

The Role of Gender and Personality Traits in Using Lexical Cohesion Devices in Oral Interactions

Mahmoud Mobaraki¹, Ferdows Aghagolzade^{2*}, Arsalan Golfam³,
 Aliyeh Kord-e Zafaranlu Kambuziya⁴

1. PH.D Candidate, Linguistics Department, Faculty of Humanities, Tarbiat Modares University, Iran
2. Associate Professor, Linguistics Department, Faculty of Humanities, Tarbiat Modares University, Iran
3. Associate Professor, Linguistics Department, Faculty of Humanities, Tarbiat Modares University, Iran
4. Associate Professor, Linguistics Department, Faculty of Humanities, Tarbiat Modares University, Iran

Abstract

In this paper, we studied lexical cohesion devices to define the role of gender and personality traits on using them in the speeches of the second grade students in elementary school. We have used survey method in questionnaire part and descriptive analysis in analyzing the obtained data. The number of students in our statical sample was 100, which was divided into 4 groups (each group was 25 students) according to gender and personality variables. The sample was chosen by cluster random sampling method. The students were divided into introverted and extroverted groups by the Eysenck Personality Questionnaire (EPQ). In order to collect data, the researches took part in classrooms during the school year, and recorded the students' voices. Then their voices were transcribed to extract the used lexical cohesion. In data analysis, we used Wilcoxon math-pairs and Man Whitney U test according to the type of samples. The main purpose of this paper was to come to this conclusion that a general and bipolar judgment about the role of gender and personality traits in the studies of speech, especially in the study of using cohesion devices in discourses, is not true. So, this study, hesitated the general outcomes of some researches such as Hall who believed introverted students have more progress than extroverted in school, and Premuzic& Furham who believed extroverted students are more successful than introverted in class activities.

Keywords: gender, introversion, extroversion, cohesion devices, interaction

1. Introduction

Communication is not a simple and mechanical transferring of information from a speaker to a receiver. Communication is a spontaneous allocation of power and an unpredictable but logical flow of thought which is distinguishable through the structure of discourse. To be acquainted with the structure of discourse, it is necessary for the speaker to know specific knowledge of discourse devices and cultural codes. S/He should have the skills of combining these elements and expressing them as a specific speech which doesn't violate the social customs. This dimensional view of discourse expands its scope from mere linguistic to paralinguistic in communication. So we have tried to shed light on discourse devices especially lexical cohesion.

2. Literature Review

In this part, we review the previous studies referred to cohesion, gender and personality briefly.

2.1. Cohesion

Halliday and Hassan (1976) are the first persons to express cohesion in text. They have explained cohesion and its devices in their book "Cohesion in English". They define cohesion as the semantic concept that refers to the relations of meaning which exist within the text, and that define it as a text (1976:4). They emphasis on the semantic relations of cohesion devices, and say they are perceived through lexicogrammar system as semantic system.

Widdowson distinguishes lexical cohesion from lexical coherence. He believes that there may be a text which has coherence but not cohesion. He claims when we express a sentence in a normal communicative activity, we are transferring a proposition and an illocutionary act simentenously (1978:26). So, when there aren't any lexical cohesion devices in a text vividly, we, as readers, perceive them by relating the propositions with illocutionary acts (ibid).

De Beaugrande& Dressler's approach (1981) to text linguistic is a functional approach. By functional, they mean the whole levels of language are described according to their functions. They know text as a kind of communicative aspect which has seven characteristics; cohesion is one of them. They relate cohesion to the arrangement of language elements in a text. So, they believe that cohesion happens in grammatical relationships.

Carrell (1982) rejects Halliday& Hassan's view of cohesion prerequisite to coherence by expressing schema theory. This theory emphasizes interaction processes between text and a reader or a listener's background knowledge (1982:482). Carrell claims that the inefficiency of Halliday& Hassan's work is that they haven't considered the role of readers or listeners.

Brown& Yule (1983) hesitate in Halliday& Hassan's view of cohesion and bring up two considerable questions: 1. Is Halliday& Hassan's cohesion really necessary for defining text? 2. Is this cohesion enough for

defining a text? They believe when a reader confronts with a text, s/he infers semantic relations automatically and interprets the sentences by their relations with previous sentences. So textuality with the meaning of explicit semantic relations is not necessary for defining a text. Brown & Yule are the main critics of Halliday & Hassan and claim that mere emphasis on formal factors is not sufficient; although they know Halliday & Hassan's discussion about cohesion devices as complete one which has become a reference.

2.2. *Personality*

Shin (2008) believes that personality defines the reason and the result of a person's function. That how a person learns and what a person learns is the sign of individual differences. So, to understand the response of people to education and learning better, considering the personality factor is necessary.

Jung (1923) used introversion and extroversion as two important factors in personality for the first time. He knows introversion and extroversion as the aspect of personal unconscious and collective unconscious in ego. He claims that the most of our conscious understanding and responses to our nature are defined by opposite subjective attitude of introversion and extroversion.

Eysenck (1981:204) cites the characteristics of introverts and extroverts. We include some of them as follow:

- 1- Reward increases the extroverts' function, but punishment is an obstacle for introverts rather than for extroverts.
- 2- Introverts are more sensitive to distractor factors rather than to extroverts.
- 3- Introverts need more time for retrieving information from long term memory in comparison with extroverts.
- 4- Extroverts show better results in successive tests, but introverts show better results in final exams.

Hall (1966) believes that there is a negative significant relationship between extroversion and progress in school. That means the more extrovert a person is, the less progress in school happens. He claims that introverts have a vast outlook for their lives which is very important for progress; because the people who just consider the present time won't be progressive ones.

Premuzic & Furham (2003) divided 100 students into introversion and extroversion groups to investigate their progress during the school year. The results of their research show a positive relationship between extroversion and progress in school. This means extroverted students do better in class activities than introverted students. They criticized the previous researches which say introverts have more progress in school than extroverts.

2.3. *Gender*

Lackoff (1975) shows some differences between the speech of male and female. He claims that women use more grammatical elements than men, and their use of lexical categories is to somehow different from that of men.

Brown (1980) studied the use of particles between men and women, and came to this conclusion that women use more particles when they communicate with their same gender. He shows the type of gender affects on choosing the type of particles.

Tennen (1995) believes male students have more participation in class discourse than female students; male students prefer to ask more questions than their female counterpart; they have more relationship with their teachers. Tennen claims that the cause of this participation in class discourses is that the society expects them to play this role in real life, so the male students are practicing the role which they should undertake in future.

Wardhaugh (2006) believes that the differences between the male and female speeches are the result of the social differences between the male and female. He cites the tendency of both types of gender in choosing the topic of conversation is related to their gender interests. Furthermore, he dismisses any vigorous remarks on comparison and contrast between men and women without paying attention to context.

3. **Research questions and hypotheses**

What factors cause the students not to participate in class discourses and interactions? This problem always comes to teachers' mind in classrooms. This can be even so complicated that affects on social and peer group relations of students and causes them to be secluded. The first hypothesis that can be formed is that they don't have knowledge about the issues and their studies are weak, or even they have a low quantity of intelligence. But after the written examinations and on the basis of teachers' reports, this hypothesis is rejected. So another hypothesis that can be formed here is that there are some psycholinguistic factors such as personality traits and individual differences, sociolinguistic factors such as social status, gender, identity and educational factors which affect on the way of using discourse devices by students. In this paper, we have studied the role of gender and personality on the use of discourse devices. By personality we mean introversion and extroversion, and to narrow down the scope of discourse devices, we have just studied lexical cohesion from cohesion devices. So, the research questions and hypotheses can be formed as follow:

3.1. *Research questions*

- A. How do the male and female students, who belong to different personality traits, use lexical cohesion in oral interactions during their one school year (second grade of elementary school)?
- B. How gender can affect on the use of lexical cohesion by students who belong to the same personality

traits?

- C. How personality can affect on the use of lexical cohesion by students who belong to the same gender groups?

3.2. Hypotheses

- A. Introverted male students don't have progress in using lexical cohesion devices in their oral interactions at the end of their school year (second grade of elementary school).
- B. Introverted female students don't have progress in using lexical cohesion devices in their oral interactions at the end of their school year (second grade of elementary school).
- C. Extroverted male students have progress in using lexical cohesion devices in their oral interactions at the end of their school year (second grade of elementary school).
- D. Extroverted female students have progress in using lexical cohesion devices in their oral interactions at the end of their school year (second grade of elementary school).
- E. Extroversion in male students causes them to use more lexical cohesion devices in their oral interactions than introversion in male students.
- F. Extroversion in female students causes them to use more lexical cohesion devices in their oral interactions than introversion in female students.
- G. Extroverted female students use more lexical cohesion devices in their oral interactions than extroverted male students at the end of their school year.
- H. Introverted female students use more lexical cohesion devices in their oral interactions than introverted male students at the end of their school year.

4. Theoretical framework and methodology

Halliday & Hassan defines five cohesion devices which produce a network of semantic relations in text:

1. Reference which consists of personal, demonstrative and comparative.
2. Substitution which includes nominal, verbal and clausal.
3. Ellipsis which includes nominal, verbal and clausal as substitution.
4. Conjunction which consists of additive, adversative, causal and temporal.
5. Lexical cohesion which consists of reiteration, synonymy, hyponymy, general word and collocation.

In this paper, we present the role of gender and personality traits in using the fifth device and its branches in Halliday & Hassan theoretical framework.

We have used survey method in questionnaire part and descriptive analysis in analyzing the obtained data. In addition to gender and personality variables, other variables such as age, geographical zone, social and cultural status, teaching methods can affect on using lexical cohesion devices by the students. So to control the mediator variables, it was necessary to select a homogenous population in which the students are nearly the same according to the above variables except gender and personality traits. It is worth mentioning that the teaching method was also the same in all classes under study.

The population with the above mentioned characteristics was the whole male and female students of second grade of elementary school in Tehran, Iran in school year 2014-2015.

The number of students in our statical sample was 100, which was divided into 4 groups (each group was 25 students) according to gender and personality variables. The sample was chosen by cluster random sampling method.

Choosing second grade of elementary school was according to the following reasons:

- A. This grade is the first grade in which students are learning the material seriously, and have more participation in class activities.
- B. The second grade students are under influence of educational discourse outside of classroom less than the upper grades.
- C. They show their individual differences and personalities more easily than the students in upper grades.

The students were divided into introverted and extroverted groups by the Eysenck Personality Questionnaire (EPQ). In order to collect data, the researches took part in classrooms during the school year, and record the students' voices. Then their voices were transcribed to extract the used lexical cohesion. It is necessary to mention that each student had equal time to speak by asking them to make a short story according to the shown pictures both in pre-tests taken in the beginning of second grade and post-tests taken at the end.

The aim of this paper is to investigate the impact of gender and personality traits on the way of using lexical cohesion in discourse, so gender and personality are known as independent variables and lexical cohesion devices are known as dependent variables. One the one hand, the independent variables are in nominal scale and dependent variables are in ordinal scale, and on the other hand the inconsistency of normality hypothesis was proved by applying normality test with SPSS software (version 20), so the selected tests should be nonparametric. When the purpose of paper was to compare the different cases (here, pre-test and post- test) of a

variable in a sample, Wilcoxon math-pairs was used; and when the purpose of paper was to compare the different cases (here, pre-test and post- test) of a variable in two samples, Man Whitney U test was used. It is worth mentioning that these tests were done by SPSS software version 20.

5. Data analysis

5.1. The way of using lexical cohesion devices according to gender and personality traits

In this part, we investigate lexical cohesion devices which include reiteration, synonymy, hyponymy, general word and collocation according to gender and personality traits separately to define students' progress or retrogression of using these devices by comparing the pre-tests with post-tests. So, the students are divided into four groups: male introverted, male extroverted, female introverted and female extroverted. The results in the form of tables and explanations come as follow:

Table1. Significant difference between pre-test and post test in using reiteration

	Extroversion	Introversion
	Wilcoxon math-pairs test ($p>0.05$) result	Wilcoxon math-pairs test ($p>0.05$) result
male	($p=.015$, $Z=-2.44$, $p<.05$)	($p=.367$, $Z=-.902$)
female	($p=.326$, $Z=.982$)	($p=.133$, $Z=-1.50$)

- There is no progress or retrogression in using reiteration device by introverted male students.
- For extroverted male students, the mean rank in post- test is greater than the mean rank in pre-test according to appendix I (mean rank in post- test= 11.23, mean rank in pre-test= 8.30).
- There is no progress or retrogression in using reiteration device by female students (introverted and extroverted).

Result:

The extroversion factor in male students causes them have significant progress in using reiteration in their speeches at the end of school year, while the introversion factor has no progress or retrogression in using reiteration by male students. In general, personal factors (introversion and extroversion) have no effects on using reiteration by female students.

Table2. Significant difference between pre-test and post test in using synonymy

	Extroversion	Introversion
	Wilcoxon math-pairs test ($p>0.05$) result	Wilcoxon math-pairs test ($p>0.05$) result
male	($p=.021$, $Z=-2.31$, $p<0.05$)	($p=.655$, $Z=-.447$)
female	($p=.891$, $Z=-.137$)	($p=.305$, $Z=-1.02$)

- There is no progress or retrogression in using synonymy device by introverted male students.
- For extroverted male students, the mean rank in post- test is greater than the mean rank in pre-test according to appendix I (mean rank in post- test= 5.13, mean rank in pre-test= 4).
- There is no progress or retrogression in using synonymy device by female students (introverted and extroverted).

Result:

The extroversion factor in male students causes them have significant progress in using synonymy in their speeches at the end of school year, while the introversion factor doesn't cause any progress or retrogression in using synonymy by male students. In general, personal factors (introversion and extroversion) have no effects on using synonymy by female students.

Table3. Significant difference between pre-test and post test in using hyponymy

	Extroversion	Introversion
	Wilcoxon math-pairs test ($p>0.05$) result	Wilcoxon math-pairs test ($p>0.05$) result
male	($p=.083$, $Z=-1.73$)	($p=.317$, $Z=-1$)
female	($p=.317$, $Z=-1$)	($p=.157$, $Z=-1.41$)

- There is no progress or retrogression in using hyponymy device by male students (introverted and extroverted).
- There is no progress or retrogression in using hyponymy device by female students (introverted and extroverted).

Result:

Introversion and extroversion factors don't cause progress or retrogression in using hyponymy by male and female students.

Table4. Significant difference between pre-test and post test in using general word

	Extroversion	Introversion
	Wilcoxon math-pairs test ($p>0.05$) result	Wilcoxon math-pairs test ($p>0.05$) result
male	($p=.317$, $Z=-1$)	($p=.317$, $Z=-1$)
female	($p=.157$, $Z=-1.41$)	($p=1$, $Z=0$)

- There is no progress or retrogression in using general word device by male students (introverted and extroverted).
- There is no progress or retrogression in using general word device by female students (introverted and extroverted).

Result:

Introversion and extroversion factors don't cause progress or retrogression in using general word by male and female students.

Table5. Significant difference between pre-test and post- test in using collocation

	Extroversion	Introversion
	Wilcoxon math-pairs test (p>0.05) result	Wilcoxon math-pairs test (p>0.05) result
male	(p=.145, Z= -1.45)	(p=.623, Z= -.49)
female	(p=.135, Z= -1.49)	(p=.058, Z= -1.89)

- There is no progress or retrogression in using collocation device by male students (introverted and extroverted).
- There is no progress or retrogression in using collocation device by female students (introverted and extroverted).

Result:

Introversion and extroversion factors don't cause progress or retrogression in using general word by male and female students.

5.2. *The effect of personality traits on using lexical cohesion devices in the speeches of male and female students*

In this section, first we fix male gender and then female to study the effect of personality traits. So, each of extracted devices in pre-tests of introverted male and female students compares with the similar devices in pre-tests of extroverted male and female students. This process has been repeated in post-tests. Because we study the way of using lexical cohesion devices in two independent samples (i.e. introverted male students and extroverted male students or introverted female students and extroverted female students), so Man Whitney U test should be used. The results in the form of tables and explanations come as follow:

Table6. Significant difference in using lexical cohesion devices in the speeches of male students according to the type of personality and test (p>0.05)

	Lexical cohesion									
	reiteration		synonymy		hyponymy		general word		collocation	
	Extroverted		Extroverted		Extroverted		Extroverted		Extroverted	
	Pre-test	Post test	Pre-test	Post test	Pre-test	Post test	Pre-test	Post test	Pre-test	Post test
Introverted Pre-test	p = .34 Z= -.94 U= 265		p = .38 Z= -.82 U= 287.5		p = .30 Z= -1.03 U= 287.5		p = .31 Z= -1 U= 300		p = .85 Z= -.18 U= 304	
Introverted Post test		p = .003 Z= -2.99 U= 165 P<.05		p = .07 Z= -1.8 U= 245.5		p = .15 Z= -1.4 U= 287.5		p = .31 Z= -1 U= 300		p = .62 Z= -.49 U= 292.5

- There is no significant difference between pre-tests in using reiteration device, but there is a significant difference between the post-tests of introverted male students and extroverted male students. According to the rank table (appendix II), for extroverted male students, the mean rank is greater than that of introverted male students (mean rank of introverted male students = 19.60, mean rank of extroverted male students = 31.40).
- On the one hand there is no significant difference between pre-tests, and on the other hand there is no significant difference between post-tests in using synonymy, hyponymy, general word and collocation devices.

Result:

Introversion and extroversion in students have no roles in using reiteration device in pre-test, but extroversion causes the male students use this device more than the introverted male counterparts. In using synonymy, hyponymy, general word and collocation devices on the behalf of male students, personality factors have no roles.

Table7. Significant difference in using lexical cohesion devices in the speeches of female students according to the type of personality and test ($p>0.05$)

	Lexical cohesion									
	reiteration		synonymy		hyponymy		general word		collocation	
	Extroverted		Extroverted		Extroverted		Extroverted		Extroverted	
	Pre-test	Post test	Pre-test	Post test	Pre-test	Post test	Pre-test	Post test	Pre-test	Post test
Introverted Pre-test	p = .644 Z= -.46 U= 289		p = .931 Z= -.08 U= 309		p = .317 Z= -1 U= 300		p = .153 Z= -1.42 U= 287.5		p = .449 Z= -.75 U= 283.5	
Introverted Post test		p = .096 Z= -1.6 U= 228		p = .578 Z= -.55 U= 289.5		p = .153 Z= -1.42 U= 287.5		p = .317 Z= -1 U= 300		p = .251 Z= -1.14 U= 259.5

On the one hand there is no significant difference between pre-tests, and on the other hand there is no significant difference between post-tests in using reiteration, synonymy, hyponymy, general word and collocation devices.
 Result:

Introversion and extroversion factors have no roles in using lexical cohesion devices in female students' speeches whether in the beginning of the school year or at the end of it.

5.3. The effect of gender on using lexical cohesion devices in the speeches of introverted and extroverted students

In this section, we fix personality variable to study the role of gender in using lexical cohesion devices. So, each of extracted devices in pre-tests of introverted male students compares with the similar devices in pre-tests of introverted female students and that of extroverted male students with extroverted female students. This process has been repeated in post-tests. For the reason which mentioned in section 7.2 we use Man Whitney U test. The results in the form of tables and explanations come as follow:

Table8. Significant difference in using reiteration in the students' speeches according to the type of gender and test ($p>0.05$)

male \ female	Introverted pre-test	Introverted post test	Extroversion pre-test	Extroversion post test
Introverted pre-test	p= .046, Z= -1.99 U= 211.5, $p<.05$			
Introverted post test		p= .495, Z= -.682 U= 278.5		
Extroversion pre-test			p= .060, Z= -1.88 U= 217	
Extroversion post test				p= .450, Z= -.755 U= 274.5

- There is a significant difference in using reiteration between the pre-test of introverted female students and the pre-test of introverted male students. According to the rank table (appendix III), for female students, the mean rank is greater than that of male students (mean rank of male students = 21.46, mean rank of female students = 29.54). But, there is no significant difference between the post-tests of the introverted female students and the post test of introverted male students.
- There is no significant difference between the pre- tests and post-tests of the extroverted female students and the pre-test of introverted male students.
- On the one hand there is no significant difference between the pre-tests of the extroverted female students and the pre-tests of extroverted male students, and on the other hand there is no significant difference between their post-tests.

Result:

Whenever, introversion is considered the female gender causes the students use this device better than the male students in pre-test; but there is no significant difference between two types of gender in post-tests, as if the role of gender is neutralized at the end of school year. Whenever, extroversion is considered, the type of gender has no roles on using this device.

Table9. Significant difference in using synonymy in the students' speeches according to the type of gender and test ($p>0.05$)

male \ female	Introverted pre-test	Introverted post test	Extroversion pre-test	Extroversion post test
Introverted pre-test	$p= .222, Z= -1.22$ $U= 267$			
Introverted post test		$p= .162, Z= -1.40$ $U= 262.5$		
Extroversion pre-test			$p= .057, Z= -1.90$ $U= 247$	
Extroversion post test				$p= 1, Z=0$ $U= 312.5$

- There is no significant difference in using synonymy on the part of introverted male students and introverted female students both in pre-tests and post-tests.
- There is no significant difference in using synonymy on the part of extroverted male students and extroverted female students both in pre-tests and post- tests.

Result:

Gender doesn't have any significant roles on the usage of synonymy by the students whose personality traits are the same.

Table10. Significant difference in using hyponymy in the students' speeches according to the type of gender and test ($p>0.05$)

male \ female	Introverted pre-test	Introverted post test	Extroversion pre-test	Extroversion post test
Introverted pre-test	$p= .317, Z= -1$ $U= 300$			
Introverted post test		$p= .153, Z= -1.42$ $U= 287.5$		
Extroversion pre-test			$p= .302, Z= -1.03$ $U= 287.5$	
Extroversion post test				$p= 1, Z=0$ $U= 312.5$

- There is no significant difference in using hyponymy on the part of introverted male students and introverted female students both in pre-tests and post-tests.
- There is no significant difference in using hyponymy on the part of extroverted male students and extroverted female students both in pre-tests and post- tests.

Result:

Gender doesn't have any significant roles on the usage of hyponymy by the students whose personality traits are the same.

Table11. Significant difference in using general word in the students' speeches according to the type of gender and test ($p>0.05$)

male \ female	Introverted pre-test	Introverted post test	Extroversion pre-test	Extroversion post test
Introverted pre-test	$p= .317, Z= -1$ $U= 300$			
Introverted post test		$p= .317, Z= -1$ $U= 300$		
Extroversion pre-test			$p= .153, Z= -1.42$ $U= 287.5$	
Extroversion post test				$p= 1, Z=0$ $U= 312.5$

- There is no significant difference in using general word on the part of introverted male students and introverted female students both in pre-tests and post-tests.
- There is no significant difference in using s general word on the part of extroverted male students and extroverted female students both in pre-tests and post-tests.

Result:

Gender doesn't have any significant roles on the usage of general word by the students whose personality traits are the same.

Table12. Significant difference in using collocation in the students' speeches according to the type of gender

and test ($p > 0.05$)

male \ female	Introverted pre-test	Introverted post test	Extroversion pre-test	Extroversion post test
Introverted pre-test	$p = .666, Z = -.432$ $U = 291.5$			
Introverted post test		$p = .119, Z = -1.55$ $U = 243$		
Extroversion pre-test			$p = .143, Z = -1.46$ $U = 247$	
Extroversion post test				$p = .453, Z = -.751$ $U = 280$

- There is no significant difference in using collocation on the part of introverted male students and introverted female students both in pre-tests and post-tests.

- There is no significant difference in using s collocation on the part of extroverted male students and extroverted female students both in pre-tests and post-tests.

Result:

Gender doesn't have any significant roles on the usage of collocation by the students whose personality traits are the same.

6. Discussion

According to above analysis we can say: hypothesis A and B are accepted, introverted male and female students didn't have progress in using lexical cohesion devices in their oral interactions at the end of their school year. Hypothesis C should be modified, if it refers to reiteration and synonymy it is accepted, because they had progress in using these devices at the end of year. But if it refers to other lexical cohesion devices it is rejected. Hypothesis D is rejected; because there is no progression on the part of extroverted female students in using all of the lexical cohesion devices. Hypothesis E should also be modified, if it refers to reiteration, it is accepted; because extroversion in male students causes them to use more reiterations in their oral interactions than introversion in male students. But if it refers to other lexical cohesion devices it is rejected. Hypothesis F is rejected, because there is no significant difference between extroverted female students and introverted female students in using all of the other lexical cohesion devices. Hypothesis G is rejected, because there is no significant difference between extroverted female students and extroverted male students in using all of the lexical cohesion devices, so gender has no role in extroverted students. Hypothesis H is also rejected, because there is no significant difference between introverted female students and introverted male students in using all of the lexical cohesion devices at the end of school year.

7. Conclusion

According to data analysis in section 7, a general and bipolar judgment about the role of gender and personality traits in the studies of speech, and especially in the study of using cohesion devices in discourses is not true. So, this study, hesitate the general outcomes of some researches such as Hall who believes introverted students have more progress than extroverted in school, and Premuzic & Furham who believe extroverted students are more successful than introverted in class activities. Because it must be mentioned these judgments happen in what topic and which activities. As the results show in using some of lexical devices, introverted students had better function and in using some other lexical devices extroverted students had better function; this is true about the role of gender. So whenever we talk about the role of gender and personality traits on the usage of cohesion devices, we should define exactly the name of device, not to content ourselves with a general judgment.

8. References

Brown, P., (1980). How and why are women more polite: some evidence from a Mayan community. in McConnell
 Gient et al, (eds), in *Women & Language in Literature & Society*. New York: Praeger.
 Brown, G., & Yule, G., (1983). *Discourse Analysis*, Cambridge University Press.
 Carrell, P., (1982). Cohesion is not coherence. *TESOL quarterly*, 16(4), 479-488. Retrieved May 16, 2002, from
<http://education.nmsu.edu/brazilTESOL/pdf/article1.pdf>.
 De Beaugrande, R.A., & Dressler, W., (1981). *Introduction to text linguistics*, London; New York: Longman.
 Eysenck, H.J., (1981). General features of the model. In H. J. Eysenck (Ed.), *A model for personality*. Berlin:
 Springer-Verlag.
 Hall, E. T., (1966). *The hidden dimension*, Garden City, NY: Doubleday.
 Halliday, M.A.K., & Hasan, R., (1976). *Cohesion in English*, London, England: Longman.
 Jung, C.G., (1923). *Personality types*, Harcourt, Brace & Company, Inc.
 Lackoff, R., (1975). *Language and Women's Place*, New York: Harper and Row.

Premuzic, T., & Furnham, A., (2003). Personality predicts academic performance: Evidence from two longitudinal

university samples. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 37,pp. 319-338.

Shin,U., (2008). *Seikaku ruikei ni yoru gakushuusha no kobetusei.Ochanomizu (Differences in personality type among the students at Ochanomizu University)*, University katudou houkokusho kaigai kenshuu jigyouonn.

Tennen, D., (1995). The power of talk: Who gets hard and why. *Harvard Business Review*, September, v.73, n5, pp. 138-148.

Wardhaugh, Ronald, (2006). *An Introduction to sociolinguistics (5th ed.)*, Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.

Widdowson, H.G., (1978). *Teaching Language as Communication*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Appendix I

		Ranks		N	Mean Rank	Sum of Ranks
male	introvert	repetition3 - repetition1	Negative Ranks	9 ^a	9.13	73.00
			Positive Ranks	11 ^b	10.64	117.00
			Ties	6 ^c		
			Total	25		
		synonym3 - synonym1	Negative Ranks	3 ^d	3.00	9.00
	Positive Ranks		2 ^e	3.00	6.00	
	Ties		20 ^f			
	Total		25			
	hyponym3 - hyponym1	Negative Ranks	1 ^g	1.00	1.00	
		Positive Ranks	0 ^h	.00	.00	
		Ties	24 ⁱ			
		Total	25			
	generalword3 - generalword1	Negative Ranks	1 ^j	1.00	1.00	
		Positive Ranks	0 ^k	.00	.00	
		Ties	24 ^l			
		Total	25			
	collocation3 - collocation1	Negative Ranks	4 ^m	4.63	18.50	
		Positive Ranks	5 ⁿ	5.30	26.50	
		Ties	16 ^o			
		Total	25			
extrovert	repetition3 - repetition1	Negative Ranks	5 ^a	8.30	41.50	
		Positive Ranks	15 ^b	11.23	168.50	
		Ties	5 ^c			
		Total	25			
		synonym3 - synonym1	Negative Ranks	1 ^d	4.00	4.00
	Positive Ranks		8 ^e	5.13	41.00	
	Ties		16 ^f			
	Total		25			
	hyponym3 - hyponym1	Negative Ranks	3 ^g	2.00	6.00	
		Positive Ranks	0 ^h	.00	.00	
		Ties	22 ⁱ			
		Total	25			
	generalword3 - generalword1	Negative Ranks	0 ^j	.00	.00	
		Positive Ranks	1 ^k	1.00	1.00	
		Ties	24 ^l			
		Total	25			
	collocation3 - collocation1	Negative Ranks	2 ^m	7.00	14.00	
		Positive Ranks	8 ⁿ	5.13	41.00	
		Ties	15 ^o			
		Total	25			
female	introvert	repetition3 - repetition1	Negative Ranks	13 ^a	10.15	132.00
			Positive Ranks	6 ^b	9.67	58.00
			Ties	6 ^c		
			Total	25		
		synonym3 - synonym1	Negative Ranks	6 ^d	6.17	37.00
	Positive Ranks		4 ^e	4.50	18.00	
	Ties		15 ^f			
	Total		25			
	hyponym3 - hyponym1	Negative Ranks	0 ^g	.00	.00	
		Positive Ranks	2 ^h	1.50	3.00	
		Ties	23 ⁱ			
		Total	25			
	generalword3 - generalword1	Negative Ranks	0 ^j	.00	.00	
		Positive Ranks	0 ^k	.00	.00	
		Ties	25 ^l			
		Total	25			
	collocation3 - collocation1	Negative Ranks	7 ^m	7.71	54.00	
		Positive Ranks	4 ⁿ	3.00	12.00	
		Ties	14 ^o			
		Total	25			
extrovert	repetition3 - repetition1	Negative Ranks	8 ^a	10.94	87.50	
		Positive Ranks	13 ^b	11.04	143.50	
		Ties	4 ^c			
		Total	25			
		synonym3 - synonym1	Negative Ranks	5 ^d	6.30	31.50
	Positive Ranks		6 ^e	5.75	34.50	
	Ties		14 ^f			
	Total		25			
	hyponym3 - hyponym1	Negative Ranks	1 ^g	1.00	1.00	
		Positive Ranks	0 ^h	.00	.00	
		Ties	24 ⁱ			
		Total	25			
	generalword3 - generalword1	Negative Ranks	2 ^j	1.50	3.00	
		Positive Ranks	0 ^k	.00	.00	
		Ties	23 ^l			
		Total	25			
	collocation3 - collocation1	Negative Ranks	9 ^m	8.33	75.00	
		Positive Ranks	5 ⁿ	6.00	30.00	
		Ties	11 ^o			
		Total	25			

- a. repetition3 < repetition1
- b. repetition3 > repetition1
- c. repetition3 = repetition1
- d. synonym3 < synonym1
- e. synonym3 > synonym1
- f. synonym3 = synonym1
- g. hyponym3 < hyponym1
- h. hyponym3 > hyponym1
- i. hyponym3 = hyponym1
- j. generalword3 < generalword1
- k. generalword3 > generalword1
- l. generalword3 = generalword1
- m. collocation3 < collocation1
- n. collocation3 > collocation1
- o. collocation3 = collocation1

Appendix II

Ranks

	repetition2	N	Mean Rank	Sum of Ranks
testscore	intro	25	19.60	490.00
	extro	25	31.40	785.00
	Total	50		

Test Statistics^a

	testscore
Mann-Whitney U	165.000
Wilcoxon W	490.000
Z	-2.993
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)	.003

a. Grouping Variable:
repetition2

Appendix III

Test Statistics^a

	testscore
Mann-Whitney U	211.500
Wilcoxon W	536.500
Z	-1.992
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)	.046

a. Grouping Variable:
repetition1

Ranks

	repetition1	N	Mean Rank	Sum of Ranks
testscore	intromale	25	21.46	536.50
	introfemal	25	29.54	738.50
	Total	50		

The IISTE is a pioneer in the Open-Access hosting service and academic event management. The aim of the firm is Accelerating Global Knowledge Sharing.

More information about the firm can be found on the homepage:

<http://www.iiste.org>

CALL FOR JOURNAL PAPERS

There are more than 30 peer-reviewed academic journals hosted under the hosting platform.

Prospective authors of journals can find the submission instruction on the following page: <http://www.iiste.org/journals/> All the journals articles are available online to the readers all over the world without financial, legal, or technical barriers other than those inseparable from gaining access to the internet itself. Paper version of the journals is also available upon request of readers and authors.

MORE RESOURCES

Book publication information: <http://www.iiste.org/book/>

Academic conference: <http://www.iiste.org/conference/upcoming-conferences-call-for-paper/>

IISTE Knowledge Sharing Partners

EBSCO, Index Copernicus, Ulrich's Periodicals Directory, JournalTOCS, PKP Open Archives Harvester, Bielefeld Academic Search Engine, Elektronische Zeitschriftenbibliothek EZB, Open J-Gate, OCLC WorldCat, Universe Digital Library, NewJour, Google Scholar

