

Investigating Gender Differences in Utilizing Deictic Expressions and Transitional Phrases in Discourse in Light of Halliday's framework

استقصاء الفروق بين الجنسين في توظيف التعبيرات الإشارية والعبارات الانتقالية في الخطاب في ضوء إطار هاليداي للتماسك
النصي

By

Faiza Abdalla Elhussien Mohammed

email. faizaabdall@oiu.edu.sd

English Dept. College of Education, Omdurman Islamic University, Sudan
&

Ammar Mohammed Ahmed Mudawy

English Dept. Majmaah College of Education, Majmaah University and Holy Quran and Taseel
of Sciences University –Sudan
&

Sabri Mohammed Abdalla

English Dept. College of Education, Omdurman Islamic University, Sudan

Abstract

This study investigates gender differences in the use of linguistic features, focusing on deictic expressions and transitional phrases in English academic writing. Using a mixed-methods design, data were collected from 24 undergraduate students (12 males and 12 females) during the 2025 academic year. Participants wrote essays on online learning, which were analyzed through content analysis to identify cohesive devices. Quantitative differences were examined using the Chi-square (χ^2) test. The results revealed clear gender-related patterns in linguistic choices. Male students used personal (68.55%), temporal (78.80%), and spatial (66.45%) deictic expressions more frequently. Female students, however, showed greater use of transitional phrases, particularly those expressing addition (51%), causation (84%), and contrast (73%), indicating stronger emphasis on textual cohesion. Males exceeded females in exemplification (46.2%), clarification (37.5%), and concluding transitions (40%). From a sociolinguistic perspective, these differences appear to reflect culturally influenced communicative preferences rather than inherent gender distinctions. Within Halliday's framework of cohesion, neither gender demonstrated linguistic superiority; instead, each displayed complementary strengths in the use of cohesive devices. The findings also

challenge previous assumptions that males rely more on nouns while females favor pronouns for interpersonal purposes. Overall, the study contributes new empirical evidence to research on language and gender and highlights the need for further cross-cultural, context-sensitive investigations into gender-related variation in academic writing.

Keywords: Gender differences, Discourse analysis, Deictic Expressions, transitional phrases and Textual Cohesion

المستخلص

تستقصي هذه الدراسة الفروق بين الجنسين في استخدام السمات اللغوية، مع التركيز على التعبيرات الإشارية والعبارات الانتقالية في الكتابة الأكاديمية باللغة الإنجليزية. واعتمدت الدراسة المنهج المختلط، حيث جمعت البيانات من (24) طالباً وطالبة في مرحلة البكالوريوس (12 ذكراً و12 أنثى) خلال العام الأكاديمي 2025. وطلب من المشاركين كتابة مقالات حول التعلم عبر الإنترنت، ثم حُللت باستخدام تحليل المحتوى للكشف عن وسائل التماسك النصي. كما فُحصت الفروق الكمية بين المجموعتين باستخدام اختبار مربع كاي (χ^2). وأظهرت النتائج وجود أنماط واضحة مرتبطة بالنوع الاجتماعي في الاختيارات اللغوية؛ إذ استخدم الطلاب الذكور التعبيرات الإشارية الشخصية (68.55%)، والزمانية (78.80%)، والمكانية (66.45%) بمعدلات أعلى. في المقابل، أظهرت الطالبات استخداماً أكبر للعبارات الانتقالية، ولا سيما تلك الدالة على الإضافة (51%)، والسببية (84%)، والتضاد (73%)، مما يعكس اهتماماً أكبر بتحقيق التماسك النصي. كما تفوق الذكور في استخدام عبارات التمثيل بالأمثلة (46.2%)، والتوضيح (37.5%)، والانتقال الختامي (40%) ومن منظور علم اللغة الاجتماعي، تشير هذه الفروق إلى أنها تعكس تفضيلات تواصلية تتأثر بالعوامل الثقافية أكثر من كونها فروقاً فطرية بين الجنسين. ووفقاً لإطار هاليداي للتماسك النصي، لم يُظهر أي من الجنسين تفوقاً لغوياً، بل أظهر كل منهما نقاط قوة متكاملة في استخدام وسائل التماسك. كما تتحدى النتائج الافتراضات السابقة التي ترى أن الذكور يعتمدون بدرجة أكبر على الأسماء، في حين تميل الإناث إلى استخدام الضمائر لتحقيق التقارب بين المتخاطبين. وبوجه عام، تسهم هذه الدراسة في إثراء البحوث المتعلقة باللغة والنوع الاجتماعي بأدلة تجريبية جديدة، وتؤكد أهمية إجراء مزيد من الدراسات المقارنة العابرة للثقافات والحساسية للسياقات المختلفة لفهم التباين المرتبط بالنوع الاجتماعي في الكتابة الأكاديمية.

الكلمات المفتاحية: الفروق بين الجنسين، تحليل الخطاب، التعبيرات الإشارية، العبارات الانتقالية، التماسك النصي.

1.0 Introduction

The written discourse language is useful to convey knowledge to the people. A discourse should have been required as a good text. In a discourse, many sentences need to have unity and be coherent with cohesive devices; the discourse can have pleasant unity in connecting between

sentences. If a discourse has a good unity, it brings a deep understanding of its context, and the reader can get the message that the writer wants to tell. Scholars as Van dijk (1997) define discourse as an arrangement of language that is something larger than just a sentence enhanced by cohesion and coherence and is written or spoken. Spoken discourse can be formed like an interview, speech, conversation, and dialogue. Whereas the written discourse can be formed like a thesis, journal, daily notes, article, column, poem, novel, and many more. As mentioned before, one of the written discourse is an essay.

Writing essays is crucial for undergraduate students in the English Department, as it is a graduation requirement involving essays, research projects, and reports. Coherent writing is vital for further academic pursuits, such as postgraduate programs, where students must present papers. Despite the importance of clear writing, experts like Brown (2004) argue that many struggle to write effectively, even in their native language. For foreign language learners, mastering cohesive devices is essential for producing coherent essays and research proposals.

1.1 Problem

The research problem highlights the significance of deictic expressions and transitional phrases in creating coherence and reference in written discourse. Despite their importance, there is a lack of understanding regarding how these linguistic elements may vary between genders. This study aims to explore the potential influence of gender on the selection and usage of deictic expressions and transitional phrases, ultimately contributing to a deeper comprehension of gender differences in written language and enhancing the overall understanding of effective communication strategies."

1.2 Research Questions

The study attempted to answer the following main question:

1. Do male and female differ in their use of deictic expressions and transitional phrases in written discourse? Which categories show the most significant differences?
2. How do gender differences in deictic expressions and transitional phrases affect coherence, reader focus, and rhetorical effects in writing?
3. Do findings support the assumption that females' language is superior, male language is a deficiency?

4. What are the cognitive, sociolinguistic, or cultural factors influence differences in deictic and transitional phrase usage by gender? How do these factors interact with writing contexts?

1.3 Objectives

In line with the study questions, the study aims to:

1. To identify and analyze the differences in the frequency and distribution of deictic expressions and transitional phrases used by men and women in written discourse.
2. To examine how gender influences the choice and function of deictic expressions and transitional phrases in establishing coherence and guiding reader focus.
3. To explore the cognitive, sociolinguistic, and cultural factors that contribute to gender differences in language use and their interaction with various writing contexts.

1.4 Significance

The present study findings may have significant benefits to the researchers, EFL teachers, students as follow:

1. Investigating the influence of gender on deictic and transitional choices offers a nuanced lens for analyzing written discourse. By understanding how male and female may differentially navigate the landscape of reference and coherence, to gain deeper insights into the rhetorical strategies, communicative styles, and underlying thought processes embedded within their writing.
2. Understanding gender influences on deictic and transitional choices provides insights into written discourse.
3. Recognizing gender-specific language patterns helps improve cross-gender communication. By identifying preferred deictic references and transitional cues, it can enhance clarity and effectiveness in communication, allowing messages to resonate better with both genders and fostering collaboration

2.0 Literature Review

2.1 Theoretical Background

Halliday's framework of textual cohesion.

In systemic functional linguistics (SFL), Halliday (1985) posits that language operates as a semiotic system where textual coherence and situational context are realized through specific lexicogrammatical choices. Within this framework, deictic expressions serve to anchor discourse to the spatio-temporal and interpersonal context of the speaker, while transitional phrases act as cohesive devices that structure logical relations across clauses (Halliday & Hasan, 1976; Halliday & Matthiessen, 2014). Investigating gender differences through Halliday's textual and interpersonal metafunctions reveals how male and female speakers strategically deploy these linguistic resources to construct stance and organize narrative flow. Empirical studies examining gendered discourse show that variations in person and spatial deixis often reflect distinct modes of social positioning, with female speakers frequently utilizing relational deictics to establish solidarity and male speakers leaning toward referential precision (Weatherall, 2002; Holmes, 2013). Furthermore, the differential deployment of cohesive tie transitionals—such as adversative and additive conjunctions—highlights how gendered patterns in discourse organization align with Halliday's model of textual management, demonstrating that linguistic choices are systematically mediated by social identity and context-bound communicative goals (Eckert & McConnell-Ginet, 2013).

Gender Differences in Writing

Many scholars and researchers in linguistics (psycholinguistics and sociolinguistics) have distinguished between males and females in the speech act. (Tannen, 1990) believes that "the females 'choices regarding speech acts play an important role in the achievement of intimacy. Females 'choices regarding speech acts are identified as their way of maintaining relationships. Halliday (1994), in written texts, distinguishes between two types of differences among males and females. These two types are referred to as —involved and —informative writing. Other studies discussed lexical and phonological differences between males and females. Trudgill (1972) and Eckert (1989), for example, discuss males' and females' lexical choices based on a sociolinguistic variation of middle-class females and working-class males. They state middle-class women, non-standard forms introduce standard forms by working-class men.

Discourse Content Analysis

Discourse content analysis uses to find out about the purposes, messages, and effects of communication content. They can also make inferences about the producers and audience of the texts they analyze. Content analysis can be used to quantify the occurrence of certain words, phrases, subjects, or concepts in a set of historical or contemporary texts. Discourse Analysis bargains with the ponder of the relationship between language and the setting in which it is utilized (McCarthy, 2001). Discourse analysis is related to the investigation of language to utilize. There are three viewpoints in this issue: specific sentences as questions, content as item, and talk as a plan (Brown and Yule, 1983:196) since this investigation concerns papers as printed writings. In this regard, they state that there are makers and recipients of sentences or amplified writings, but the examination concentrates exclusively on the item, which is words on the page. The examination of the printed content itself does not include any thought on how the item is created or how it is gotten.

Deictic Expression and Transitions Phrases Theories

The term deictic refers to a class of linguistic expressions used to indicate elements of the situational and discourse context, including the speech participants, the time and location of the current speech event (Fillmore 1997; Levinson 2004). English has a wide variety of expressions that are commonly analyzed as deictics: personal pronouns such as I and you, spatial adverbs such as here and there, demonstratives such as this and that, temporal adverbs such as now, then, today, ago, and recently, motion verbs such as come and go, and tense morphemes such as the future auxiliary will and the past tense suffix -ed (Lyons 1977; Fillmore 1997).

The most familiar presuming reference items are three types of deictic expressions: personal, possessive, temporals, and spatial deixis are:

Personal Deixi Expressions

Galuh (2014) states that “Personal Reference is Reference using a function in the speech situation, through the category of person. The category of personal includes the three clauses of a personal pronoun, possessive determiners (usually called possessive adjectives), and possessive pronouns. This reference system is known as a person, where a person is used in a unique sense of role; the

traditionally recognized categories are first person, second person, and third person, intersecting with the number categories of singular and plural. It includes a. Personal: we, you, I, it, she, he, and they. b. Possessive adjective: my, your, his, her, its, our, their. Possessive pronoun deixis such as mine, yours, his, hers, its, ours, theirs.

Spatial Deixis

The spatial reference refers to a form of verbal pointing (this, these, here, there, that, those, then). are also called Place deixis as spatial deixis and describe where people and objects' relative location are being indicated. Demonstrative adverbs for place deixis are *here, this, these, that, those, there*. There is a gestural use for spatial deixis as well as a non-gestural use. The gestural use can be shown through an eye-gaze or a head movement. The non-gestural use refers to an area where an example would be saying, "I love it here!" while walking through a park (Gjergji, 2015).

Temporal deixis

Temporal deixis is conjunctions expressing the time order of events. Temporal conjunction reflects the relation between two sentences. There is one sequence in time; the one is after the other. It is signaled by then, finally, soon, afterward, at last, at the same time, at once, since, after that, an hour later. Time Deixis is an expression about a certain point of time when the speaker produces an utterance.' Usually, the reference point for time deixis is the moment of utterance, which is the coding time. There is a distinction between coding time and receiving time in the written or recorded language use (Levinson, 2004: 114).

Transitional Phrases' Theories and Types

Transitional phrases are words that help a writer move from one sentence to another. One of the significant challenges of using transitional phrases is that we do not hear them often when we speak. Transition words and phrases are used to connect ideas in formal writing and speaking. Using transitions helps a piece of writing flow seamlessly from one thought to the next. These terms also help readers understand the purpose of the next thought (adding information, giving an example, and contrasting a previous point). (Tanya Trusler 2017)

2.2 Previous Studies

This section reviews some of the previous studies that are related to this study. The first previous study is written by by Hazim Alkrisheh, Feisal Aziez, and Taisir Alkhrisheh (2019) ,which investigates gender differences in writing style; it also investigates language use differences in Arabic and English written texts by native speakers of Arabic in the average sentence length, lexical density, and readability. The study used Halliday 's framework about language functions to investigate gender differences, which claimed that females 'writing style is, as he described, "involved" while males 'writing style is more informative '. The results of the study do not confirm Halliday's assumptions about gender differences in writing. No significant differences were found between males and females in the frequencies of nouns, prepositions, numerals, and modifiers. The only significant difference found in the use of pronouns is not enough to account for the assumptions. The second previous study by Leti Marsetia Nilopa, M. Zaini Miftah, and Aris Sugianto (2017) aims to describe the types of cohesive devices used by the third-semester students of English Department of Tarbiyah Faculty of State Institute for Islamic Studies (IAIN) of Palangka Raya. The subjects of the study were thirteen (13) students of the third semester. In order to get the data, the students were asked to write expository essays. The data were analyzed based on Halliday and Hasan's (1976) framework on cohesive devices covering reference, substitution, ellipsis, conjunction, and lexical cohesion. The study shows that (1) the types of cohesive devices to be found in the students' essays are conjunction (43.25%), reference (33.73%), and lexical cohesion (23.01%). Although there are a few cohesive devices to be used, most of the students' opinion essays fail to achieve cohesion.

The third previous study is a dissertation Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirement for the Degree of Master in English by Mokdad Zohra and Kacir Chabha. The study investigates the use of cohesive devices in students' writing essays. It aims at checking whether students are familiar with using cohesive devices when they write, exploring the influence of using CDS in writing essays, and investigating the most predominant cohesive devices used by students. Halliday and Hasan's theory, 'Cohesion in English' (1976), has been used as a theoretical framework to meet these objectives. The results of the study showed that 944 cohesive devices are used in the writing pieces. According to the findings, students have used particular types of cohesive devices; this mainly appears in conjunctions and references because they are the most

known. However, using specific cohesive devices is due to the little use of ellipsis and substitution in which they have little experience.

3.0 Methodology

The present employs content analysis to measure the targeted constructs, based on the study problem and its objectives. It was quantitative (focused on counting and measuring) and qualitative (focused on interpreting and understanding). In both types, the study categorized or code words, themes, and concepts within the texts and then analyzed the results.

Data Collection Instrument

The study assigned informative essay of five paragraphs entitled: “*The Impact of Online Learning on your Academic Success*” to investigate the genders' differences in utilizing two types of cohesive devices” Deixis and Transitional Phrases" for make thoughts coherence

Participants

They were twenty- four English- major undergraduates, males, and females, at level five, who enrolled in the "College Essays Writing course" at College of Education, Majmaah University, in the academic year 2024.

The investigation and analysis based and focus on the researcher's subjective judgments focusing on creating categories, interpret, test and audit to make a decision trail provides evidence to support and test themes and patterns observed in the data by chunking together groups of previously coded cohesive devices: a) deixis: person, spatial and temporal deixis, and b) transitional phrases used for addition, repetition, cause, and effect, compare and contrast and conclusion. The researchers extract similar or contrast statements from the context of the written essays. Lisa (2008, p. 74)

The Procedures of Data collection and Analysis

The research employed the following procedures:

Males and females asked to write essays of five paragraphs entitled: “The Impact of Online Learning on your Academic Success” to investigate the genders' differences in utilizing two types of cohesive devices,” Deixis and Transitional Phrases", to make their thoughts coherence. To

display each device, the researchers highlighted all device types with different colors to make it easy for calculating the frequencies and the types of cohesive devices displayed in each student text.

At the end of the procedure, all the data were imported to an excel sheet to do the analysis using (Chi-square (χ^2) statistic test to test the statistically significant relationship between the categorized variables to contrast the genders' different uses of deixis and transitional phrases as follows:

Methods of Analyzing Inferential Data: (Chi-square (χ^2) statistic):

Chi-square (χ^2) statistics is a test that measures how expectations compare to actual observed data (or model results). The data used in calculating a chi-square statistic must be random, raw, mutually exclusive, drawn from independent variables, and drawn from a large enough sample. Chi-square tests are often used in hypothesis testing. The Chi-Square Test of Independence determines whether there is an association between categorical variables (i.e., whether the variables are independent or related). It is a nonparametric test. Chi-square tests the null hypothesis versus the alternative hypothesis for the population. It tests two hypotheses, and the tested is a two-Sided Test:

H₀: There is no statistically significant relationship between the two variables (The variables are independent).

H₁: There is a statistically significant relationship between the two variables (The variables are not independent).

The Chi-Square formula is: $\chi^2 = \sum \frac{O - E^2}{E}$. Where: C = Degrees of freedom. O = Observed value(s). E = Expected value(s)

Decision Rule: To use a P-value to conclude a hypothesis test, compare the P-value with a significance level (α):

If the P-value less than an equal (Significance Level) ($\alpha = 0.05$), we reject the null hypothesis.

If P-value more significant than (Significance Level) ($\alpha = 0.05$), we do not reject (Accept) the null hypothesis.

Later, the students were fed-back with the researchers' comments to motivate them and for future improvement. The researchers hope to come out with significant findings, discuss them, and come out with a relevant conclusion and recommendations.

Results

The following results are presented in relation to the research questions. They are presented in separate tables (Table 2 to Table 11) to calculate the types and the frequency of the occurrence of the deictic and transitional phrases for each student. All were obtained and analyzed as follow:

Table No (1): Frequency distribution of the study sample according to the gender variable

Gender	Frequencies	Percentage
Male	12	50%
Female	12	50%
Total	24	100

Table (1) shows that (50%) of the study sample are males, whereas their number is (12) members of the statistical population, and that (50%) are females, and their number is (12).

2. Personal pronouns:

Total personal pronouns frequency between male and Female.

Table No (2): Total personal Pronouns between male and Female

Gender	Frequencies	Percentage
Male	316	68.55%
Female	145	31.45%
Total	461	100

Table (2) shows that the percentage of males frequency uses of personal pronouns are (68.55%), whereas females are (31.45%).

3. Temporal pronouns:

Total temporal pronouns frequency used between male and female.

Table No (3): Total Temporal uses between male and Female

Gender	Frequencies	Percentage
Male	368	78.80%
Female	99	21.20%
Total	467	100

Table (3) shows that the percentage of males' frequency uses of temporal pronouns are (78.80%), whereas females are (21.20%).

4. Spatial pronouns:

Total spatial pronouns frequency used between male and female.

Table No (4): Total Spatial uses between male and Female

	Frequencies	Percentage
Male	406	66.45%
Female	205	33.55%
Total	611	100

Table (4) shows that the percentage of males' frequency uses of spatial pronouns are (66.45%), whereas females are (33.55%).

5. Addition phrases

Total of the addition phrases frequency used between male and female.

Table No (5): Total addition tools uses between male and Female

	Frequencies	Percentage
Male	25	49.00%
Female	26	51.00%
Total	51	100

Table (5) shows the percentage males frequency uses of addition phrases are (49%), whereas females are (51%).

6. Causation phrases

Total causation phrases frequency uses between male and female.

Table No (6): Total causation phrases uses between male and Female

	Frequencies	Percentage
Male	4	16.00%
Female	21	84.00%
Total	51	100

Table (6) shows that the percentage of males' frequency uses of causation phrases are (16.00%), whereas females are (84.00%)

7. Combining phrases

Total combination phrases frequency uses between male and female.

Table No (7): Total Combining phrases uses between male and Female

	Frequencies	Percentage
Male	152	49.51%
Female	155	50.49%
Total	307	100

Table (7) shows that the percentage of males' frequency uses of combining Phrases are (49.51%), whereas females are (50.49%).

8. Contrast Phrases :

Total Contrast Phrases frequency uses between male and female.

Table No (8): Total Contrast uses between male and Female

	Frequencies	Percentage
Male	7	26.92%
Female	19	73.08%
Total	26	100

Table (8) shows that the percentage of males frequency uses of Contrast phrases are (26.92%), whereas females are (73.08%).

9. Exemplification Phrases

Total Exemplification Phrases frequency uses between male and female.

Table No (9): Total Exemplification Phrases uses between male and Female

	Frequencies	Percentage
Male	7	53.85%
Female	6	46.15%
Total	13	100

Table (9) shows that the percentage of males frequency uses of Exemplification phrases are (53.85%), whereas females are (46.15%).

10. Clarification

Total Clarification Phrases frequency uses between male and female.

Table No (10): Total Clarification Phrases uses between male and Female

	Frequencies	Percentage
Male	5	62.50%
Female	3	37.50%
Total	8	100

Table (10) shows the percentage of males' frequency uses of Clarification Phrases are (62.50%), whereas females are (37.50%).

11. Conclusion Phrases

Total Conclusion of the Phrases frequency uses between male and female.

Table No (11): Total Conclusion Phrases uses between male and Female

	Frequencies	Percentage
Male	9	60.00%
Female	6	40%
Total	15	100

Table (11) shows the percentage of the males' frequency uses of Conclusion Phrases are (60.00%), whereas females are (40.00%).

Table No (12) Gender and use deixis and Transitional Phrases Cross Tabulation

Gender * Use Deixes and Transition Phrases Crosstabulation													
Gender			Use Pronouns										Total
			Perso nal	Tempo ral	Spati al	Addit ion	Causati on	Combi ne	Contr ast	Exemp lificati on	Clarif icatio n	Con clus ion	
Gender de r	Male	Count	316	368	406	25	4	152	7	7	5	9	1299
		Expected Count	301.8	305.8	400.0	33.4	16.4	201.0	17.0	8.5	5.2	9.8	1299.0
	Female	Count	145	99	205	26	21	155	19	6	3	6	685
		Expected Count	159.2	161.2	211.0	17.6	8.6	106.0	9.0	4.5	2.8	5.2	685.0
Total		Count	461	467	611	51	25	307	26	13	8	15	1984
		Expected Count	461.0	467.0	611.0	51.0	25.0	307.0	26.0	13.0	8.0	15.0	1984.0

Chi-Square Tests:

Chi-Square Tests			
	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	124.756 ^a	9	.000
Likelihood Ratio	123.741	9	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	67.052	1	.000
N of Valid Cases	1984		
a.; two cells (10.0%) have an expected count of less than 5. The minimum expected count is 2.76.			

From Table (12) Cross-tabulation and Chi-Square test to examine the statistically significant relationship between male and female in utilizing deictic expressions and transitional phrases in a written discourse (The two variables are independent).

It was observed that the P-value computed by SPSS software and using the Chi-square test is (0.000). This value is less than the significance level (0.05). Reject the null hypotheses. Then there is a statistically significant relationship between the male and female in utilizing deictic expressions and transitional phrases in a written discourse (The two variables are independent).

Discussion

The results answered the first question: ‘Were there any statistically significant gender differences in utilizing deixis in a written discourse? They indicated that there were statistically significant gender differences in utilizing deictic expressions as follows: Males used deictic expressions sufficiently; they used more personal pronouns (68.55%), temporal pronouns (78.80), and spatial pronouns (66.45%) more than females. The argument about the use of deictic expression is that males tend to use deictic expressions intensively. The results regarding this category indicate statistical significant differences between both genders in utilizing deictic expressions in favor of males.

Regarding the second study question: “Were there any statistically significant gender differences in utilizing transitional phrases in a written discourse”? The results obtained from the

data analysis answered the second question in that there were statistically significant differences in employing the transitional phrases different types in favor of females as follows: females use more addition phrases (51%), causation phrases (84%), contrast phrases (73.08%) and combining phrases (50.49%) with an exception in the use fewer exemplification phrases (46.15%), less clarification, and concluding phrases (37.50% and 40.00%), respectively in favor of the males.

The argument about the use of transition expressions is that females used them more than males. Therefore, the results regarding this category indicate a significant difference between both genders in favor of females. To conclude, the results answered question two: There were statistically significant gender differences in utilizing deictic expression in favor of females. They are the most superior in utilizing transitional phrases to make their written discourses coherent more than males do.

Regarding the third question: Do findings support the assumption that females' language is superior, male language is a deficiency? The results that answered the first and the second questions do not substantially support the absolute assumption that female language choice is superior, and male's language is a kind of deficiency.

The current study supports Halliday's theory (1976), which claimed that females' writing style is involved, and males writing style is more informative, and agrees, but to some extent, with Lakoff (1975), who also claims women's language is weaker because it is EXPECTED to be weaker. It contradicts Alkrisheh, Aziez, and Alkhrisheh (2019), who investigated gender differences in writing style; in the average sentence length, lexical density, and readability. Their results show no significant differences between males and females in the frequencies of nouns, prepositions, numerals, and modifiers. Moreover, the present study disagrees with a study done by Nilopa, Miftah, and Sugianto (2017); that opposed Halliday and Hasan's framework (1976) to describe the types of cohesive devices used by the third-semester students of the English Department of Tarbiyah Faculty of State Institute for Islamic Studies (IAIN) of Palangka Raya. They found that most of the students' opinion essays fail to achieve cohesion, which differs from the current study results. However, males have differed statistically in the frequency and types from that used by females. However, they still used adequate deictic expressions and transition phrases, in which twenty- four male and female students used (1539) different types of deictic expressions and (468)

transitional phrases. These indicated that each gender has its preferable choice in utilizing deictic expressions and transitional phrases in their written discourse.

Conclusion and Recommendation

The present study found that the use of personal, spatial, and temporal pronouns is widespread among males, which contradicts and opposes some studies that indicated that males use nouns on a large scale due to their need to assert their authority and identity, and claimed that females use more pronouns to maintain intimacy and relationship the thing that proved oppositely. The research opens a new avenue for further investigations of gender and language differences. The study supports and confirms some of the existing theories of language and contradicts others. Finally, the current study suggests a further study investigating gender differences in employing other types of cohesive devices not explored by the existing studies.

Implications

The following implications suggest that understanding gender differences in language use can enhance educational practices, promote effective communication, and encourage further research in the field:

1. To tailor writing curricula to address identified gender-specific strengths and weaknesses. This could involve focused training on cohesive devices that are less frequently used by one gender, helping to enhance overall writing skills.
2. To inform communication strategies in academic and professional settings to align with gendered preferences for deictic expressions or transitional phrases can improve clarity and effectiveness.
3. The findings highlight the need for further investigation into gender differences in language use across various contexts, including other linguistic features.
4. The findings underscore the importance of cohesive devices in creating effective written discourse. Awareness of these elements can lead to better writing practices among students and professionals.

Limitations

There are some limitations that could be observed in the study:

1. The study provides a snapshot of writing styles at a particular time, without considering how these might evolve over time or through additional experience in writing.

2. Other factors influencing writing, such as educational background, language proficiency, and personal experiences, may not have been adequately controlled, complicating the interpretation of results.
2. While the study examines deictic expressions and transitional phrases, there are many other cohesive devices that could also show gender differences.

Acknowledgement

I would like to express my sincere gratitude to Omdurman Islamic University, Colleges of Education English Departments Sudan, for accepting this research for publication, and to Majmaah University, College of Education, English Department in the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia, for their support and guidance throughout this research. I also extend my heartfelt thanks to Furthermore, I am deeply appreciative of the anonymous reviewers for their valuable comments and constructive feedback on the manuscript, which greatly contributed to enhancing the quality of this work.

References

- Alkrisheh, H., Aziez, F., and Alkhrisheh, T. (2019) Study on Gender and Language Differences in English and Arabic Written Texts. *Research and Innovation in Language Learning* Vol. 2(2) May 2019 pp. 120-138. <http://jurnal.unswagati.ac.id/index.php/RILL>.
- Bee, H (2000) The journey of adulthood. Upper Saddle River. NJ: Prentice-Hall
- Brantmeier, C. (2003). Does gender make a difference? Passage content and comprehension in second language reading. *Reading in a Foreign Language*, 15.
- Brown, G. & Yule, G. (1983). *Discourse analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Coates, J. (ed.) (1998) *Language and gender: A reader*. Oxford: Blackwell
- Eckert, P. (1989). The whole woman: Sex and gender differences in variation. *Language Variation and Change*. 1(3), 245–268.
- Eckert, P., & McConnell-Ginet, S. (2013). *Language and gender* (2nd ed.). Cambridge University Press.
- Fillmore, Charles J., 1997. *Lectures on Deixis*. Stanford, CA: CSLI Publications.
- Finlay, L (2008) Reflecting on 'Reflective practice,' Practice-based Professional Learning Centre, paper no 52.

- GaluhJgs (2014) PersonalReferenceisa Reference by Means of Function in the Speech Situation
(<https://www.scribd.com/document/195813195/Personal-Reference-is-a-Reference-by-Means-of-Function-in-the-Speech-Situation>)
- Gjergji, S. (2015). A pragmatic analyses of the use of types of deixis in poetry and novels of the author Ismail Kadare. *Academicus International Scientific Journal*, 6(12), 134-146.
- Halliday, M. A. K. (1985). *An introduction to functional grammar*. Edward Arnold.
- Halliday, M. A. K. (1994). *Introduction to functional grammar* (2nd ed.). London: Arnold.
- Halliday, M. A. K., & Hasan, R. (1976). *Cohesion in English*. Longman.
- Halliday, M. A. K., & Matthiessen, C. M. I. M. (2014). *Halliday's introduction to functional grammar* (4th ed.). Routledge.
- Halliday, M.A.K. & Hasan, R. (1976). *Cohesion in English*, London. Longman.
- Holmes, J. (2013). *Women, men and language: An introduction to the study of sexism in language* (3rd ed.). Routledge.
- Jones, S. & Myhill, D. (2007). Discourses of differences? Examining gender differences in linguistic characteristics of writing. *Canadian Journal of Education*, 30(2), 456-482.
- Levinson, Stephen C., 2004. Deixis and pragmatic. In: L. Horn & G. Ward (eds.). *The Handbook of Pragmatics*. Oxford: Blackwell, 97–121.
- Lisa, M. G (Ed) (2008) *The SAGE Encyclopedia of Qualitative Research Methods*. Vol. 1 & 2. Publisher: Rolf A. Janke. USA.
- Lyons, John, 1977. *Semantics*, vol. 1–2. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Mc. Carthy, M. (2000). *Discourse Analysis for Language Teachers*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- McCarthy, M. (2001). *Issues in applied linguistics*. Cambridge University Press.
- Mezirow, J (2006)) An overview of transformative learning. In P Sutherland and J Crowther (Eds), *Lifelong learning: Concepts and contexts* (pp 24-38): New York: Routledge.
- Moon, J A (1999) *Reflection in learning and professional development: theory and practice*. London: Kogan Page.
- Stein D (2000) Teaching critical reflection. ERIC Clearinghouse. Available at: www.calpro-online.org/eric/docs/mr00024.pdf

- Strauss, A., & Corbin, J. (1990). Basics of qualitative research: Grounded theory procedures and techniques (1st ed.). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Tannen, D. (1990). You just do not understand: Women and men in conversation. New York, NY: William Morrow.
- Trudgill, P. (1972). Sex, covert prestige and linguistic change in the urban British English of Norwich. *Language in Society*, 1, 179–95.
- Van Dijk, T. A. (1997). The study of discourse. *Discourse as structure and process*, 1(34), 703-52.
- Weatherall, A. (2002). *Gender, language and discourse*. Routledge.
- Wiśniewski, K. (2006). Discourse analysis. Retrieved from www.tlumaczeniaangielski.info/linguistics/discourse.htm.
- Yuka Ishikawaa (2014) Gender Differences in Vocabulary Use in Essay Writing by University Students, 2nd GLOBAL CONFERENCE On LINGUISTICS And FOREIGN LANGUAGE TEACHING, LINELT-2014, Dubai – the United Arab Emirates, December 11 – 13, 2014.