

Gender Differences in the Use of Negation Markers in Qassimi Arabic: A Sociolinguistic Analysis

Noorah A. Almohaimeed¹

¹ Department of English Language and Literature, College of Languages & Humanities, Qassim University, Buraydah, Saudi Arabia

Correspondence: Noorah A. Almohaimeed, Department of English Language and Literature, College of Languages & Humanities, Qassim University, Buraydah, Saudi Arabia.

Received: April 3, 2024 Accepted: July 10, 2024 Online Published: July 24, 2024

doi:10.5539/ijel.v14n4p117 URL: <https://doi.org/10.5539/ijel.v14n4p117>

Abstract

This study investigates the use of negation markers in the Qassimi Arabic (QA), a variety of Najdi Arabic, spoken in central-north Saudi Arabia. Employing a qualitative approach, we observed the speech patterns of 28 Qassimi speakers (14 male, 14 female; ages 28–34). The local negators *Muhub/Mub* were used by 39% of males but only 12.4% of females. Conversely, the supralocal negator *Mu* was used by all females (35.6%) and a smaller portion of males (12.9%). These findings highlight gender differences in negation marker preference within the Qassim dialect. The study aims to improve communication between genders and encourage broader understanding of linguistic variation in Najdi Arabic.

Keywords: Arabic sociolinguistic studies, gender differences, negation markers, Qassimi Arabic

1. Introduction

Over the past eight decades, Saudi Arabia has experienced sharp changes in its economy, political system, and cultural structure which may lead to changes in its spoken language. In Arabic sociolinguistics, the linguistic outcomes of these changes are rarely studied, apart from a few variationist studies on certain phonological features in certain urban areas (Al-Essa, 2009). Contact-induced social interactions lead to increased and prolonged social interactions, linguistic mixing, leveling, and simplification processes caused by contact, and it is important to note among any group of speakers, language changes are usually a natural process; however, radical changes can result in the loss of distinct linguistic features (Al-Azraqi, 2016), as some changes in the case of the Qassimi dialect which is spoken in the north of Saudi Arabia in negation particularly.

Due to an explosion of studies over the last few decades that explore the nature and existence of differences between men and women, Ige (2010) has discussed the role of “language and culture in influencing recognition and prestige as a central theme of language and gender research” (p. 3048). One of the most popular questions asked was how men and women differ in their language usage; in part, Newman et al. (2008) have elaborated that this popularity grows from the fact that language is an inherently social phenomenon, providing insight into how men and women interact with each other.

In regard to the previous studies (e.g., Almohaimeed, 2022), the use of language between males and females still poses a significant problem in communication. Thus, these differences often lead to misunderstandings or disappointment between people. Since these differences have been mentioned above, in the current study, the main focus would be to investigate gender differences in using negators among Qassimi Arabic speakers.

1.1 Statement of the Problem

In particular, this study takes place in the Qassim region, and it focuses on the different use of Qassimi dialect negators which are: *Muhub* or *Mub*, as they are considered Qassim local and non-standard negators, and *Mu*, which is considered the common negator used in Najdi dialect in general, Najdi is spoken in the interior area of the province, as well as the northern areas, which include Riyadh and the towns in the provinces of Qassim and Ha'il, and also a supralocal and prestigious negator. Thus, the aim of this study is to shed light on previous debates by examining the phenomenon of gender differences in the use of Qassimi dialect negators and attempting to clarify if these differences still exist nowadays.

2. Literature Review

This review of the literature will focus on the gender differences in language use, cross-gender related patterns, the concept of negation and its meaning, negation in Arabic, and lastly, Arabic varieties in the expression of negation.

2.1 *Gender Differences in Language Use*

Many notions and concepts have been developed in areas such as pragmatics and sociolinguistics to explain gender differences in language use (e.g., Tannen, 1990; Holmes, 1992). For example, Tannen conducted his study on 2nd-, 6th-, and 10th-grade same-sex best friends who talked to each other for 20 minutes. He found that girls are more concerned with avoiding arguments and anger; furthermore, they encounter difficulty when talking about any topic, as they “exhibit minimal or no difficulty finding something to talk about, and they talk about a small number of topics, all related to troubles” (p. 73). Compared to the younger boys, the 10th-grade boys use highly personal topics to describe their feelings; two pairs of younger boys produce more small amounts of talk, and they generate large amounts of talk on a great number of topics but “each develops his own topic and minimizes the other’s” (p. 73).

2.2 *Cross-Gender Related Patterns*

Although gender differences play a large role in language behavior, it is important to keep in mind that they are interconnected with all the other factors: Ethnicity, class, region, age, and professional training, among others (Tannen, 1996). Surveying studies of interruption and gender, (e.g., James & Clarke, 1993 as cited in Tannen, 1996), researchers found that women tend to interrupt men more than men interrupt women and that all-female conversations tend to be interrupted more often than all-male conversations. James and Clarke clarified that although these interruptions usually attempted to reinforce the original speaker’s point rather than to wrest the floor from them, they tend to be supportive in nature.

During every age level of Tannen’s (1990) study, he observed that female friends quickly established topics for conversation and produced extended talk related to a relatively small number of topics, whereas boys at the young age levels engaged in very little talking about a wide range of topics. On the other hand, he noted that “at the two older ages, the boys and men, like their female counterparts, produced a lot of talk about a few topics, but the level at which they discussed the topics was more abstract, less personal” (p. 74).

Additionally, Kuhn (1996) conducted a study that serves as a distinct illustration of this approach by examining the classroom discourse of professors at universities in the United States and Germany. Initially, she found the language employed by female academics in the United States strange. At first, they gave students direct instructions more assertively than their male colleagues. In Kuhn’s study, the significant difference was not in the form of language used in the classroom discourse between men and women but rather in the way they approached their respective groups’ requirements and students, and they framed their discourse accordingly.

2.3 *The Concept of Negation and its Meaning*

Negative statements identify things that are not happening or that we do not want to happen because they contain negative particles or expressions. Consequently, an affirmation that is negated is known as a negation. Thus, negation is the act of turning a sentence into a negative statement by assigning it negative particles. As elaborated by Wedin (1990) that Aristotle’s opposition is comprised of four distinct species: contrariety (between two contraries), e.g., good vs. bad, and affirmative (positive) to negative (negative), e.g., he eats vs. he does not eat, correlation (between two relatives), e.g., double vs. half, and privation (positive vs. negative), e.g., blind vs. sighted, Aristotle proceeds to distinguish the different senses where the term ‘opposite’ is used. He stated that contradictions (all pleasure is good, some pleasure is not good) are both mutually exhaustive and mutually exclusive, whereas contrary contradictions (no pleasure is good, all pleasure is good) do not overlap. In contrast to contradictions, which can be true simultaneously, contradictory pairs cannot be true and false at the same time; they “divide the true and the false” (p. 134). The same way applies to contradictory terms (black/non-black, odd/even, male/female), excluding all middle terms, such as shirts that are neither black nor not-black or integers that are neither odd nor even.

Languages incorporate various elements of this basic structure to render negative meaning using negation as a means of expressing the absence of something, an object, an action, or a feeling (Alhilali, 2020). He contributed that in spite of some universal practices, such as positioning the negative mark before the verb, it has long been suspected that different languages employ different negation patterns. Furthermore, he stated a basic assumption which is every natural language has universal linguistic structures that are based on cognitive processes, and these structures show up in one way or another as an example of this assumption is negation, which is considered one

of these linguistic universals found in Arabic and English.

2.3.1 Negation in Arabic

Negation is a universal concept and one of the most fundamental components of our mind. Consequently, it is an intrinsic component of our natural languages, which serve as the means of conveying our thoughts. Arabic utilizes negation as a basic linguistic phenomenon at different levels of syntactic structure and with different purposes (Al-Momani, 2011). It is important to note that a number of studies have been conducted on the subject of Arabic negation, but most of those studies have been syntactic, and some of these studies have been done by Fassi Fehri (1993), Bahloul (1996), and others.

According to Bahloul (1996), he presents a typology of affirmation and negation that is based on texts presented in contemporary media, primarily newspapers and short stories. He proposes that affirmation and negation fall into the same functional classification: The assertive Phase (AP). Based on this analysis, the Negative Phase is only one aspect of this broader classification, which is the Assertive Phase. Additionally, Al-Tamari (2001) studies the concept of sentential negation using a syntactic perspective. He has not addressed a wide range of negation-related topics, such as categorical negation, as his research is restricted to verbal and verbless sentential negations in Standard Arabic and certain dialects of Arabic, including Jordanian Arabic.

Although negation is discussed syntactically in Standard Arabic, Arabic books consider negation in terms of the negative particles which are scattered throughout various subjects (Al-Azraqi, 2016). She elaborated that the negative particles in Standard Arabic are: *laysa*, *mā*, *lā*, *lan*, *lammā*, *lam*, and *lāt*, and they occur in verbal and non-verbal predication and fulfill a variety of functions in sentences. A verb can also be inflected like *Laysa*, taking an example from Al-Ghani Arabic dictionary, as it said: (حضر اللاعبيون ليس الحكم) which *Laysa* functions here as a verb and indicates negation in the present tense. Besides, Fehri (1993) terms the negative particle *mā* a 'neutral' negator because it occurs with both verbal and non-verbal predicates.

The negation system of Modern Standard Arabic (MSA) is frequently a challenge for students of Arabic as a second language, like other aspects of the language, and the reason behind that, as Kasem (2002) clarified before, reflects its complexity when compared to other languages since it includes sub-systems such as gender, number, and tense, which each have their own specific features.

2.3.2 Arabic Varieties in the Expression of Negation

One of the most striking differences between Classic and Modern Standard Arabic and a number of spoken Arabic varieties from North Africa is the way in which negation is expressed, both in these varieties and in the majority of spoken Arabic varieties from North Africa, negation is exclusively expressed preverbally or with basic verbal negators (Laucus, 2020), as in the following example in Damascus Arabic:

1) *Mā Bəddahhək*, which means this is not something to laugh at.

Furthermore, Laucus (2020) clarified that in most Arabic varieties, the answer is clear, and these varieties use the verbal negators: (*mā*, *mā...-š*) to negate existential predicates, as is demonstrated by the following Cairo Arabic example:

2) *Mā fiš haga*, and that means there is nothing.

Additionally, a post-verbal construction is also possible in some varieties that permit the bipartite construction as in Cairo Arabic. Here is an example of the use of post-verbals in Palestinian Arabic:

3) *Badaħhin-š*, means I do not smoke.

To sum up, in researching gender interactions in negotiation dyads, Bowles and Flynn et al. (2010) proposed that a negotiator's persistence is related to the gender composition in the dyad. In light of their findings, they challenge sex-stereotypic perspectives, revealing that women continue to struggle more with male naysayers than female naysayers, although they do so in a stereotypically indirect (as opposed to direct) manner. Accordingly, by following the gender stereotypes, men would tend to stand their ground, whereas women would be more prone to compromise and accommodate.

As discussed above, in the literature review of the current study, many research studies have investigated gender differences in language use, linguistic variant choices and related patterns, and the use of negation in English and Arabic. However, there has not been a study that investigated the gender differences in the use of negation among Qassimi Arabic speakers. Therefore, the present study has been conducted to shed light on this phenomenon and attempt to clarify if these differences still exist nowadays. Consequently, it aims to provide an answer to the following question:

1) What are the differences, if any, between male and female speakers in the use of *Muhub*/*Mub* and *Mu* as Qassimi Arabic negators in their speech?

3. Methods

This element offers a description of the research methodology of this study. It has been organized into four sections: Variables of the study, participants, data collection, and data collection procedure.

3.1 Variables of the Study

Since this study aimed at observing the linguistic choices of Qassimi men and women as to their usage of local negators, it included one dependent variable (i.e., gender) and three independent variables (i.e., the local negators: *Muhub*, *Mub*, and the supralocal negator: *Mu*).

3.2 Participants

Since the focus of the study was on gender differences, 28 participants were chosen, 14 females and 14 males. The most important selection criterion for participants was that they had been born and raised in Buraydah, Qassim region, Saudi Arabia. Furthermore, they all have BA degrees. The participants were 28–34 years old, and this middle-aged sample was chosen in the current study because middle-aged speakers are increasingly shifting toward the use of supralocal variants, as stated by Al-Rojaie (2013), and it attempts to examine if this case still exists nowadays.

3.3 Data Collection

The methodology of the current study is a mixed-method. Since data will be explained in descriptive and numerical outcomes. Therefore, to collect data, the researcher used the observation method for the reason that it suits this study since observing involves watching interactions and relations, evaluating them, drawing conclusions, and commenting on them (Ciesielska et al., 2017). Ciesielska et al. assert that this methodology is regarded as useful in sociolinguistic research “one of the most important research methods in social sciences and at the same time one of the most diverse” (p. 33).

3.3.1 Observation Techniques

Observation may be direct or indirect. In indirect observation, the observer relies on receipt of information from others or the recording of past events in the form of documentation, videos, and so on. Direct observation, on the other hand, occurs when the observer is directly watching events as they occur before his/her eyes (Ciesielska et al., 2017). Therefore, this study is based on indirect observation. The researcher relied on recordings of past events in the form of published videos.

3.4 Data Analysis

YouTube is the most frequently referenced platform as “a website that provides video clips, TV show clips, music videos, short films and documentaries, audio recordings, movie trailers, live streams, original short video content, and educational videos” (Mozes, 2020, p. 120). In the present study, 28 published videos on YouTube were chosen from a random selection of the participants. While observing the way that the participants were speaking, the researcher was taking notes, since note-taking from the field always be seen as a selective exercise, and there is no single best way to create notes (Ciesielska et al., 2017).

However, the researcher followed a few guidelines which were outlined in Ciesielska et al.’s (2017) study, which are:

- 1) Note the details: the initial impressions of appearances, reactions and behaviors, sounds, and so on.
- 2) Try to understand what the event means for the observed individuals and communities, but making your notes, do not ascribe motifs to the observed behavior.
- 3) Describe rather than make judgments. Avoid quick and unjustified generalizations and stereotype typifications.
- 4) Your notes should address your research topic. The selection of the material depends on both the research problem and the views of the researcher on what may be important and interesting.

The total time was 587 minutes for all the seen videos, illustrated in the following table:

Table 1. Length of each published video

Type of video	Situation Context	Name & Gender	Video Length
Discussing topics with friends or family	Informal	Sara (F)	31 mins.
Discussing topics with friends or family	Informal	Sulaiman (M)	19 mins.
Discussing topics with friends or family	Informal	Abdullah (M)	22 mins.
Discussing topics with friends or family	Informal	Afnan (F)	16 mins.
Discussing topics with friends or family	Informal	Dana (F)	17 mins.
Discussing topics with friends or family	Informal	Reema (F)	23 mins.
Advertising products	Informal	Rakan (M)	27 mins.
Advertising products	Informal	Salman (M)	18 mins.
Advertising products	Informal	Faisal (M)	22 mins.
Advertising products	Informal	Lulu (F)	19 mins.
Narrating a story	Informal	Munira (F)	27 mins.
Narrating a story	Informal	Wafi (M)	16 mins.
Narrating a story	Informal	Anfal (F)	21 mins.
Narrating a story	Informal	Abdulaziz (M)	18 mins.
Narrating a story	Informal	Abeer (F)	17 mins.
Narrating a story	Informal	Ali (M)	25 mins.
Narrating a story	Informal	Turfah (F)	21 mins.
Narrating a story	Informal	Ibrahim (M)	24 mins.
Advertising products	Informal	Nawaf (M)	16 mins.
Advertising products	Informal	Saleh (M)	19 mins.
Advertising products	Informal	Nouf (F)	22 mins.
Advertising products	Informal	Noura (F)	26 mins.
Discussing topics with students	Informal	Fahad (M)	16 mins.
Discussing topics with friends or family	Informal	Nayef (M)	23 mins.
Discussing topics with friends or family	Informal	Tala (F)	28 mins.
Discussing topics with friends or family	Informal	Nujoud (F)	18 mins.
Discussing topics with friends or family	Informal	Shaden (F)	16 mins.
Advertising products	Informal	Saud (M)	20 mins.
			Total: 587 mins.

Note. (M) refers to male, (F) refers to female, and mins refer to minutes.

The videos were composed of informal situations. Regarding their content, they were about narrating stories, advertising products, and discussing some topics with families and friends. In that event, all participants had a right to privacy, their personal information was protected, and the names in Table 1 are not real in order to preserve their privacy. In the next section, the researcher drew a conclusion and provided an answer to the research question of this study.

4. Findings

In a sample composed of 14 males and 14 females, their speeches were analyzed. Table 2 illustrates the differences between female and male characteristics in terms of the linguistic choices of Arabic Qassimi negators.

Table 2. Number of occurrences of use of all negators

Name & Gender	Type of Negators	
	<i>Mu</i> negator	<i>Muhub\Mub</i> negators
Sara (F)	11	3
Sulaiman (M)	2	7
Abdullah (M)	4	10
Afnan (F)	6	2
Dana (F)	3	2
Reema (F)	5	1
Rakan (M)	0	4
Salman (M)	2	5
Faisal (M)	1	3
Lulu (F)	4	2
Munira (F)	6	1
Wafi (M)	3	7
Anfal (F)	5	3
Abdulaziz (M)	1	4
Abeer (F)	5	2
Ali (M)	3	8
Turfah (F)	7	3
Ibrahim (M)	2	8
Nawaf (M)	0	5
Saleh (M)	1	3
Nouf (F)	5	2
Noura (F)	3	1
Fahad (M)	2	7
Nayef (M)	2	4
Tala (F)	5	0
Nujoud (F)	5	3
Shaden (F)	2	0
Saud (M)	3	4

Note. All the examples of using negation are taken from the observed speakers.

Table 3. The use of negators among both genders

Negator type	Gender	
	Qassimi male speakers	Qassimi female speakers
<i>Mu</i>	12.9%	35.6%
<i>Muhub\Mub</i>	39%	12.4%

4.1 *Muhub\Mub* Negators

Table 2 shows that females and males used negators differently when they speak. As shown in Table 3, on average, a total of 39% of males used *Muhub\Mub* local non-standard negotiators in their speech, compared to 12.4% of females, who used these negotiators less often than males. For instance:

- 1) يقول فهد: "مهيب بالطريقة تسعفونه"
- 2) وايضاً: "مب هذي الأداة"

Fahad says: "It is not this tool" and "this is not how the injured is treated".

Fahad is a Qassimi doctor, he is 31 years old. He presented the first aid procedures to medical students. In the previous example, he chose *Muhub\Mub* negators in his speech and when he was being asked to clarify a point, he chose *Mu* negator, as the following:

- 3) "ايوه صحيح مو كذا"

He says: Yes, you are right, it is not like this.

It was noticed that when the speaker was explaining the procedures to his students, he chose the local negator naturally in his speech. On the other hand, one of his students was asking him to be sure about something, and Dr. Fahad answered him using the *Mu* negator, the example is bolded in number 3.

Another example from Saleh, as the following:

- 1) يقول صالح: "مهيب يشغلك بالتنتقل"
- 2) وأيضاً: "ميزة ميب موجودة بأغلب الشركات"

Saleh says: "It does not bother you when you want to change your place" and "a great feature that most companies do not have".

Saleh is a Qassimi social media influencer, he is 29 years old. He advertised a product; a charger for smartphones to the viewers. In his speech, he used *Muhub\Mub* negators all the time and never use *Mu* negator based on the seen videos.

4.2 *Mu* Negator

As for *Mu* negator, Table 3 illustrates that 35.6% of females used this negator in most cases, which is intended as the common supralocal negator used in Najd dialects and considered a standard and prestigious negator. In contrast, males used it in fewer situations with a percentage of 12.9%. This is an example from Reema:

- 1) تقول ريماء: "ماش اليوم مهيب يومي"
- 2) وايضاً: "أدري مو هذا محتواي اللي عودتكم عليه"

Reema says: "oh, it is not my day", and "I know, this is not what you expect from me as usual".

Reema is a Qassimi hairstylist, she is 32 years old. She shared her events and tutorials on YouTube. Regarding example 1, based on the seen video, she was completely upset and frustrated. By what she said, that is because she accidentally deleted a tutorial video on YouTube while she was trying to upload it. In this case, she chose *Muhub\Mub* negators. She was very sorry that she appeared sad, and at the end of the video, she said: "I know, this is not what you expect from me as usual", as an apology to the viewers. Then, in this case, she used *Mu* negator, as illustrated in example 2.

5. Discussion

The influence of gender differences on the manner in which they utilize Qassimi Arabic negation in their speech has been apparent in these findings, which are detailed and explicit. Additionally, they they provided sharp differences in their use as well as they answered the research question. In terms of *Muhum\Mub* negators used by males, as shown in Table 3, all the males used these negators in their speech in a percentage of 39%, compared to 12.4%, of the use of these negators by females. Since *Muhum\Mub* negators are considered local negators, it was noticed that males tend to speak an informal language in most cases, and this statement is in harmony with Fischer's (1958) study. Whose results suggested that boys showed great preferences for using non-standard variants in most cases of formal and informal situations rather than girls. At the same time, this result is consistent with Trudgill's (1974) study, which indicates that men or males in general, tend to use informal variants in their speech. Thus, males were more common to use informal forms in the majority of cases.

Alternatively, in comparison with the females, they tend to use *Mu* negator in all situations, as illustrated in Table 3 with a percentage of 35.6%. Moreover, they showed a greater preference for speaking the formal language. Even though the situation was narrating stories to their friends and family, they tend to speak in a prestigious way. The present finding seems to match the conclusion of Al-Rojaie (2013) and Gordon's (1997) studies. Gordon revealed that women use prestigious forms as a way to appear in high esteem. According to Al-Rojaie, his data suggested that in the younger and middle age of Qassimi speakers, especially females, the use of the supralocal variant [k] is increasingly predominating over the local variant [ts]. Furthermore, it is consistent with Fischer's (1958) study, in which his findings suggested that 83% of the girls showed their preference for the formal variants [-ing] form, whereas 42% of the boys did.

Considering the use of *Mu* negator by the Qassimi male speaker, even though of the mentioned situation in section 4.1, the Qassimi speaker used the local negators *Muhub\Mub* in his speech, and only 2 times he used the *Mu* negator, based on Table 3. It was questioned the case in which he used this negator and what are the reasons that guided him to use *Mu* supralocal negator only 2 times. By understanding what the event means for the observed individuals and communities as suggested by Ciesielska et al.'s (2017) study, and making notes regarding the situation without making judgments. It was observed that the speaker, when he clarified some points to the audience; as a result, he used the supralocal negator *Mu* while he was trying to convey and clarify the ideas that he had. As stated before in section 1.1, *Mu* negator is considered the common negator used in the Najd dialect, which involves the Qassim dialect; thus, the Qassimi male speaker here in this situation, used this negator as taking the different types of listeners into his consideration, the case of Dr. Fahad and his medical students.

Regarding negators, the current study used Qassimi Arabic negators which are: *Muhub* or *Mub* and *Mu*. They function and match the basic verbal negators of Cairo Arabic and Damascus Arabic; *Mā* negator, as illustrated in Lucas's (2020) study, and Standard Arabic negators: *laysa*, *mā*, *lā*, *lan*, *lammā*, *lam*, and *lāt*, in Al-Azraqi's (2016) study, in terms of the location of the negators in a clause, which comes before the negated objects:

- 1) *Mā* Bəddahhək (Damascus Arabic).
- 2) *Muhub youmi* (Qassimi Arabic).
- 3) *Mā* fiš haga (Cairo Arabic).
- 4) *Laysa* alhakam (Standard Arabic).

Whereas the location of Palestinian Arabic negation is as post-verbals, as mentioned in Lucas's (2020) study, that means it comes at the end:

- 1) Badahhjin-š (Palestinian Arabic).

In the case of Cairo Arabic, Lucas (2020) stated that the negation locates in the beginning and at the end, as the following:

- 1) *Mā* fiš haga (Cairo Arabic).

This corresponds to the case of Palestinian Arabic, in which negation comes at the end of the clause. Furthermore, Standard Arabic, Damascus Arabic, and Cairo Arabic use the same *Mā* negator in their functional and locational settings.

6. Conclusion

The role of language in human societies is not limited to communication; every individual within a given community speaks differently, and every individual has his/her own features and speaking style (Soori & Zamani, 2012). Among the sociocultural influences on language, the gender component has been prominent in many studies (Kamari et al., 2012). Speaking, therefore, is a form of social interaction, and it can be achieved by adapting ideas and expressions created by others to fit within accepted discourses (Auer et al., 2018). This study highlights and provides valuable information about distinctions between men and women Qassimi Arabic speakers in the ways they use negations in their speech. In addition, the current study is helping Arabic people in general and Qassimi speakers in particular to understand the linguistic choices common to everyone, males and females. This information will enhance communication between the two genders and can eliminate misunderstandings between them. Such topics should be studied and studied in depth.

Over and above, it has been observed that females are using more prestigious supralocal negators than males, which logically implies that women use prestigious and standard forms as a way to appear in high esteem. Whereas males usually do not mind about their outward appearance or how other people think about their looks. In light of such outcomes, people should take steps to understand the gender differences nature among speakers.

Additionally, the improvement of communication could be facilitated by elucidating the aforementioned differences, provided that individuals possess a comprehensive understanding of the nature of these gender distinctions. The gender difference in the use of negation observed here may simply be an artifact of either the sample or the cultural context of Saudi Arabia, but the fact that language proficiency was explicitly measured and impacts were identified in negation use indicates that this phenomenon can be general in nature. In the future, therefore, instruction and research will be needed in this area. Besides the method used in the present study, the researcher recommends conducting interviews with the participants to obtain a better understanding of their linguistic choices in future work.

References

- Adams, A. M., & Simmons, F. R. (2019). Exploring individual and gender differences in early writing performance. *Reading and Writing*, 32(2), 235–263. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11145-018-9859-0>
- Almohaimeed, N. A. (2022). Gender Analysis of Writing E-Mails Received from Graduate Students at Saudi Universities. *International Journal of English Linguistics*, 12(6).
- Al-Azraqi, M. (2016). A change in the usage of negators in Abha Arabic through dialect levelling. *مجلة جامعة الملك عبدالعزيز للعلوم الإنسانية*, 24(1). <https://doi.org/10.4197/Art.24-1.12>
- Al-Essa, A. (2009). When Najd meets Hijaz: Dialect contact in Jeddah. In *Arabic Dialectology* (pp. 201–222). Brill. <https://doi.org/10.1163/ej.9789004172128.i-298.76>
- Al-Momani, I. M. (2011). The syntax of sentential negation in Jordanian Arabic. *Theory and Practice in Language*

- Studies*, 1(5). <https://doi.org/10.4304/tpls.1.5.482-496>
- Al-Rojaie, Y. (2013). Regional dialect leveling in Najdi Arabic: The case of the deaffrication of [k] in the Qaṣīmī dialect. *Language Variation and Change*, 25(1), 43–63. <https://doi.org/10.1017/s0954394512000245>
- Al-Saadi, Z. (2020). Gender differences in writing: The mediating effect of language proficiency and writing fluency in text quality. *Cogent Education*, 7(1), 1770923. <https://doi.org/10.1080/2331186x.2020.1770923>
- Al-Tamari, E. A. (2001). *Sentential negation in English and Arabic: A minimalist approach*. University of Kansas.
- Alhilali, A. (2020). A contrastive analysis of negation between Arabic and English with reference to Quranic translation. *لغويات*, 3(38), 548–535. <https://doi.org/10.31185/lark.vol3.iss38.1494>
- Amir, Z., Abidin, H., Darus, S., & Ismail, K. (2012). Gender differences in the language use of Malaysian teen bloggers. *GEMA Online Journal of Language Studies*, 12(1).
- Auer, B. J., Calvi, J. L., Jordan, N. M., Schrader, D., & Byrd-Craven, J. (2018). Communication and social interaction anxiety enhance interleukin-1 beta and cortisol reactivity during high-stakes public speaking. *Psychoneuroendocrinology*, 94, 83–90. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.psyneuen.2018.05.011>
- Babayiğit, S. (2015). The dimensions of written expression: Language group and gender differences. *Learning and Instruction*, 35, 33–41. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.learninstruc.2014.08.006>
- Bahloul, R. M. (1996). Negation in French and Tunisian Arabic. *Perspectives on Arabic Linguistics*, 8, 67–83. <https://doi.org/10.1075/cilt.134.07mal>
- Ciesielska, M., Boström, K. W., & Öhlander, M. (2017). Observation methods. *Qualitative Methodologies in Organization Studies*, 33–52. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-65442-3_2
- Fassi Fehri, A. (1993). Issues in the structure of Arabic clauses and words. *Studies in Natural Language and Linguistic Theory*, 29. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-017-1986-5>
- Fehri, F. A. (1993). *Issues in the structure of Arabic clauses and words*. London: Kluwer. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-017-1986-5>
- Fischer, J. L. (1958). Social influences on the choice of a linguistic variant. *WORD*, 14(1), 47–56. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00437956.1958.11659655>
- Flynn, B. B., Huo, B., & Zhao, X. (2010). The impact of supply chain integration on performance: A contingency and configuration approach. *Journal of Operations Management*, 28(1), 58–71. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jom.2009.06.001>
- Gordon, E. (1997). Sex, speech, and stereotypes: Why women use prestige speech forms more than men. *Language in Society*, 26(1), 47–63. <https://doi.org/10.1017/s0047404500019400>
- Herring, S. C. (1993). Gender and democracy in computer-mediated communication. *Electronic Journal of Communication*, 3(2), (Online) Retrieved 21 October 2011.
- Holmes, J. (1992). Women's talk in public contexts. *Discourse & Society*, 3(2), 131–150. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0957926592003002001>
- Ige, B. (2010). Identity and language choice: 'We equals i'. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 42(11), 3047–3054. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2010.04.018>
- James, D., & Clarke, S. (1993). Women, men, and interruptions: A critical review. *Gender and Conversational Interaction*, 231(80).
- Jespersen, O. (1922). *Language: Its nature, development, and origin*. London: George Allen & Unwin.
- Kamari, E., Gorjian, B., & Pazhakh, A. (2012). Examining the effects of gender on second language writing proficiency of Iranian EFL students: Descriptive vs. opinion one-paragraph essay. *Advances in Asian Social Sciences (AASS)*, 3(4).
- Kasem, M. M. M. (2002). Group theoretic approach for solving the problem of diffusion of a drug through a thin membrane. *Elsevier*, 1–11.
- Kuhn, E. (1996). Cross-Cultural stumbling blocks for international teachers. *College Teaching*, 44(3), 96–99. <https://doi.org/10.1080/87567555.1996.9925560>
- Lakoff, T. R. (1975). *Languages and woman's Place*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Lucas, C. (2020). Contact and the expression of negation. *Arabic and Contact-Induced Change*, 643.

- Mozes, G. N. (2020). The influence of YouTube on English vocabulary for children 7–8 years old. *Epigram*, 17(2), 119–124. <https://doi.org/10.32722/epi.v17i2.3458>
- Newman, M. L., Groom, C. J., Handelman, L. D., & Pennebaker, J. W. (2008). Gender differences in language use: An analysis of 14,000 text samples. *Discourse Processes*, 45(3), 211–236. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01638530802073712>
- Rosseti, P. (1998). Gender differences in email communication. *The Internet TESL Journal*, 4(7).
- Soori, A., & Zamani, A. A. (2012). Language features in the writing of male and female students in English and Persian. *European Journal of Social Sciences*, 33(2), 324–329.
- Tannen, D. (1990). *You just don't understand* (1st ed.). London: Virago.
- Tannen, D. (1996). Researching Gender-Related patterns in classroom discourse. *TESOL Quarterly*, 30(2), 341. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3588149>
- Trudgill, P. (1974). Linguistic change and diffusion: Description and explanation in sociolinguistic dialect geography. *Language in Society*, 3(2), 215–246. <https://doi.org/10.1017/s0047404500004358>
- Verhoeven, L., & Van Hell, J. G. (2008). From knowledge representation to writing text: A developmental perspective. *Discourse Processes*, 45(4–5), 387–405. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01638530802145734>
- Wedin, M. V. (1990). Negation and quantification in Aristotle. *History and Philosophy of Logic*, 11(2), 131–150. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01445349008837163>
- Zhang, M., Bennett, R. E., Deane, P., & Rijn, P. W. (2019). Are there gender differences in how students write their essays? An analysis of writing processes. *Educational Measurement: Issues and Practice*, 38(2), 14–26. <https://doi.org/10.1111/emip.12249>

Copyrights

Copyright for this article is retained by the author, with first publication rights granted to the journal.

This is an open-access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).