
- [5] Guo, Y.T. The Principle of Appropriateness in Family Education. *Journal of Hunan Medical University: Social Science Edition*, 2009, 5, 199–200+209.

- [6] Xu, Y.Y.; Sun, K. A Preliminary Study on the Pragmatic Functions of New and Popular Words in Japanese. *Journal of Yangzhou Institute of Education*, 2011, 3, 34-37.
- [7] Wang, W.P. English Euphemisms from the Perspective of the Politeness Principle. *Overseas English*, 2013, 17, 259-260.
- [8] Nie, G.L.; Zhang, A.Y. Rational Reflection on the Phenomenon of Verbal Violence by Teachers. *Rhetoric Studies*, 2008, 1, 64-67.
- [9] Wu, T.T.; Xu, Y.B. The Impact of Teachers' Classroom Verbal Violence on Primary School Students' Learning Interest. *Forum on Education and Teaching*, 2022, 50, 181-184.
- [10] Zeng, Y.P.; Cheng, Y. A Pragmatic Analysis of Verbal Violence in Family Communication—From the Perspective of Parent-Child Interaction. *Journal of Harbin Vocational & Technical College*, 2020, 05, 89-91.
- [11] Hao, M.Y. An Analysis of Verbal Harm in School and Family Education. *Modern Communication*, 2010, 04, 162.
- [12] Wen, Q.Y. A Kind Word Can Warm Three Winters; A Harsh Word Can Chill in June. Yunnan Normal University, 2022.
- [13] Fu, Z.J. A Brief Analysis of Verbal Violence in Classroom by Teachers. *Success (Education)*, 2008, 12, 140-141.
- [14] Wang, D. An Analysis of the Impact of Verbal Violence by Physical Education Teachers in Primary and Secondary Schools. *PE Teacher & Friend*, 2018, 41(01), 58-60.
- [15] Mao, Y.S. A Pragmatic Interpretation of the Justification of Verbal Violence. *Journal of Jiangnan University (Humanities and Social Sciences Edition)*, 2013, 12(03), 95-100.
- [16] Guo, C.C. The Relationship Between Senior Primary Students' Tolerance to Teachers' Verbal Violence and Aggressive Behavior. Bohai University, 2020.
- [17] Jose, S.G.L.; Juan, O.L.J.; Antonio, T.M. Perception of Verbal Violence in the Classroom: Mediation on Stage. *Revista Electronica Interuniversitaria de Formacion del Profesorado*, 2021, 24(3), 221-236.
- [18] Ramakrishnan, S.M. Speak Out: Teaching Domestic Violence in Your Literature Classroom. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 2014, 118, 296-301.
- [19] Wang, Q.; Su, Y.; Song, P, et al. The Impact of Self-Esteem and Interpersonal Relationships on the Processing of Verbal Violence: Evidence from ERPs. *Biological psychology*, 2025, 194 108984.
- [20] Tian, Z.; Zhang, N.; Li, Y. et al. Adverse childhood experiences and subsequent experiences of intimate partner violence in adulthood: a gender perspective. *Epidemiology and psychiatric sciences*, 2024, 33 (75): e75.
- [21] Shanmugasundaram, L.B.; Luthra, A. Between choice and sustainability: Navigating menstrual waste management in India through feminist political ecology and ecological modernization. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 2024, 483, 144304-144304.

- [22] Mishra, A.; Patel, S.; Maiti, A, et al. Work place violence among health-care providers working in a tertiary care hospital: A study from Central India. *Asian Journal of Medical Sciences*, 2024, 15(12), 91-97.
- [23] Dengler, C.; Plank, C. Foregrounding invisible foundations: (eco-)feminist perspectives on provisioning systems. *Sustainability: Science, Practice and Policy*, 2024, 20 (1).
- [24] Theodore, A.D.; Heck, J.C.; Huang, S. et al. Correlates of verbal and physical violence experienced and perpetrated among cisgender college women: serial cross-sections during one year of the COVID-19 pandemic. *Frontiers in Reproductive Health*, 2024, 61366262-1366262.



© 2025 by the author(s); licensee International Technology and Science Publications (ITS), this work for open access publication is under the Creative Commons Attribution International License (CC BY 4.0). (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>)