



Institute of Letters and Languages

Department of Foreign Languages

Branch: English

The Impact Of Gender Differences On EFL Learners’ Speaking Fluency During Debates

The case of EFL learners at Mila University Centre

A Dissertation Submitted in Partial Fulfillment for the Requirement of the
Master Degree in
Didactics of Foreign Languages

Presented by:

- Soumia BAHRI
- Chaima DEFFOUS

Supervisor:

Dr. Fouzia BENNACER

Board of Examiners:

- Chairman: Dr. Layla ZOUREZ
- Supervisor: Dr. Fouzia BENNACER
- Examiner: Dr. Messaouda BOUDJERIDA

2023 - 2024

Dedication

All praise to Allah, who has blessed me with the strength and guidance to achieve my goals.

*To my beloved father, **Amar**, who lightened my way and served as the perfect role model for every decision I have ever made.*

*To my kind-hearted mother **Zohra**, who has never left my side and has always been there for me.*

To my dear siblings, my dearest friends, and loved ones who supported me throughout my entire educational career.

*To all of my professors, and especially my precious supervisor, **Dr. Fouzia Bennacer**, who contributed significantly to the success of this work with her constant presence, hard work, guidance, and expertise. A great thanks and appreciation to you.*

Last but not least, I want to thank myself for always believing in me.

Soumia

Dedication

With heartfelt gratitude, I dedicate this dissertation to my parents, my pillars of strength and the guiding stars of my life. Your unwavering love, support, and sacrifices have illuminated my path and shaped me into the person I am today.

To my dear brothers and sisters, whose unwavering faith in my abilities has been a constant source of motivation. Your encouragement has been invaluable, and I am blessed to have you by my side on this journey.

To my cherished friends, whose friendship and encouragement have provided strength during the most challenging moments. Your support has been a beacon of light, guiding me through the darkest of times.

Lastly, a sincere thank you to myself for the determination and perseverance that led to the completion of this dissertation. Through late nights, countless revisions, and unwavering commitment, I remained consistent in pursuit of my academic goals. This journey has been a testament to my resilience and dedication, and I am proud of the growth and achievements I have attained along the way.

Chaima

Acknowledgments

We thank Allah, the Almighty, for the bounty He has blessed us with; it is our good fortune and God's mercy that our Lord created us Muslims as members of a religion of morals. As our Prophet Muhammad, peace be upon him, said, “Whoever does not thank people does not thank God.”

Our deepest gratitude goes to our supervisor, Dr. Fouzia Bennacer, for the time, support, inspiration, and ongoing advice she provided us to accomplish this dissertation. We are truly fortunate to have such a dedicated supervisor who genuinely cares about our work and addresses our inquiries and concerns with her full attention in a timely manner.

Special thanks are extended to all the teachers who assisted us, as well as the students who participated in the study. We are grateful to all those who contributed to the realization of this work.

Abstract

The current study examines how gender differences affect EFL students' speaking fluency during debates. It aims to determine the existence of these gender disparities, whether they have an impact on speaking fluency, and if such impacts are beneficial or negative. Three research questions are posed in order to determine the influence and look into the nature of it based on the study's content. The method for gathering the required data is a descriptive research approach. Thus, twenty-eight students at the Mila University Center's Department of Foreign Languages participated in an observation. The primary findings of the research indicate that gender disparities do occur, although to varying degrees. In addition to their existence, they have a mixed effect on the learners' speaking fluency. But it turned out that there are other factors that affect speaking fluency than gender, and the influence of gender is marginal in comparison to one's skills and personal abilities. The research ultimately presents a wide range of suggestions for pedagogy and further studies in an effort to highlight the differences in gender and the numerous ways in which they may affect many facets of EFL learners, instructors, and settings.

Key words: Gender differences, Speaking fluency, EFL learners, Debates

List of Abbreviations

ACTFL OPI: American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages—Oral Proficiency Interview

APA: The American psychological Association

CEFR: Common European Framework of Reference for Languages

EFL: English as a Foreign Language

FAO: Food and Agriculture Organization

FST: Fluent Speaking Time

GDE: Gender Dynamics in Education

OPI: Oral Proficiency Interview

SRI: Sex Role Inventory

TBL T: Task-Based Language Teaching

TBL: Task-Based Learning

TST: Total Speaking Time

TWA: Total Words Attempted

TWD%: Total Word Disfluent Percentage

TWD: Total Words Disfluent

TWF: Total Words Fluent

WPM: Words Per Minute

List of Tables

Table 1: fluency statistics gained from debate one	50
Table 2 : fluency statistics gained from debate two.....	51
Table 3: fluency statistics gained from debate three.....	51
Table 4: fluency statistics gained from table four.....	52
Table 5: fluency statics gained from debate five	53
Table 6: fluency statistics gained from debate six	54
Table 7: fluency statistics gained from debate seven.....	54
Table 8: fluency statistics gained from debate eight.....	55
Table 9: fluency statistics gained from debate nine.....	56
Table 10: fluency statistics gained from debate ten.....	57
Table 11: fluency statistics gained from debate eleven	57
Table 12: fluency statistica gained from debate twelve.....	58
Table 13: fluency statistis gained from debate thirteen	59
Table 14: fluency statistics gained from debate fourteen	60

Table of Content

Soumia’s dedication.....	2
Chaima's dedication	3
Acknowledgments	4
Abstract.....	5
List of Abbreviations	6
Table of Content	8

General introduction

1. Background to the study	12
2. Statement of The Problem	15
3. Aim of the Study.....	15
4. Research Questions.....	16
5. Research methodology.....	16
6. Structure of the Study	16

Chapter One: Gender and Speaking Fluency in EFL Learning: Theoretical Foundations and

Implications

Introduction.....	18
-------------------	----

Section one: Gender Differences

1.1.1 Definition of Gender Differences.....	18
1.1.2 Gender vs sex	21

1.1.3 Gender Dynamics in Education: Promoting Equality and Inclusive Learning Environments	22
1.1.4 Gender variations.....	25
1.1.5 Gender and Education.....	30
Section Two: Fluency in Speaking	
1.2.1 Definition of Speaking Fluency.....	33
1.2.2 Measurements of the Speaking Fluency.....	34
1.2.3 Kinds of Speaking Fluency	35
1.2.4 Evaluation processes of speaking fluency.....	36
1.2.5 Effective Techniques for Enhancing Speaking Fluency	41
Conclusion	45
Chapter two: Analyzing the Effects of Gender Differences on Speaking Fluency in Debates	47
Introduction.....	47
Section one: Research Methodology and Procedure	47
2.1.1. Research Methodology	47
2.1.2 The Student’s Observation	48
Section two: Data Analysis & Interpretation.....	49
2.2.1. Analysis of the Students’ Observation	49
2.2.3. Analysis and interpretation of the impact of gender differences on speaking fluency ..	51
2.2.2. Discussion of Results.....	64
2.2.3. Limitations of the Study	65
Conclusion	66

General Conclusion.....	67
List of References	70
Appendix.....	76
Resumé.....	78
ملخص.....	81

General Introduction

1. Background to the Study

English language proficiency is crucial for communication in several fields, including business, science, technology, and academia. English proficiency can enhance work success and distinguish individuals from their peers. Mastering all four English skills allows for good communication with people from all over the world. Speaking is considered the most crucial of these skills. This ability is employed for successful communication, which is an essential necessity in today's environment. Humans cannot thrive without communication. They need to convey their thoughts, opinions, and feelings, and language may help them do so.

In order to communicate effectively, speaking is the productive skill that language learners should strive to develop when learning a foreign language. According to yang (2014), Speaking fluently is crucial to being competent in communication because it allows the speaker to convey thoughts continuously without making it difficult for the listener to understand them and to better retain their points. As noted by Hartmann and Stork (1976), the term "fluent" refers to the ability of a speaker to employ appropriate language structures at a typical tempo, which entails speaking organically while concentrating on the delivery of information rather than the form or structure of a language. Additionally, according to Richards et al. (1985), fluency is the ability to talk with pauses, rhythm, emphasis, and intonations that are similar to those of a native speaker. In an EFL class, fluency is also related to communicative competency.

Depending on the investigator Wafidin (2022), fluency is defined as the capacity to use language both expressively and effectively, as per Webster's Dictionary (1991). In order to become fluent in communication, let the speech "stream" to "flow" while keeping in mind the "riverbank" of discourse, phonology, syntax, or teaching. The capacity to

speak effectively without hesitation, pauses, or breakdowns is known as fluency. This speaks to people's natural ability to communicate. Hughes (2002) asserted that the ability to convey oneself properly, succinctly, and without hesitation is necessary for effective communication. If not, listeners can become disinterested. Furthermore, it is conceivable to be correct but not fluent or fluent but inaccurate, according to Crystal (1997).

Speaking is not an easy task, as Brown and Yule (1983) stated: "learning to talk in the foreign language is often considered to be one of the most difficult aspects of language learning," Speaking is one of the biggest issues that students have; they still struggle with knowing how to communicate in English naturally. Teachers must identify the elements influencing their students' speaking performance in order to assist them in overcoming speaking acquisition challenges.

Researchers asserted that a variety of factors, both internal and external, influence students' speaking abilities. according to Tuan and Mai (2015), a number of factors, including listening comprehension, topical knowledge, feedback during speaking activities, affective factors (such as motivation, confidence, and anxiety), time constraints, planning, performance standards, and amount of support, can all have an impact on students' speaking performance. Additional researchers who looked into the impact of other factors such as age, gender, and self-esteem on speaking abilities were Koosha, et al (2011).

The socially generated qualities of males and females are referred to as gender. Gender is a socially and culturally constructed concept that influences a person's actions and thought processes. Since male and female students dwell in the same environment and share the same learning activities and instructions, disparities in gender are evident, particularly in the classroom. The teacher's contribution and the students' performance might be influenced by this distinction.

Many studies have been conducted to investigate the potential impacts of gender variations on the speaking fluency of EFL learners . Actually, there is no precise agreement on these impacts and how much they affect interactions and learning. The outcomes are a little contradictory.

Koosha, et al (2011) conducted a study to examine the relationship between speaking skills and self-esteem, age, and gender on one side, and speaking skills on the other. Their findings indicate that there is not a statistically significant association between gender and speaking fluency, which may be explained by the fact that both genders are taught by the same teacher and are exposed to the same materials and methods.

The study by Namaziandost et al (2019) aimed to investigate the impact of gender on Iranian upper-intermediate learners' speaking accuracy and fluency. Initially, 25 male and 25 female upper-intermediate learners were chosen from a group of 90 to see whether there were any gender disparities in students' performance in terms of speaking accuracy and fluency. Based on the data, it can be claimed that gender variations do have an influence on learning different abilities and their components. Male and female foreign language learners exhibit differing capacity for acquiring distinct linguistic skills. Statistical research revealed that female participants outperformed male participants in fluency, whereas male participants fared better in speaking accuracy.

With regard to Wafidin (2022), in his comparative study of the speaking fluency of male and female students at Muhammadiyah Senior High School, Among the variables that affect speaking fluency are age, gender, and level of education. Because male and female students have different abilities, gender has an impact on speaking fluency. Speaking proficiency may vary depending on gender. Perceptions of communication styles impact gender disparities in English language instruction, says Mahmud (2008). Rahayu (2016) believes that because gender differences may affect students' performance and

competence, it is important to include them while teaching language acquisition. Wafidin's (2022) investigation at Muhammadiyah Senior High School compared male and female students' speaking fluency to determine gender differences. The study concludes that gender does not affect speaking fluency, but does have an impact on it.

2. Statement of The Problem

Improving speaking skills is critical for effective communication while studying English as a foreign language (EFL). However, there is a lack of information of how gender dynamics affect EFL students' speaking fluency.

Despite the abundance of research on language acquisition and gender disparities in communication styles, there is currently a lack of studies that specifically examine how gender dynamics impact EFL learners' speaking fluency. Many studies have looked at a range of elements that impact language learning, such as individual differences and social consequences, but few have specifically researched how gender effects EFL learners' speaking fluency, and those that have found little or inconsistent results.

The researchers believed it was crucial to carry out a study to look at the effects of gender disparities on the speaking fluency of English as a foreign language (EFL) learners during debates and oral sessions because of the conflicting results in earlier studies. By filling up this research gap , we may learn more about how gender affects language performance in these scenarios, as well as whether or not these disparities actually exist and what kind of impact they have. This study will provide significant insight on how gender dynamics affect EFL learners' speaking abilities and how to foster the development of an inclusive and fair learning environment where students of all genders can thrive academically.

3. Aim of the Study

This study attempts to evaluate the impact of gender differences on EFL learners' speaking fluency during debates and oral sessions. It seeks to determine if such distinctions exist and, if so, to comprehend their implications—whether they are beneficial or harmful. The ultimate objective is to create equity and justice in the classroom for all students while improving English teaching techniques accordingly.

4. Research Questions

1_Do differences in speaking fluency actually exist between male and female EFL learners?

2_What effects do gender differences have on the oral and debate fluency of EFL students?

3_Do these gender disparities either enhance or decrease EFL students' ability to speak fluently in oral presentations and debates?

5. Research methodology

The researchers chose to perform a descriptive study, in which qualitative data is gathered through observations. Participants will engage in oral debate sessions comprising both male and female EFL students from the university centre of Abdelhafid Bousouf. They will be divided into pairs, one female and one male, and will choose a random topic from a list of other themes that have been pre-selected and determined by the investigators to ensure the transparency and spontaneity of the arguments. The entire operation is videotaped and audio recorded to ensure that all information are captured. The investigators shall be provided with a pre-set checklist, for gender differences. By attentively monitoring participants in naturalistic settings, the aim is to capture speaking behaviors, in-the-moment interactions, and communication patterns that may not be fully captured by traditional study methodologies.

6. Structure of the Study

There are two chapters in this dissertation. the first is theoretical. The second chapter is practical. The opening chapter is further divided into two sections: the initial part addresses gender differences in depth, beginning with its definition, sex vs gender , Gender Dynamics in Education: Promoting Equality and Inclusive Learning Environments, gender variations and, lastly, gender and education. The second part discusses speaking fluency beginning with a definition of speaking fluency as well as its measurements, kinds, evaluation processes, and development techniques.

The second chapter, "field work," is devoted to the practical work and includes an interpretation of the findings in relation to the research questions as well as an analysis of the EFL learners' observations.

Chapter One: Gender and Speaking Fluency in EFL Learning:

Theoretical Foundations and Implications

Introduction

For language learners, it is essential to determine the factors that affect speaking fluency in English as a foreign language (EFL). By shedding light on how differences in gender impact a speaker's capacity to speak in an EFL setting, teachers and scholars can gain a deeper understanding of the complex connection between gender and language development with the aid of this study. This theoretical chapter discusses two variables: gender inequalities and EFL learners' speaking fluency. It is further separated into two sections: the first one goes into great detail about gender differences, starting with their definition and moving on to discuss sex vs. gender, gender dynamics in education, gender variations, and gender and education. The second section defines speaking fluency and goes into its types, measurements, assessment procedures, and development methods.

Section one: Gender Differences

1.1.1 Definition of Gender Differences

The Oxford Learner's Dictionary (Oxford University Press, n.d.) defined gender as "the fact of being male or female, especially when considered with reference to social and cultural differences, rather than differences in biology." In other words, gender is understood through the lens of how societies and cultures perceive and construct roles, behaviors, and identities associated with being male or female. This definition suggests that gender is not solely determined by biology but is also shaped by the norms, expectations, and practices within a given society or culture. It emphasizes the social and cultural aspects of being male or

female. According to the definition given, "gender" is a concept that goes beyond biological distinctions between male and female.

According to Sari (2014), most people define gender as the social, cultural, and psychological norms that are applied to people according to their biological sex. Gender roles are influenced by society norms and expectations, whereas sex is related to fixed biological and anatomical traits (Mcelhinny, 2003). Butler (1990) argued that gender is a performative reality that is molded via repeated stylized acts within cultural contexts, rather than an innate feature. Butler contended that gender is a continuing accomplishment rather than a permanent quality picked up early in life. Cameron (2004) highlighted even more how repeated acts continuously generate gender.

Furthermore, Gender is described by the Food and Agriculture Organization (1997) (FAO) as the material and perceptual relationships between men and women, with a focus on social construction rather than biological determinism. According to FAO (1997), gender refers to the characteristics and actions that people are supposed to exhibit in accordance with society standards. In diverse cultural settings, these expectations take the form of distinct limitations, perspectives, opportunities, needs, roles, and duties. In general, gender identities are not only determined by biological differences; rather, they are culturally formed and comprise both male and female identities.

According to this viewpoint, gender differences are the variations that people encounter in terms of cultural norms and societal expectations related to their perceived gender identity, which in turn affects their limits, viewpoints, opportunities, needs, duties, and responsibilities. These disparities are not only the result of biological variations between males and females; they are also socially produced. Therefore, rather of coming just from

biological factors, gender differences are also molded by the roles and behaviors that society prescribes.

The other reigning school of thought that explains both gender difference and gender domination is differential socialization - the 'nurture' side of the equation. Men and women are different because we are taught to be different from the moment of birth; males and females are treated differently. Gradually we acquire the traits, behaviors, and attitudes that our culture defines as 'masculine' or 'feminine'. We are not necessarily born different: We become different through this process of socialization. (Kimmel, 2011, p. 12-13)

This passage captures the heart of the differential socialization viewpoint, which holds that gender differences and the persistence of gender dominance are mostly the result of cultural influences rather than innate biological predispositions. According to this concept, individuals are socialized from birth, and they are treated differently based on their gender. Individuals absorb cultural norms and expectations connected with masculinity and femininity through this process, eventually acquiring the qualities and actions considered proper for their gender within their particular cultures. Individuals become different as a result of the socialization process, rather than being born differently, emphasizing the tremendous importance of cultural forces in defining gender identities and sustaining gender differences.

Gender disparities, according to the differential socialization approach, are variances in features, actions, and attitudes acquired by people via the process of socialization within their various cultures. These characteristics are neither inherent nor physiologically determined, but rather formed by society conventions and expectations of masculinity and femininity. Gender disparities exhibit themselves in a variety of areas of life, including family duties,

labor force involvement, emotional expression, and social interaction. For example, in many cultures, men are trained to be forceful, independent, and competitive, whereas women are expected to be caring, cooperative, and empathic.

1.1.2 Gender VS Sex

Justice Antonin (1994; as cited in kimmel 2011, p.3) said that "the word 'gender' has acquired the new and useful connotation of cultural or attitudinal characteristics (or opposed to physical characteristics) distinctive to the sexes; that is to say, gender is to sex as feminine is to female and masculine is to male". This assertion emphasizes a sophisticated interpretation of "gender," stressing how it differs from the biological notion of "sex." According to this, "gender" refers to cultural and attitudinal characteristics connected to being male or female, whereas "sex" typically refers to biological distinctions; this is comparable to the phrases "feminine" and "masculine." This viewpoint emphasizes the notion that gender is a complex construct influenced more by cultural expectations and conventions than by purely biological causes.

Kacha (2019) investigated the subtle distinctions between the concepts of "gender" and "sex" as recognized in the fields of linguistics and social sciences. She began by defining "sex" as biological features such as reproductive anatomy and genetic composition, whereas "gender" refers to the set of cultural, social, and linguistic norms and duties assigned to people depending on their perceived sex. Notably, the American Psychological Association APA (Hacker et al 2009) recommended using the term "gender" instead of "sex" to avoid any misinterpretations, particularly with sexual behavior. Furthermore, authors such as Shapiro (Holmes & Meyerhoff, 2003) emphasized the necessity of using "sex" when describing biological inequalities and "gender" when addressing the cultural constructions that shape these discrepancies.

The issue then shifted to the duality of nature vs nurture, arguing that "sex" is an innate quality that people are born with, but "gender" is a socially created identity gained via interactions and socialization processes. This viewpoint is consistent with Simone de Beauvoir's belief (Robson & Stockwell, 2005) that people are not born as women or men, but rather develop their identities via cultural practices. Furthermore, Kacha (2019) emphasized the performative nature of gender roles, stressing how people voluntarily participate in and absorb society expectations about their gendered actions and displays. Children, in particular, are shown as enthusiastic learners and mimics of gendered behaviors observed in their immediate social settings, demonstrating the dynamic process by which gender is produced and perpetuated throughout society.

Importantly, emphasizing that, while biological sex influences gender, it also encompasses a complex interaction of cultural, social, and individual elements. Eckert and McConnel-Ginnet's discovery that gender is not inevitably derived from sex supports the notion that gender is not predetermined but rather formed by continuous social processes. This viewpoint opposed essentialist views of gender as exclusively biological, stressing the flexible and socially contextual aspect of gender identity and expression.

In brief, gender refers to the social and cultural roles, behaviors, and expectations that come with being male or female, and they might change between countries and circumstances. Sex, on the other hand, refers to the biological traits that distinguish an individual as male, female, usually based on reproductive anatomy and chromosomes.

1.1.3 Gender Dynamics in Education: Promoting Equality and Inclusive Learning Environments

According to Azka (2023), gender plays a crucial role in analyzing social shifts. Gender comprises not just biological distinctions between men and women but also social norms

such as gender roles, standards, and expectations. Gender roles are changing in today's culture and are a growing concern (Wakatobi et al., 2022). Globalization, technological breakthroughs, and shifting cultural values are driving rapid and complex social transitions in today's society. These changes have far-reaching consequences for societal institutions and human relationships, notably in terms of gender roles. In today's linked and technologically advanced world, societal change occurs quickly and impacts people in different ways depending on their gender identification. The issues facing modern society include persistent gender stereotypes, gender discrimination, gender-based violence, and restricted access to opportunities and resources (Yosia, 2020). Consequently, it is required to comprehend how gender functions in the dynamics of social change and to pinpoint the variables that affect inclusive and equitable social development.

Gender plays a significant role in our lives. Our behavior, interactions, and performances in many settings. It's in our undetected and normal acts. Sunderland (2000) defined gender as "something not always apparent, but always present" (p.203). Most people overlook or do not pay attention to it. Nevertheless, the construction of gender is a continuous process that starts even before birth; from the time an individual start to wonder if the child is a boy or a girl, to the announcement of the gender at birth, to the late gendered adult performances (McConnel-Ginnet et al., 1980). Overall, from their early years of life, males and females learn to be distinct. Education is not an exception in this regard. Since boys and girls coexist in the same classroom and complete the same learning activities, gender inequalities are evident in schools. This distinction might have an impact on the information they get. As Petruskevich (1997) noted, "The issues of gender and education have been recognized as important areas of study in relation to equality and equity"(p.16). Investigating gender studies in education is therefore essential to improving learning and valuing the contributions of both boys and girls.

kacha's (2019) review of gender dynamics highlighted their pervasive effect on people's lives, notably in educational contexts. This concept emphasized how gender influences daily interactions, behaviors, and performances in a variety of circumstances, often quietly but consistently. Gender is constantly formed by societal processes, impacting people's experiences and opportunities, beginning in infancy. This structure is most visible in educational institutions, where boys and girls interact yet may have discrepancies in learning opportunities and experiences. Scholars have long stressed the relevance of gender dynamics in education in order to promote equality and justice. In addition, gender roles have an impact on participation in and access to education. The goal of social change is to eliminate gender gaps in education by providing equal opportunities and access to formal education for men and women as cited by Azka (2023). Thus, including this knowledge into investigations became vital for creating inclusion, recognizing multiple viewpoints, and supporting the full involvement of all genders within educational environments and beyond.

Gender roles in other words have an impact on participation in and access to education. The goal of social change is to eliminate gender gaps in education by providing equal opportunities and access to formal education for men and women. Therefore, promoting equality and the growth of society requires an understanding of how gender dynamics affect participation in and access to education. Individuals and organizations may work toward removing obstacles and promoting equitable opportunities for all genders by acknowledging the influence of gender roles on educational results and access. Recognizing and correcting inequalities and guaranteeing that men and women have equal access to formal education and learning opportunities are the goals of studying gender dynamics in education. This knowledge contributes to the creation and execution of programs and policies that enable all students, regardless of gender, to realize their full potential in inclusive learning settings.

From this standpoint, we may conclude that gender dynamics are important because they impact power connections, interactions, and behaviors among people based on their gender. Socio-cultural perceptions of gender influence these processes, which can either support or challenge established standards. Gender dynamics may influence how men and women are perceived differently, affecting power, status, and authority. Understanding and controlling gender dynamics is crucial for creating a fair and inclusive environment in which people are judged based on their abilities rather than gender stereotypes. Gender dynamics are a significant factor in determining the experiences and possibilities that students have in school.

Hence, awareness of how gender dynamics affect access to education and participation in educational opportunities is critical for fostering equality and social progress. Individuals and organizations may work together to break down barriers and promote equitable opportunities for all genders by acknowledging the influence of gender roles on educational access and results. Understanding gender dynamics in education aims to identify and rectify gaps, ensuring that men and women have equal access to formal education and learning opportunities. This concept guides the formulation and implementation of policies and activities intended for fostering inclusive educational settings that enable all students to attain their full potential, regardless of gender.

1.1.4 Gender Variations

Differences in gender have drawn the attention of academics and researchers for decades as a major area of study in a variety of fields. The investigation of gender differences spans a broad range of areas, including social roles, communication styles, behavioral patterns, and cognitive capacities. The realization of gender disparities' significant influence on people's lives and social systems is what has led to an ongoing interest in them.

Comprehending the nuances of gender diversity is essential for clarifying the intricacies of human behavior, providing guidance for policy formulation, and promoting social justice and inclusiveness. Gender differences have been the subject of scientific investigation for over a century (Ellis et al., 2008).

While these distinctions apply to all groups and cultures, their extent and impact may differ. Some societies may accentuate gender disparities; other civilizations may hide or minimize them. Gender disparities are more prominent in traditional cultures (e.g., Pakistan, Nigeria, Algeria) than in contemporary cultures (e.g., the Netherlands, Finland) (Bucholtz, 2004).

1.1.4.1 Exploring Gender Differences: Insights from Biological Findings

Given that biological distinctions influence gender classification, a growing number of studies have examined gender differences from a biological perspective. According to Eckert and McConnel-Ginnet (2003) "Hormonal levels, brain activity patterns, and even brain anatomy can be a result of different activity as well as a cause" (p12).

The brains of males and females differ in many ways, both neurologically and hormonally (Legato, 2005; Tyre, 2005, as cited in Griffiths, 2008; McConnel-Ginnet et al., 1980). Several variables contribute to our knowledge of gender variations in brain anatomy and function. Women, for example, have more nerve cells in the left side of the brain, which is predominantly related with language, and greater communication between the two hemispheres. This neurological divide presents a possible explanation for women's increased verbal ability and interhemispheric communication. Furthermore, data suggest that women may use a greater range of brain areas during communication tasks, which might contribute to their ability in this domain. There are also developmental differences, with females' 'language centers' growing earlier than boys'. On the other hand, conversations about gender

differences frequently go beyond verbal skills and encompass behavioral characteristics. While males are often linked with higher amounts of violence due to heightened testosterone levels, they also have left-brain dominance, which promotes reasoned conduct. Furthermore, despite their aggressive inclinations, guys typically display reasonable thinking and reasoning abilities, especially in single-gender group situations. Women's reported emotional tendencies, on the other hand, are sometimes linked to less prominent brain lateralization, which encourages emotional-based thinking in contrast to men's more logical approaches to tasks. Furthermore, the bigger corpus callosum in women allows for better integration across brain hemispheres, perhaps leading to a more holistic cognitive processing style. Finally, the early impact of androgen differences is acknowledged as a crucial element in determining gender-specific interests, activities, and degrees of aggression. Thus, the intricate interaction of genetics, behavior, and society standards emphasizes the complexities of gender variations in brain shape and function.

1.1.4.2 Exploring Gender Differences: Disparities in Behavior

In many settings, men and women behave differently, which is especially obvious in mixed-gender encounters. The research findings indicate that there are significant gender disparities in assertiveness and politeness in communication dynamics. Men are frequently found to be more aggressive than women, implying that assertive speech is a region of power that men have more access to (Eskin, 2003; Bucholtz, 2004; Carli, 1990). Women, on the other hand, are typically viewed as being more polite, caring about others, and following conventional behavioral norms (Holmes, 1995; Lakoff and Ide, 2005). Theoretical frameworks such as politeness and face, as well as politeness and gender, provide insights into how people negotiate encounters in order to preserve harmony while avoiding acts that might jeopardize their social face. Within social groupings, people use a variety of methods to maintain civility and avoid possible confrontations. Language choices have a big impact on

views of politeness, with indirect requests being seen more courteous since they allow the hearer to decline without creating pain. Scholars such as Lakoff (1975), Holmes (1995), and Brown and Levinson (1987) have investigated whether women are more polite than males, looking at topics such as politeness and face and politeness and gender. Furthermore, Zimmerman and West (1975) distinguished between interruption and overlap in conversational dynamics, emphasizing gender differences: men interrupt more frequently, whereas women participate in supporting actions such as overlapping (Tannen, 1989). These intricate relationships highlight the complicated interplay between assertiveness, politeness, and gender in communication settings.

1.1.4.3 Exploring Gender Differences: Personality Traits

Gender differences occur in a variety of personality factors that influence people's emotional, interpersonal, and cognitive tendencies. In terms of neuroticism, women frequently have abilities in regulating negative emotions such as anxiety, despair, and shame, which may contribute to their resilience in dealing with stressful situations. However, studies show that women have higher levels of anxiety and depressive symptoms than males, while scoring lower on measures of self-esteem and anger (Feingold, 1994; Nolen-Hoeksema, 1987; Costa et al., 2001). When it comes to interpersonal qualities, women often score better on agreeableness, which indicates friendliness and social harmony, whereas males frequently score higher on extraversion and dominance (Costa et al., 2001). This aligns with Bem's Sex Role Inventory (SRI), which emphasizes the link between dominance and masculinity and femininity (Costa et al., 2001). Furthermore, women are known for their emotional sensitivity and ability to interpret nonverbal cues, which contributes to their openness to aesthetic and emotional experiences (Miller et al., 1989; Feingold, 1994; Weisberg et al., 2011). In contrast, males may thrive in areas such as assertiveness and competitiveness, indicating a more aggressive personality (Costa et al., 2001). In terms of conscientiousness, women tend

to score higher than men in attributes such as organization, diligence, and self-discipline, whereas men may score higher in competence (Feingold, 1994). Gender variations in personality characteristics emerge both before and during the observation period, and they may impact the dynamics and results of mixed-gender group settings. However, such different contributions are thought to preserve behavioral balance and improve learning results (Feingold, 1994).

1.1.4.4 Gender Differences Related to Speech Activities

During verbal encounters, people participate in a variety of speech activities such as gossiping, arguing, fighting, and joking, with experts such as Eckert and McConnel-Ginet (2003) and Carli (1990) observing gender differences in the activities chosen. For example, research revealed that women gossip more than males, which might have an influence on single-gender groups (Eckert & McConnel-Ginet, 2003). While Cameron et al. (1988) defined gossip as discussing absent people with the intention of presenting them adversely, Coates and Cameron (1988) defined it as casual talk among female friends, whether pleasant or negative. Despite conflicting perspectives, both consider gossiping as a female-related speaking activity (Eckert & McConnel-Ginet, 2003). Another gendered speech activity is argument, which Tannen (as reported in Eckert & McConnel-Ginet, 2003) defined as expressing the advantages and disadvantages of a proposal or engaging in verbal dispute. While disagreeing and quarreling have similarities, McConnel-Ginet et al. (1980) claimed they had separate characteristics. Wierzbicka (1987) distinguished between quarreling and arguing, claiming that quarreling is more personal, including a conflict of wills and tempers, whereas arguing focuses on the problem and requires beliefs, logical arguments, and intellectual skill. Although both genders argue, gendered patterns in this speaking activity

may come from societal norms and expectations impacting how men and women participate in and are viewed during debates.

1.1.4.5 Differences in Language Use

Lakoff's (1975) significant study explored gender variations in language usage, revealing inequalities in word choice, sentence structure, and tone between men and women. For example, Lakoff discovered that women prefer more specific color descriptions such as "mauve," but males may prefer simpler terms. Furthermore, women typically use politeness methods such tag questions, intensifiers, and hedges in their speech, which may indicate lower levels of assertiveness than males (Lakoff, 1975). Lakoff provided an example of how women may utilize tag questions like "isn't it?" to soften comments, whereas males may use harsher language devoid of such qualifiers, adding to communication style disparities (Lakoff 1975). Furthermore, women's frequent use of hedges like "maybe" or "perhaps" reduces the directness of their claims (Lakoff 1975). Richards and Schmidt (2002) defined "genderlect" as speech patterns distinct to various gender groups based on these discoveries. Robson and Stockwell (2005) expanded on the traits that contribute to the "women genderlect" or "feminine genderlect," which include over-hesitancy, non-assertiveness, self-reference, avoidance of taboo language, politeness, and non-interruption in conversation. These studies demonstrated how language usage quietly reflects and reinforces gender norms and societal expectations, altering communication patterns and relationships (Lakoff, 1975; Richards & Schmidt, 2002; Robson & Stockwell, 2005).

1.1.5 Gender and Education

Gender prejudice frequently presents itself in educational settings as preconceptions about gender-based behaviors, abilities, or preferences, causing issues for students who do not comply to gender stereotypes (Anderman & Anderman, 2009). As children start school,

they become increasingly conscious of biological and socio-cultural distinctions between genders, and they get varied treatment from instructors, widening the gap in thinking between males and females. Research reveals strongly gendered connections between instructors and students, as seen in classroom activities (Grossman & Grossman, 1994; Lee, 2005). Male dominance in group work, differing success attributions between genders, and gendered behavior expectations are only a few examples (Fennema, 1990; Casey, 2001; Anderman, 2009).

To reduce gender prejudice, Slavin (2006) recommended that teachers avoid preconceptions, encourage gender integration, and properly allocate roles and responsibilities in collaborations. The notion of 'equity' stresses fairness and balance between genders in the classroom, as opposed to 'equality' (AAUW, 1998). Equity seeks equal outcomes rather than same care, and addresses the distinct needs of girls and boys (Reynolds & Miller, 2003).

Based on the work of Andrews, Cook, Nielson, Xiao & Martin, (2020) gender has an important impact in education at the individual, classroom, and institutional levels. Individually, gender variations in academic success and stereotypes are clear, with girls usually surpassing males in reading and boys outperforming girls in math and science. Self-efficacy, motivation, and gender norms all play a role in explaining these disparities. Teachers' attention to gender, language use, and unequal student treatment can all have an influence on academic achievement. Institutional gender concerns include the gender distribution of instructors as well as assistance for gender nonconforming pupils. Inclusive policies and actions to promote gender equality are critical for fostering positive learning environments. Overall, identifying and resolving gender-related issues in education is vital for creating fair opportunities for all students.

Gender has a varied influence on education, including academic attainment, stereotypes, teacher prejudice, adult positions in schools, gender nonconformity, and classroom segregation vs integration. Despite girls continuously outperforming boys in academic topics from kindergarten to college, the underlying causes of this inequality remain unknown, probably due to gender conventions, stereotypes, and variations in interest, self-efficacy, and drive. Gender stereotypes can affect academic performance through phenomena like stereotype threat, in which people's knowledge of negative preconceptions hampers their self-efficacy and performance. To overcome these biases, we must confront stereotypes and build inclusive cultures. Teachers' prejudiced expectations and actions may reinforce gender stereotypes, hurting students' self-esteem, motivation, and academic achievement. Implementing anti-biased teaching strategies can help to lessen these consequences. Gender discrepancies also occur in the distribution of responsibilities among educators, with women more commonly holding teaching posts and males holding administrative positions, indicating biases in recruiting and career ambitions. Classroom design, whether segregated or integrated by gender, has an impact on students' experiences and academic achievement. Integration lowers gender preconceptions and encourages healthy relationships, which benefits all kids academically. However, there is no evidence that single-gender education has any meaningful advantages and may promote preconceptions. Addressing gender-related difficulties in education necessitates debunking myths, reducing prejudices, and fostering inclusive settings that promote academic performance and well-being for all students, regardless of gender.

Section Two: Fluency in Speaking

1.2.1 Definition of Speaking Fluency

Yang (2014) claimed that, while the term "fluency" is frequently used in language education and evaluation, its definition differs. According to Hartmann and Stork (1976), "fluent" refers to a speaker's ability to use appropriate language structures at a regular pace, allowing them to focus on content delivery rather than language structure. Fillmore (1979) defined fluency as four important skills: maintaining long talks without frequent pauses, building cohesive and logically accurate phrases, using suitable language across situations, and demonstrating originality and innovation in language usage. According to Richards et al. (1985), fluency in an English as a Foreign Language (EFL) environment is dependent on students' communication abilities, which include not just linguistic ability but also successful idea transmission and participation in real-world circumstances.

Speaking fluency evaluation processes that use the recounting methodology were discussed by Hariyanto (2016), who pointed out that the meaning of fluency varies depending on the skill being assessed. Being able to formulate oral assertions that are understandable to both the speaker and the listener is a necessary skill for fluent speaking. According to Byrne (1986), fluency is the ability to communicate coherently, sensibly, and correctly without hesitation. Lennon (1990) made a distinction between two definitions of fluency: the wide definition included oral competence, which is the highest level on a language scale and a sign of social accomplishment. Fluency, in this context, refers to a specific aspect of oral proficiency evaluation.

Furthermore, as demonstrated by Wafidin (2022) fluency goes beyond linguistic proficiency to include the capacity to communicate ideas clearly and concisely. Speaking in a "smooth and easy flow" is speaking at a regular pace with few pauses; too much stuttering

interferes with effective communication. To put it briefly, speaking more smoothly improves fluency, which makes communication more effective.

Richard (2009) defined natural language usage as "meaningful interaction and comprehensible communication despite limitations in one's communicative competence" p.14. Nowadays, the concept of fluency in applied linguistics corresponds to "fluidity". In addition, Permana, et al (2020) stated that Speaking fluently improves English skills and creates a more natural and impressive tone for listeners. It promotes communication by removing distractions.

In short, speaking fluency is the capacity to convey ideas clearly and fluently in a language without making a lot of stops or interruptions. It places more emphasis on understanding concepts and expressing them clearly than it does on using language perfectly. Speaking clearly and concisely, the goal of fluent speakers is to communicate meaning rather than grammatical accuracy. In other words, speaking fluency is the capacity for easy, fluid, and natural language communication in speaking, listening, and conversational flow. Easy conveyance of meaning, assurance in language usage, fluency in speaking rapidly and spontaneously, and minimal mistakes are its defining characteristics. Speaking with natural flow and coherence is also a part of being fluent, not only speaking quickly. It is not the same as correctness, which is about using language appropriately in terms of vocabulary and grammar. Generally speaking, fluency is defined as total language proficiency.

1.2.2 Measurements of the Speaking Fluency

Hariyanto (2016) investigated speaking fluency evaluation methods, specifically using the retelling methodology. The researcher emphasized the importance of assessing fluency based on the frequency of hesitations as well as the pace of speech output. Speech tempo and

pauses are two important factors that Thornbury (2008) highlighted in his criteria for measuring changes in fluency.

As Cross (2005) pointed out, speech pace is not the only factor that determines fluency, but it is an important one. When speaking, fluent speakers have a steady pace, adjusting it to fit the tone and goal of the speech. Speech rate is measured using a variety of techniques, such as words per minute (WPM), with inclusive and exclusive rates providing information on how smoothly speech is produced. Exclusive rates just measure the speed of speech movements, failing to capture the organic flow of spoken language. Inclusive rates, on the other hand, take into consideration pauses, hesitations, and other irregularities, offering a more complete picture of communication velocity.

As per Thornbury (2008), pauses are necessary for communication, but frequent stopping might be a sign of fluency problems. It is possible to evaluate the effectiveness of pauses in speech by looking at six different parameters: run length, repetition usage, frequency, location, duration, and pause fillers. Speech gaps are frequently filled in with pause fillers like "er," "um," and "uh," as well as expressions like "sort of" and "I mean." Intervals between important word groups or sentences are when natural pauses happen, however irregular pauses break up the flow of speech. Key indicators of speech fluency include the frequency and length of pauses as well as the employment of repeats to cover up pauses. Longer runs, which are defined by the quantity of syllables said in between pauses, show more fluidity and smoother speech output.

In summary, measuring fluency entails studying speech pace and pauses, as well as paying close attention to numerous characteristics to gain a thorough grasp of fluency levels in spoken language.

1.2.3 Kinds of Speaking Fluency

Segalowitz (2010) distinguished between three concepts of fluency: cognition, perceived, and utterance.

1.2.3.1 Cognitive fluency

According to (De Jong, Steinel, Florijn, Schoonen, & Hulstijn, 2013), cognitive fluency is the fluency that "characterizes a speaker's abilities to efficiently plan and execute his speech"; in other words, it is comparable to Chomskian competence. The cognitive burden a speaker of a given language has in order to operate in different linguistic contexts is the focus of this study.

1.2.3.2 Perceived fluency

The perception that listeners have of a certain speech sample's (or speaker's) fluency based on the sample is known as perceived fluency. Individuals possess unique tastes; thus we may not interpret the same speech or assess the same performance in the same manner. Perceived fluency is therefore the most arbitrary of the three.

1.2.3.3 Utterance fluency

Measurable fluency in a speech sample is known as utterance fluency. The speech production terminates in the physical aspect of the speech performance, which is subject to objective analysis. According to Skehan, (2003) and Tavakoli & Skehan, (2005) "utterance fluency is a construct with several aspects." Counting the quantity and duration of filled and empty gaps allows us to determine "breakdown fluency," which comes first. The second is "Speed fluency," which is determined by counting the number of syllables per second during speech. Ultimately, "repair fluency" pertains to the frequency of incorrect starts, corrections, or repeats made by the speaker.

1.2.4 Evaluation processes of speaking fluency

Ginther's (2017) scholarly work offered insightful viewpoints on how language testers considered speaking to be the most challenging skill to measure among the four. To assess speaking, one must either see a "live" performance or record it for subsequent review. Selecting an elicitation method, creating rating scales, and training interviewers and/or raters are all necessary steps. Understanding the evaluation of speech needs an analysis of assessment methodologies, scales, and raters.

1.2.4.1 Indirect, Semi-Direct, and Direct Assessment

Clark's (1979) classification of language evaluation methods focused on the examination of speaking skills. Clark distinguished between indirect, semi-direct, and direct assessments. Indirect tests analyze underlying abilities without explicitly judging performance, whereas direct tests assess individuals based on their actual language use.

Direct evaluation of speaking frequently takes the form of oral proficiency interviews (OPIs), in which participants interact with an interviewer in an organized manner. OPIs, such as the American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages - Oral Proficiency Interview (ACTFL OPI), have unique formats that include warm-ups and increasingly tougher questions. However, OPIs' faithfulness to genuine discourse is debatable.

Traditionally, OPIs were one-on-one, but there is an increasing interest in paired or group assessments to improve involvement and authenticity. Paired and group oral evaluations have been effectively integrated into large-scale programs, however they complicate grading.

Some testing programs use semi-direct approaches, which do not require a live interlocutor. Examinees reply to prerecorded questions or tasks under controlled settings,

potentially increasing efficiency, saving time, and money. There have been qualitative distinctions in language generation between direct and semi-direct techniques.

Comparisons of direct and semi-direct OPI testing methods reveal good statistical correlations, implying comparability. However, qualitative evaluations demonstrate disparities in language formality and coherence, with semi-direct replies marked by longer pauses and hesitations.

Examinees frequently favor direct approaches, deeming interaction with a recorder or computer forced and unnatural. Preferences can shift with growing familiarity and the usage of local, semi-direct computer-based applications. The decision between direct and semi-direct procedures is based on accuracy, usefulness, practicality, and fairness.

1.2.4.2 Unraveling the Nuances of Speaking Assessment Scales

Understanding and measuring speaking skill entails the systematic assignment of numbers on scales, with each value representing a certain degree of performance. Speaking assessments, unlike conventional areas such as weight measurement, need distinct scales, such as those in sports events where ranks are ordinal. Global exams employ holistic scales, providing a qualitative overview of performance using criteria like pronunciation, grammar, fluency, and vocabulary. Analytic ratings split down holistic indications into precise component scores. Scale views differ depending on whether one is a user, an assessor, or a constructor, and each influences language focus and descriptors. Speaking evaluation scales are shaped by both theoretical and empirical approaches, with frameworks such as the American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages ACTFL Proficiency Guidelines and the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages CEFR acting as important guidelines. The CEFR, for example, provides a thorough framework for measuring

speaking abilities in a variety of situations, focusing on qualitative elements of spoken language usage at different competence levels.

1.2.4.3 Addressing Diversity in Rater Judgments for Speaking Proficiency Assessment

The procedure for assessing speaking competency entails addressing the critical aspect of rater training to guarantee a common understanding and uniform application of the scale. Although some diversity among raters is normal and tolerable, efforts are undertaken to detect and control systemic mistakes caused by rater performance. Systematic biases, such as awarding harsh or lenient ratings, have been connected to rater experience, native language background (for both raters and examinees), and cultural influences. Fairness becomes a significant problem when investigations demonstrate variations in the criteria used by raters from various backgrounds. Language instructors, for example, and non-teaching professions may have distinct priorities when it comes to speaking performance. Furthermore, comparisons between native and non-native speakers as raters provide conflicting results, highlighting the complexities of this topic. Despite the importance of rater training, studies show that it has short-term impacts, underlining the necessity for continual training to fight rater drift. Finally, the question of whose standard is suitable emerges, making it difficult to define a universal baseline for assessing speaking skill.

Gulchiroy et al (2021) stated that in order to ensure the validity and reliability of the assessment process, evaluation is essential when teaching foreign languages, especially when evaluating speaking abilities. The difficulty is in pinpointing the precise criteria that educators use to evaluate pupils' speaking skills. It is necessary for instructors to be linguistically competent in order to evaluate speaking performance in language instruction. Nunan (1999) pointed out that speakers ought to possess a sufficient vocabulary, mastery of

grammatical and structural elements, and a strong feeling of functional competence. Answers that are comprehensive, rational, and appropriate for the situation are what constitute functional competence. Speaking evaluations can take many different shapes because of these characteristics. Fluency evaluation is a crucial factor to take into account since it sheds light on the speaker's confidence. This is paying attention to the speaker's ability to convey their point clearly and concisely, as well as any hesitations or pauses during word creation. Assessing a speaker's fluency takes into account more than just their ability to talk clearly; it also evaluates how well they are able to keep their speech flowing naturally and coherently.

Brown (2010), developed a basic taxonomy for assessing oral production abilities based on ideas and categories commonly discussed in language instruction and assessment literature. Instead of originating from a single source, it represents widely recognized theories and practices in the field of language training. Researchers, educators, and scholars in the field of language evaluation and education contribute to the development of these taxonomies in order to enhance the assessment of language competency.

There are five criteria for assessing oral production: imitative, intense, responsive, interactive, and extensive. The taxonomy for measuring oral output is extensive and applicable to many characteristics of oral proficiency other than fluency. The taxonomy for analyzing oral output can be connected to evaluating speaking fluency in numerous ways:

a. Imitative Category: Assesses learners' ability to speak words without hesitation, with a focus on proper pronunciation.

b. Intensive Category: Focuses on fluency within short lengths of conversation, stressing smooth expression in a confined linguistic context.

c. Responsive Category: Evaluates fluency in brief talks, emphasizing rapid and honest replies in spontaneous exchanges.

d. Interactive Category: Assesses performance in lengthier and more complicated discourses with several participants, such as role-playing and interviews.

e. Extensive Category: Evaluates fluency in monologues or oral presentations, with an emphasis on the capacity to maintain coherent and continuous speaking over a lengthy duration.

Summing up, speaking fluency evaluation is a multidimensional procedure that goes beyond pronunciation and focuses on the speaker's ability to communicate easily, confidently, and clearly. It is critical in determining overall oral proficiency, offering useful information for targeted language training and continuous progress.

1.2.5 Effective Techniques for Enhancing Speaking Fluency

Mastering the art of speaking fluently is a process that combines language proficiency with strategic skill acquisition. As people attempt to communicate their ideas with clarity and confidence, the need for effective strategies to improve speaking fluency rises. This investigation goes into practical procedures and strategic approaches targeted at developing and honing the capacity to explain concepts effortlessly. From focused exercises to mindful communication practices, the road to improved speaking fluency reveals a variety of strategies aimed to help people navigate the spoken word with accuracy and grace.

1.2.5.1 The 4/3/2 Technique

According to Ghasemi et al (2021), the 4/3/2 technique improves oral fluency, allowing for faster and more confident speech delivery. According to Wood (2009), language learners engage in a four-minute conversation with a partner on a known topic before changing partners and repeating the conversation for three minutes. The identical technique is repeated for another listener, but in two minutes. The idea behind shifting listeners and interlocutors is

that if the listener remains the same, the speaker may feel obligated to change the content. This would require finding the right linguistic methods to encode the new content. Nation (1989) used the 4/3/2 strategy with six adult learners in an EFL environment to study its impact on speaking. He discovered that learners improved their grammar and pronunciation from the first to the third delivery of the speeches. Additionally, he proposed that the need to condense knowledge under time constraints led learners to use increasingly complex language and structures to convey it. To effectively relate propositions, use specific terms instead of circumlocutions and subordinate sentences.

By embracing the 4/3/2 Technique, students move through a planned continuum of speaking demands, honing not just their language skills but also their capacity to adapt to changing time restrictions. This technique fosters a sophisticated style that includes both clarity and conciseness, making it an invaluable tool for improving successful communication skills in a variety of circumstances.

1.2.5.2 The use of Task based language teaching

According to Masuram et al (2020), the current method encourages students to communicate actively to accomplish tasks and achieve goals. Task based language teaching (TBL T) aims to improve communication skills and fluency by providing language-based tasks. Students significantly improved their communication abilities, confidence, and fluency during the language learning process compared to earlier interactive sessions. Students improved their English speaking skills, including task performance, sentence construction, grammar, and speech sustainability. According to Ellis (2003), instructional tasks play a vital role in language learning. Instructional tasks can have a favorable impact on student performance. To promote successful language acquisition, curriculum designers should offer tasks that engage learners and encourage them to speak fluently (Ellis, 2003; Willis, 1996). Task-Based

Instruction (TBI) creates meaningful tasks that enhance expressive language usage in the classroom.

1.2.5.3 The use of Cooperative Teaching

According to Gomleksiz (2007), cooperative teaching is a useful strategy for improving students' speaking abilities and encouraging social engagement. Cooperative learning first appeared in schools during the 1970s, when United States programs concentrated on the development and application of cooperative learning strategies (Kessler, 1992). According to Johnson and Johnson (2009) cooperative learning is "the instructional use of small groups so that students work together to maximize their own and each other's learning,". Over the world, university and college environments as well as a number of academic subjects have begun to use this technique (Kessler, 1992; Nasri et al., 2019). Teachers worldwide and in the United States alike agree that it is an invaluable resource for teaching other languages. In line with Tsai (1998), Wei (1997), and Yu (1995), cooperative learning is known to foster active collaboration among students with a range of skills and backgrounds. This collaboration improves social behavior, academic performance, and facilitates effective progress (Kam et al., 2003).

In language classes, cooperative learning has gained popularity as a means of enhancing students' speaking fluency and interaction (McCarthy, 2006). According to Yu (1995), a teacher's background in cooperative learning may have an effect on the methods and results of instruction. Even with their extensive vocabulary and knowledge of grammar, many students find it difficult to talk in whole sentences. Because English classrooms are teacher-centered, competitive, and teachers are not familiar with cooperative learning strategies, students find it difficult to improve their spoken English skills.

Namaziandost et al (2020) study looked at the relationship between cooperative learning strategies and the improvement of speaking fluency in EFL students. The study found a significant correlation between language learners' speaking fluency and cooperative learning strategies. Studies comparing pupils taught cooperative learning techniques to those taught standard education showed statistically significant differences in speaking fluency. Group talks increased students' enthusiasm and speaking fluency, which made the classes more enjoyable and boosted their speaking abilities. Teachers of all stripes may gain from this teaching strategy, which encourages self-directed learning through a student-centered approach and gives teachers the confidence to confidently conduct oral presentations in front of the class, making learning enjoyable and stress-free.

1.2.5.4 Other Techniques

Yang (2014) suggested numerous sophisticated ways for improving speaking fluency. First, relaxing is emphasized as a necessary stage since it allows speakers to concentrate on the intricate details of language. When people are comfortable, they are better able to pay attention to minor aspects and qualities of speech, which improves their communication skills. Furthermore, comprehending speaking contexts is considered critical; knowledge with the situational and contextual aspects surrounding spoken communication allows speakers to anticipate subjects and change their speech accordingly. Furthermore, Yang emphasized the need of using clarifying terms in speech. These phrases help to bridge pauses in discourse, allowing for smoother and more fluid communication. Individuals who adopt these tactics can develop a more confident and proficient speaking style.

Yang (2014) presented alternate ways for improving speaking fluency. To begin, exposure to real English inputs from sources such as radio broadcasts and movies is prioritized. This immersion in real-world language situations gives great chances for

language learning and fluency improvement. He also proposed using library recordings and cassette tapes to practice speaking skills on their own. Speaking alone, whether through self-introduction scenarios or simulated conversations, helps people to improve their speaking skills without being pressured. Furthermore, frequent English-speaking groups provide a friendly atmosphere for practice and criticism. Finally, reading aloud and getting pronunciation criticism help to improve speaking abilities and ensure accuracy.

To sum up, the solutions described by Yang provides a holistic strategy to increasing speaking fluency. Individuals can improve their spoken English confidence and fluency by prioritizing relaxation, understanding speaking contexts, using clarification expressions, exposing themselves to authentic English inputs, practicing speaking in various scenarios, seeking feedback on pronunciation, thinking aloud, using speaking fillers, asking for clarification, and incorporating contractions. These skills enable individuals to traverse varied communication environments with ease and efficacy.

Conclusion

The initial section emphasized how societal norms and expectations shape gender as a social and cultural construct rather than merely biological distinctions, highlighting their influence on social roles, behavior, attitudes, and opportunities for men and women through differential socialization based on birth gender. It also distinguished between gender, related to cultural and social roles, and sex, referring to biological traits. In educational contexts, gender dynamics significantly affect access, participation, and learning outcomes, perpetuated by persistent stereotypes and biases that impact students' experiences. Understanding and addressing these dynamics is crucial for promoting equality and creating inclusive learning environments, given the complexity and cultural variability of gender roles and their implications for social justice and educational equity.

In the second section on fluency in speaking, researchers identified key findings regarding its definition, measurement, types, evaluation processes, and effective enhancement techniques. They defined fluency in speaking as the ability to communicate ideas clearly and coherently, prioritizing content delivery over linguistic perfection. Fluency encompasses maintaining a steady speech pace, minimizing pauses, and sustaining a smooth flow of conversation. Measurement methods include assessing speech tempo, pause frequency, and the use of cohesive language structures. Three types of fluency—cognitive, perceived, and utterance—were identified. Evaluation processes range from indirect to direct assessments, employing holistic and analytic scales to gauge speaking proficiency and mitigate rater biases. Effective techniques for enhancing speaking fluency include structured approaches such as the 4/3/2 technique, task-based language teaching, cooperative learning, and individual strategies like relaxation and exposure to authentic language inputs. These findings underscore the multidimensional nature of speaking fluency and highlight diverse strategies aimed at fostering clear, confident, and effective communication skills across various language learning contexts.

Chapter two: Analyzing the Effects of Gender Differences on Speaking Fluency in Debates

Introduction

The initial chapter addresses both variables: differences in gender and the speaking fluency of EFL learners. Following a variety of important field studies that span diverse ideas and theoretical views, this chapter gives further information on the fieldwork study technique, including the procedure, approach, and methodology employed to answer the research questions. Thus, the goal of this chapter is to provide a detailed description of the study design, respondent selection and description, research tools, data collection methods, and statistical treatments applied.

Section one: Research Methodology and Procedure

2.1.1. Research Methodology

To evaluate the influence of gender disparities on the speaking fluency of English foreign language (EFL) learners during debates and to address the research objectives, a descriptive qualitative research approach was used to explain and underpin the current study's concepts. An observational method was the most effective way to gather data for its several advantages in offering rich and detailed data in real-time and providing a nuanced understanding of behaviors, interactions, and contexts.

Ultimately, observation is an important tool for investigating gender differences given that it affords an extensive understanding of behavior in real-world contexts, allowing us to

detect, evaluate, and interpret the complex interplay of elements that influence gender dynamics.

2.1.2 The Student's Observation

2.1.2.1. Population and Sample

At the University Center of Mila, especially in the Department of Foreign Languages, the sample group has been selected from the target population. The EFL learners are the focus of this study; however, the researchers were unable to work on the entire sample due to the learners' unwillingness to participate. Accordingly, Marczyk et al. (2005) emphasized the importance of selecting a 'representative group' that reflects the general characteristics of the entire population of interest; it is impractical to work with every member of the target population. As a result, if something is appropriate to the sample group, it will apply to the entire population. To avoid bias, members of the group sample were chosen randomly.

2.1.2.2. Description of The Students' Observation

The observation included twenty-eight (28) English foreign language (EFL) students of the Mila University Center at different levels during the academic year 2023-2024, including 14 participants of both genders. Participants performed oral debates. They were grouped into pairs, one female and one male, and each pair chose a random topic from a list of pre-selected and specified themes by the investigators to assure the transparency and spontaneity of the debates. The entire procedure was caught on camera to ensure that all behaviors and necessary details were captured. The researchers designed a checklist to fill out after the observation of the recorded data with nine differences that can occur between both genders, according to previous investigations. We aimed to see if these gender differences were really present during debates. The checklist included speaking patterns, nonverbal

communication, argumentation style, response to opposition, leadership and dominance, language and vocabulary, emotional expression, negotiation and compromise, and receptivity to feedback. It has distinct sections for males and females for every feature and is marked in accordance with observed trends or behaviors. In order to calculate speaking fluency regardless of the grammatical structure and other language features, we used mathematical equations cited by Harianto (2016). From these, we were able to derive the disfluency percentage, which allowed us to use a straightforward subtraction to arrive at the fluency results of our sample. We also manually wrote all of the debates and gathered the necessary data from the recordings. Finally, we used a stop watch to count the seconds and a website called "word counter" to help us count the attempted words.

2.1.2.3. Implementation of the Students' Observation

At Mila University Center, a sample of 28 EFL students performed the observation for this study. Every couple had ten (10) minutes to argue during the observation, which took place in unoccupied rooms. The participants were chosen at random on the days of the observation, and they were not prepared in order to guarantee the transparency and spontaneity of the debates. Over the course of three days—April 15, 17, and 30—the entire process of recording the observations took two hours and twenty minutes.

Section two: Data Analysis & Interpretation

2.2.1. Analysis of the Students' Observation

2.2.1.1. Analysis of the Students' Gender Differences

Speaking patterns: 86% of female speakers showed cooperative speaking, which promoted inclusive language usage and attentive listening, leading to a smoother speech pattern. On the

other hand, 36% of males spoke more quickly, interrupted more frequently, and dominated speaking turns.

Non-verbal Communication: 93% of the female participants showed higher nodding and active listening habits, which indicate attentiveness and comprehension. Nonetheless, 57% of men projected higher confidence through more dominating body language.

Argumentation Style: 71% of female participants used emotional arguments and storytelling. While all men (100%) tended to argue in a strong and direct manner, expressing their views with clarity and conviction.

Response to Opposition: 36% of females used indirect techniques to challenge opposing ideas and maintain a more composed and fluent language by calming down and avoiding aggressive arguments. While just 14% of male participants were less open to criticism, they also experienced pauses or hesitations while formulating counterarguments.

Leadership and Dominance: 50% of females exercised leadership via cooperation and consensus-building, whereas 29% of men embraced leadership responsibilities with assertiveness.

Language and Vocabulary: 100% of women used inclusive language and nuanced expression to convey complicated concepts with richness and depth, whereas 100% of men used assertive, technical language to ensure clarity and precision in their communication.

Emotional Expression: 71% of females had a broader variety of emotional expression, which improved their ability to convey passion and conviction. 93% of males were less expressive of emotions and spoke at a more constant and controlled speed.

Negotiation and Compromise: 64% of girls emphasized relationship preservation and made compromises by encouraging constructive discussion and finding common ground. along with 64% of boys conducted negotiating with a competitive perspective, emphasizing compelling reasons to defend their position.

Receptivity to Feedback: 64% of men were more resistant to feedback, whereas 50% of women were more open to it.

2.2.1.2. Analysis of Students' Speaking Fluency

Table 1: *Fluency statistics gained from debate one*

Male	Female
Total Words Attempted (TWA): 224	TWA: 245
Total Speaking Time (TST): 101	TST: 96
Fluent Speaking Time (FST): 41	FST: 86
Pauses: 2 seconds	Pauses: 0 seconds
Total Word Disfluent (TWD): 36	TWD: 9
Total Word Fluent (TWF): 188	TWF: 236
TWD% : 16%	TWD% : 4%
TWF% : 84%	TWF% : 96%

As shown in the table, the male speaker attempted 224 words in a total speaking period of 101 seconds, according to the video. He took a two-second pause. He had thirty-six disfluencies in all. In a total of 41 seconds, he was able to speak with fluency in 188 words. In contrast, the female took 96 seconds to attempt a total of 245 words. The girl spoke in a fluent 86 seconds, uttering 236 words without any pauses, while only using 9 disfluent words overall. The girl outperformed the male participant in this argument because she spoke more

fluently in a shorter amount of time. The male demonstrated 84% fluency, whereas the girl showed 96%.

Table 2: *Fluency statistics gained from debate two*

Male	Female
TWA : 377	TWA: 268
TST: 277	TST : 189
FST: 210	FST : 172
Pauses: 0 seconds	Pauses: 0 seconds
TWD: 14	TWD: 12
TWF: 363	TWF: 256
TWD% : 4%	TWD% : 5%
TWF% : 96%	TWF% : 95%

As shown in the table, the male spoke for a total of 277 seconds, attempting 377 words without pausing. He had 14 disfluencies in all. In 210 seconds, he was able to speak with fluency in 363 words. In contrast, the female took 189 seconds to attempt a total of 268 words. The girl was able to speak 256 fluent words in a total fluent time of 172 seconds without pausing, with a total of 12 disfluent words. The male participant in this argument outperformed the female because he was able to maintain the flow of the conversation, talk more, and do so for a longer period of time. Still, they were almost the same. The male demonstrated 96% fluency, whereas the girl showed 95%.

Table 3: *Fluency statistics gained from debate three*

Male	Female

TWA : 462	TWA : 348
TST : 158	TST : 177
FST : 128	FST : 53
Pauses : 0 seconds	Pauses : 7 seconds
TWD : 20	TWD : 62
TWF : 442	TWF : 286
TWD% : 4%	TWD% : 17%
TWF% : 96%	TWF% : 83%

As shown in the table, in this debate the male spoke for 158 seconds straight, attempting 462 words in all without pausing. He had twenty disfluencies in all. In a total of 128 seconds, he was able to speak with fluency in 442 words. In contrast, the female attempted 348 words in total in 177 seconds. The female was able to speak 286 fluent words in a total of 53 seconds, with a 7-second stop, compared to her total of 62 disfluent words. In this argument, the female performer performed worse than the male; while he spoke longer than her, he displayed less disfluencies than the girl did. The male demonstrated 96% fluency, whereas the girl showed 83%.

Table 4: *Fluency statistics gained from debate four*

Male	Female
TWA : 226	TWA : 232
TST : 103	TST: 143
FST : 38	FST : 130
Pauses : 2 seconds	Pauses : 0 seconds
TWD: 54	TWD : 11

TWF : 172	TWF : 221
TWD% : 23%	TWD% : 5%
TWF% : 77%	TWF% : 95%

As shown in the table, the male speaker in this argument attempted 226 words in all, speaking for 103 seconds pausing for two seconds. He had a total of 54 disfluencies. He managed to talk fluently in 172 words in a total of 38 seconds. The female speaker, on the other hand, tried 232 words in a total of 143 seconds. The girl attempted 11 disfluent words in total, in 130 seconds, she was able to utter 221 fluent words without pausing. The female participant in this debate outperformed the male; she spoke more for longer and showed less unnatural speech patterns. The male displayed 77% fluency, whereas the girl showed 95%.

Table 5: *Fluency statistics gained from debate five*

Male	Female
TWA : 362	TWA : 154
TST : 118	TST : 52
FST : 84	FST : 29
Pauses: 0 seconds	Pauses : 3 seconds
TWD : 34	TWD : 16
TWF : 328	TWF : 138
TWD% : 9%	TWD% : 10%
TWF% : 91%	TWF% : 90%

As shown in the table, the male speaker talked for a total of 362 words in 118 seconds without pausing; in 84 seconds, he was able to say 328 words that were fluent and 34 words that were not. While the female only managed to attempt 138 fluent words in 29 seconds after

stopping for 3 seconds, she managed to attempt 154 words in total in 52 seconds. The male kept the discussion longer and used more fluent language than the female, making him somewhat superior. The male demonstrated 91% fluency, whereas the girl displayed 90%.

Table 6: *Fluency statistics gained from debate six*

Male	Female
TWA : 340	TWA : 208
TST : 113	TST : 187
FST : 83	FST : 70
Pauses : 0 seconds	Pauses : 6 seconds
TWD : 27	TWD : 10
TWF : 313	TWF : 198
TWD% : 8%	TWD% : 5%
TWF% : 92%	TWF% : 95%

As shown in the table, the male speaker spoke for a total of 340 words without pausing in 113 seconds; 313 of those words were said fluently, and 27 were not. Even though the female paused for six seconds, she was still able to attempt 198 fluent words in 70 seconds, out of a total of 208 words in 187 seconds. Because the male could talk more fluently and for longer periods of time, the male did partially better than the female. The male demonstrated 92% fluency, whereas the girl showed 95%.

Table 7: *Fluency statistics gained from debate seven*

Male	Female
TWA : 262	TWA : 232

TST : 107	TST : 139
FST : 97	FST : 106
Pauses : 5 seconds	Pauses : 22 seconds
TWD : 5	TWD : 15
TWF : 257	TWF : 217
TWD% : 2%	TWD% : 6%
TWF% : 98%	TWF% : 94%

As shown in the table, the female attempted 232 words in a total of 139 seconds, stopping for 22 seconds, whereas the male attempted 262 words in a total of 107 seconds, pausing only for 5 seconds. The male managed to utter 257 fluent words in 97 seconds with minor disfluent 5 words. In 106 seconds, she managed to speak 217 fluent words and 15 disfluent ones. The male performed better than the female because, aside from having less disfluencies than the female, he could utter more fluent words in less time. The male demonstrated 98% fluency, whereas the female showed 94%.

Table 8: *Fluency statistics gained from debate eight*

Male	Female
TWA : 219	TWA : 148
TST : 75	TST : 50
FST : 69	FST : 36
Pauses : 5 seconds	Pauses : 8 seconds
TWD : 2	TWD : 4
TWF : 217	TWF : 144
TWD% : 1%	TWD% : 3%

TWF% : 99%	TWF% : 97%
-------------------	-------------------

As shown in the table, the male compared to his minimal disfluent 2 words, was able to pronounce 217 fluent words in 69 seconds out of a total of 219 words attempted in 75 seconds, with a 5-second pause. The female attempted 148 words in all in 50 seconds, stopping for 8 seconds, however she was only able to speak 144 words fluently in 36 seconds, with 4 disfluent words. The male spoke longer and with greater fluency than the female, able to produce fewer disfluencies and more fluent words. Compared to him, she spoke less, used fewer fluent words, and yet had more disfluencies. The male demonstrated 99% fluency, whereas the female showed 97%.

Table 9: *Fluency statistics gained from debate nine*

Male	Female
TWA : 434	TWA : 281
TST : 147	TST : 98
FST : 137	FST : 70
Pauses : 4 seconds	Pauses : 10 seconds
TWD : 3	TWD : 9
TWF : 431	TWF : 272
TWD% : 1%	TWD% : 3%
TWF% : 99%	TWF% : 97%

As shown in the table, The male attempted 434 words in total in 147 seconds, pausing for 4 seconds. Compared to his minimal disfluent 3 words, he was able to speak 431 fluent words in 137 seconds. The female attempted 281 words in all in 98 seconds, stopping for 10 seconds in between, however she was able to speak 272 words fluently in 70 seconds, along

with 9 disfluent words. The male was more fluent than the female; he spoke longer, was able to create more words quickly, and had less disfluencies. She spoke less and produced fewer words than he did, but she still had more disfluencies than him. The male demonstrated 99% fluency, whereas the female showed 97%.

Table 10: *Fluency statistics gained from debate ten*

Male	Female
TWA : 125	TWA : 159
TST : 103	TST : 142
FST : 72	FST : 115
Pauses : 6 seconds	Pauses : 12 seconds
TWD : 21	TWD : 17
TWF : 104	TWF : 142
TWD% : 17%	TWD% : 11%
TWF% : 83%	TWF% : 89%

As shown in the table, the male attempted 125 words in total in 103 seconds, pausing for 6 seconds. Compared to his disfluent 21 words, he was able to pronounce 104 words fluently in 72 seconds. The female tried 159 words in total in 142 seconds, breaking for 12 seconds. However, she was able to speak 142 words fluently in 115 seconds, with 17 words that were not fluent. The female did better than the man in this debate; she was able to speak more fluently and made fewer mistakes, even though her fluency period was longer than his. The male demonstrated 83% fluency, whereas the female showed 89%.

Table 11: *Fluency statistics gained from debate eleven*

Male	Female
TWA : 164	TWA : 157
TST : 55	TST : 53
FST : 34	FST : 37
Pauses : 5 seconds	Pauses : 0 seconds
TWD : 16	TWD : 16
TWF : 148	TWF : 141
TWD% : 10%	TWD% : 10%
TWF% : 90%	TWF% : 90%

As shown in the table, the male attempted 164 words in total in 55 seconds, pausing for 5 seconds. In contrast, he was able to speak 148 fluent words in 34 seconds as opposed to 16 disfluent words. With 16 disfluent words, the female could only recite 141 fluent words in a total fluent period of 37 seconds, although she attempted 157 words in 53 seconds without pauses. There was almost equal contribution from both genders in this debate. Both genders demonstrated 90% fluency.

Table 12: *Fluency statistics gained from debate twelve*

Male	Female
TWA : 153	TWA : 109
TST : 51	TST: 40
FST : 38	FST : 27
Pauses: 7seconds	Pauses : 12 seconds
TWD : 21	TWD: 7
TWF : 132	TWF : 102

TWD% : 14%	TWD% : 6%
TWF% : 86%	TWF% : 94%

As shown in the table, the male attempted 153 words in total in 51 seconds, pausing for 7 seconds. In contrast to his disfluent 21 words, he was able to speak 132 words in 38 seconds with fluency. Despite attempting 109 words in 40 seconds and breaking for 12 seconds, the female was able to recite 109 words fluently in 27 seconds, with 7 disfluent words. The female did better than the male and committed fewer disfluencies. The male demonstrated 86% fluency, whereas the female showed 94%.

Table 13: *Fluency statistics gained from debate thirteen*

Male	Female
TWA : 307	TWA : 296
TST : 201	TST : 186
FST : 192	FST : 171
Pauses : 0 seconds	Pauses : 2 seconds
TWD : 6	TWD : 10
TWF : 301	TWF : 286
TWD% : 2%	TWD% : 3%
TWF% : 98%	TWF% : 97%

As shown in the table, the male attempted 307 words in total in 201 seconds with no pauses. Compared to his minimal disfluent 6 words, he was able to speak 301 fluent words in 192 seconds. With 10 disfluent words, the female managed to pronounce 286 fluent words in a total fluent duration of 171 seconds, while attempting 296 words in 186 seconds and stopping for 2 seconds. Compared to the male, the female committed more disfluencies and

paused more frequently, although they were about equal. The male demonstrated 98% fluency, whereas the female showed 97%.

Table 14: *Fluency statistics gained from debate fourteen*

Male	Female
TWA : 122	TWA : 285
TST : 60	TST : 179
FST : 42	FST : 168
Pauses : 13 seconds	Pauses : 5 seconds
TWD : 21	TWD : 7
TWF : 101	TWF : 278
TWD% : 17%	TWD% : 2%
TWF% : 83%	TWF% : 98%

Description: As shown in the table, the male attempted 122 words in total in 60 seconds with a 13-second break. Compared to his disfluent 21 words, he was able to pronounce 101 words fluently in 42 seconds. After attempting 285 words in 179 seconds and stopping for 5 seconds, the female was able to speak 278 words fluently in 168 seconds, with 7 disfluent words. When compared to the male, the female performed greater because she could speak more fluently, with less stumbles and pauses. The male demonstrated 83% fluency, whereas the female showed 98%.

2.2.3. Analysis and interpretation of the impact of gender differences on speaking fluency

The 86% of female speakers who demonstrated cooperative speaking, fostering inclusive language usage, and attentive listening resulted in a smooth speech pattern with less

disfluencies, which contributed significantly to enhancing metric outcomes. However, 36% of males who spoke quicker, interrupted more frequently, and dominated speaking turns encountered hesitations and disfluencies, which severely damaged their speaking ability from this perspective. We may presume that the cooperative speaking pattern has a beneficial influence on speaking fluency in contrast to the dominant speaking pattern.

93% of female participants who showed better nodding and active listening behaviors, as well as attention and comprehension, had more understanding and less miscommunication, resulting in fewer stops and hesitations and a higher fluency score. Nonetheless, 57% of males who projected more confidence through more dominant body language were less hesitant and did not tremble as much, resulting in a smoother speech flow and better metrics. From this angle, we could claim that both nonverbal communication styles were effective in increasing speaking fluency.

71% of the female participants employed storytelling and emotional arguments. But all males had a tendency to debate strongly, directly, and with conviction about their positions. Nevertheless, there is no apparent correlation between these argumentative approaches and their speaking fluency measures, leading us to conclude that argumentation methods have no effect on fluency.

In order to avoid confrontational interactions and maintain a more controlled and fluent language, 36% of the female participants chose indirect strategies to counter opposing perspectives. This allowed their speech to flow effortlessly and with minimal stumbles. Speaking fluency scores fell for the 14% of male participants who stopped or delayed when formulating counterarguments, indicating that they were more resistant to criticism. This implies that speaking fluency is influenced by how different genders react to criticism.

Although 29% of males accepted leadership roles with assertiveness, their assertiveness had no impact on their fluency when speaking; rather, it was more dependent on their individual abilities. 50% of female leaders who demonstrated their cooperative and consensus-building skills encouraged the use of inclusive language, which improved speech flow and fluency.

While 100% of men used assertive, technical language to ensure clarity and precision in their communication, 100% of women used inclusive language and nuanced expression to convey complex ideas with richness and depth. Nevertheless, their vocabulary and language choices had no control over their speaking fluency. It indicates that language and vocabulary have nothing to do with the fluency measurements.

Although 93% of males and 71% of females expressed their emotions more broadly and talked at a steady, controlled pace, respectively, neither group's emotions had any impact on the fluency of their speech. It revealed that expressing emotion had no obvious effect on their measurements.

64% of girls prioritized maintaining relationships and made accommodations by fostering positive dialogue and identifying points of agreement, which improved their speaking fluency. 64% of boys, on the other hand, approached negotiations from a competitive standpoint, highlighting strong arguments for their position. Having a competitive attitude may result in confrontations, which may interfere and have a negative impact on speaking fluency.

While 50% of women were more receptive to criticism, which allowed them to modify their communication style and improve their statistics, 64% of men were more resistant to it, which caused them to hesitate and explain their stances, leading them to

commit more disfluencies. This suggests that the way people of both genders receive feedback has a significant impact on how fluently they speak.

2.2.2. Discussion of Results

The objective of this research was to determine how differences in gender impacted the speaking fluency of EFL learners during debates. To address concerns raised by the study, the investigators conducted an observation of a sample of EFL learners. The results of our analysis clearly demonstrate the existence of gender differences, and the data input confirms this even if they appeared in varying degrees. The findings show that cooperative speaking, active listening, indirect opposition-countering strategies, consensus-building leadership, upholding a constructive debate, and being open to criticism all favorably affect speaking fluency, especially in female participants in line with the findings of Namaziandost et al. (2019) that revealed females were more fluent thanks to the positive impact of their gender differences; however, male intolerance to criticism and competitive negotiating strategies causes greater hesitations and disfluencies and has a negative effect on speaking fluency. However, neither gender's fluency is greatly impacted by assertiveness in leadership, language and vocabulary choices, argumentation strategies, or emotional expression. This implies that while some cooperative and interpersonal behaviors may improve fluency, other behaviors, such as argumentative strategies, emotional expression, and word selection, may have the opposite effect.

Furthermore, not every female participant who reported the advantages of their gender characteristics was able to produce high fluency measures; this varied from person to person. This suggests that only females who meet the requirement of having strong speaking abilities would experience the beneficial effect. Likewise, for men, any advantages derived from their gender differences only contribute to fluency if they already possess a high level of personal

speaking proficiency. Still, regardless of how proficient a speaker of either gender is, any adverse impact resulting from gender disparities reduces their ability to speak fluently. In line with Wafidin's (2022) study, it came to the conclusion that while gender has an impact on speaking fluency, it does not influence it. If we can connect the researcher's findings to ours, we agree that while the gender differences in our sample had little to no effect on participants' speaking fluency, they did have an impact that deserved recognition.

We are ultimately able to respond to the research inquiries. Our investigation's results indicate that gender differences do exist and impact EFL learners' speaking fluency. These effects can be both positive and negative, or they can have no effect at all. Although it would be unfair to attribute all of the effects to them, one's personal differences, as well as their skills and abilities, have a significant impact. Many individuals reported similar gender discrepancies, but because each person had a different proficiency level, the fluency outcomes varied greatly. Therefore, the findings of this study provide insight into the existence of these gender differences and their effects, which would greatly improve someone's speaking fluency if these facts were recognized. However, we cannot simply relate a person's poor speaking fluency to their gender; gender is one factor, but there are many other factors that must also be taken into account.

2.2.3. Limitations of the Study

This work did in fact have a number of limitations. They established barriers to the research's accomplishment, which may have lowered the quality of the conclusions. As a result, we will outline the major difficulties the researchers faced.

The first issue we encountered was low participation from most students, who expressed no interest in taking part in the observation. Some students were also hesitant to be

recorded due to shyness, and some of them outright refused to be recorded especially female students who were afraid of being recorded because Algerian society norms do not support recording girls. Furthermore, there were relatively few men at the University of Mila, making it difficult to find males, especially because the selection process was so arbitrary. To make matters worse, of the few males, the majority did not consistently attend. The final restriction is the lack of dependable systems to convert videos to PDF, which forced us to write every debate. Additionally, there was no system in place to determine speaking fluency, so we had to calculate it by hand, which would have required a lot of time and work if the sample had been larger.

Conclusion

This chapter focused on the practical application of the research and looked at how gender disparities affected EFL learners' speaking fluency during debates. The researchers concluded that there are gender differences and that some of them have an influence on speaking fluency while others do not, with the influence varying from debate to debate after evaluating and interpreting the data gathered from the observation. The chapter further discussed the results, highlighted the limits of the study from the perspective of the researchers.

General Conclusion

Whether a woman or a guy is a better speaker was a commonly doubted concern. Discrimination in the classroom would occur if a significant portion of the population believed that one gender was superior to the other. This study aimed to investigate the impact of gender differences on oral communication fluency among EFL students in oral sessions and debates. Results confirm the existence of these differences as well as any favorable or negative effects. In addition to advancing English teaching practices and giving all students access to a more equitable and fair learning environment, this study offered significant new insights, in addition the answer to the following questions:

1/Do differences in speaking fluency actually exist between male and female EFL Learners ?

2/What effects do gender differences have on the oral and debate fluency of EFL Students ?

3/ do these gender disparities either enhance or decrease EFL Students ability to speak fluently in oral presentations and debates?

The current study employed a descriptive qualitative research approach to explain and support its concepts in order to analyze the impact of gender differences on the speaking fluency of English foreign language (EFL) learners during debates and to achieve its research objectives. Since observational methods give rich and detailed data in real-time and provide sophisticated knowledge of behaviors, relationships, and situations, an observation is the most efficient way to collect data.

For the dissertation, there are two chapters. The first is conceptual in nature. Chapter two is a practical one. The introductory chapter is further separated into two sections: the first portion goes into great detail about gender differences, starting with their definition and moving on to discuss sex vs. gender, gender variations, gender dynamics in education, and gender and education. Speaking fluency is covered in detail in the second section, which starts with a definition and goes on to examine measures, types, evaluation procedures, and development strategies. The second chapter covers the practical work and provides an analysis of the EFL learners' observations as well as an interpretation of the results in connection to the research questions, the limitations faced by the investigators, and suggestions for further investigations related to the study area.

The investigation's conclusions indicate that, while gender discrepancies do exist and have an impact, they are not the only factor affecting the speaking fluency of EFL learners. Both individual differences and one's skills and abilities have a significant impact. Despite the fact that many demonstrated similar gender inequalities, differences in competence caused the fluency outcomes to differ greatly. Therefore, speaking fluency would significantly increase if these facts were realized. The results of the investigation showed the existence and significance of these gender differences. Nevertheless, blaming someone's low speaking fluency just on their gender is insufficient because there are several other factors to take into account.

On the basis of our findings there are several recommendations for future studies on relevant themes regarding EFL teaching and learning. First off, researching the effects of gender differences on the interactions between EFL teachers and their students may be quite fruitful and insightful regarding the process of teaching and learning English as a foreign language. Another important topic of research is the learners' self-awareness of their gender

differences and how these affect their relationships and communication dynamics in a language learning setting. Lastly, the impact of various teaching strategies on EFL students according to their gender is a crucial topic of research as it helps to customize the most effective teaching methods and improve the results of the learners.

List of References

- Anderman, E., & Anderman, L. (2009). *Psychology of Classroom Learning: An Encyclopedia*. USA: Macmillan Social Science Library.
- Andrews, N. C. Z., Cook, R. E., Nielson, M. G., Xiao, S. X., & Martin, C. L. (2020). *Gender in Education*.
- Azka, M. F. (2023, June 18). The role of gender in the dynamic of social change: *An analysis of intersectionality in the context of contemporary society*.
<https://doi.org/10.31219/osf.io/ab8e4>
- Brown, D., & Abeywickrama, P. (2010). *Language Assessment: Principles and Classroom Practices*. Pearson Education, New York.
- Brown, G., & Yule, G. (1983). *Teaching the Spoken Language*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Brown, P., & Levinson, S. (1987). *Politeness: Some Universals in Language Use*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bucholtz, M. (2004). *Language and Women's Place: Texts and Commentaries*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Butler, J. (1990). *Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity*. Routledge.
- Byrne, D. (1986). *Teaching Oral English*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Cameron, D., McAlinden, F., & O'Leary, K. (1988). Lakoff in context: the social and linguistic function of tag questions. In J. Coates & D. Cameron (Eds.), pp. 74–93.

- Carli, L. (1990). Gender, language, and influence. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 39*(3), 941–931.
- Casey, B. (2001). Spatial-mechanical reasoning skills versus mathematics self-confidence as mediators of gender differences on mathematics subtests using cross-national gender-based items. *Journal for Research in Mathematics Education, 32*, 28–57.
- Clark, J. L. D. (1979). Direct vs. semi-direct tests of speaking ability. In E. J. Briere & F. B. Hinofotis (Eds.), *Concepts in Language Testing: Some Recent Studies* (pp. 35–49). Washington, DC: TESOL.
- Coates, J., & Cameron, D. (1988). *Women in Their Speech Communities: New Perspectives on Language and Sex*. London and New York: Longman.
- Costa, P. T. Jr., & McCrae, R. R. (2001). Gender differences in personality traits across cultures: Robust and surprising findings. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 81*(2), 322–331.
- Cross, D. E. (2005). Procedures for analysis and reporting segmental features of fluency and speaking rate.
<http://www.ithaca.edu/cross/SUPERVISION/MATERIALS/EVALUATION/EVALUATIO>
- Cutting, J. (2002). *Pragmatics and Discourse: A Source Book for Students*. London: Routledge.
- De Jong, N. H., Groenhout, R., Schoonen, R., & Hulstijn, J. (2013). Second language fluency: speaking style or proficiency? Correcting measures of second language fluency for first language behavior. *Applied Psycholinguistics, 36*(2), 223-243.

- Eckert, P., & McConnell-Ginet, S. (2003). *Language and Gender*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Ellis, L., Hershberger, S., Field, E., Wersinger, S., Pellis, S., Geary, D., Palmer, C., Hoyenga, K., Hetsroni, A., & Karadi, K. (2008). *Sex Differences: Summarizing More Than a Century of Scientific Research*. New York, NY: Psychology Press.
- Ellis, R. (2003). *Task-Based Language Teaching and Learning*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Eskin, M. (2003). Self-reported assertiveness in Swedish and Turkish adolescents: A cross-cultural comparison. *Scandinavian Journal of Psychology*, 44, 7–12.
- FAO. (1997). Gender is the key to sustainability and food security. SD Dimensions, May 1997. Available at www.fao.org/sd.
- Feingold, A. (1994). Gender differences in personality: A meta-analysis. *Psychological Bulletin*, 116, 429–456.
- Fennema, E. (1990). Justice, equity, and mathematics education. In Fennema, E., & Ledet, G. C. (Eds.), *Mathematics and Gender*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Fillmore, C. J. (1979). *Individual Differences in Language Ability and Language Behavior*. New York: Academic Press.
- Ghasemi, A. A., Sattari, S., Mozaheb, A., & Sadiq, I. (2021). Developing EFL learners' speaking fluency: use of practical techniques.
- Ginther, A. (2017). Assessment of speaking.
- Goffman, E. (1967). *Interaction Ritual: Essays on Face-to-Face Behavior*. New York: Doubleday Anchor.

- Griffiths, C. (2008). *Lessons from Good Language Learners*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Grossman, H., & Grossman, S. H. (1994). *Gender Issues in Education*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Hacker, D. J., Dunlisky, J., & Graesser, A. C. (2009). *Handbook of Metacognition in Education*. New York: Routledge.
- Hariyanto, H. (2016). The assessment procedures for speaking fluency using the retelling technique.
- Hartmann, R. R. K., & Stork, F. C. (1976). *Dictionary of Language and Linguistics*. New York, NY: Wiley.
- Holmes, J. (1995). *Women, Men, and Politeness*. Harlow: Longman.
- Holmes, J., & Meyerhoff, M. (2003). *The Handbook of Language and Gender*. USA: Blackwell Publishing.
- Kimmel, M. (2011). *The Gendered Society*.
- Koosha, B., Ketabi, S., & Kassaian, Z. (2011). The effects of self-esteem, age, and gender on the speaking skills of intermediate university EFL learners.
- Lakoff, R. T. (1975). *Language and Women's Place*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Lakoff, R. T., & Ide, S. (2005). *Broadening the Horizons of Linguistic Politeness*.
- Lee, S. W. (2005). *Encyclopedia of School Psychology*. USA: Sage Publications.
- Lehfeldt, E. A. (n.d.). Group work: Gen Ed Skill Area. USA: Cleveland State University.

- Marczyk, G., De Matteo, D., & Festinger, D. (2005). *Essentials of Research Design and Methodology*. New Jersey: John Wiley and Sons, Inc.
- Masuram, J., & Sripada, P. N. (2020). Developing spoken fluency through task-based teaching.
- Masyithah, N. (2019). Students' strategies for improving speaking fluency (pp. 11–12).
- McConnell-Ginet, S., Borker, R. A., & Furman, N. (1980). *Women and Language in Literature and Society*. New York: Praeger.
- McElhinny, B. (2003). There are three approaches to the study of language and gender.
- Miller, P. A., Eisenberg, N., Fabes, R. A., Shell, R., & Gular, S. (1989). Socialization of empathetic and sympathetic responses. In Eisenberg, N. (Ed.), *New Directions for Child Development* (pp. 65–83). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Namaziandost, E., Abedi, T. P., & Nasri, M. (2019). The role of gender in the accuracy and fluency of Iranian upper-intermediate EFL learners' L2 oral productions.
- Namaziandost, E., Homayouni, M., & Rahmani, P. (2020). The impact of a cooperative learning approach on the development of EFL learners' speaking fluency.
- Nation, I. S. P. (1989). Improving speaking fluency. *System*, 17(3), 377–384.
[https://doi.org/10.1016/0346-251x\(89\)90010-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/0346-251x(89)90010-9)
- Nunan, D. (1999). *Second Language Teaching and Learning*. Heinle & Heinle Publishers.

Oxford University Press. (n.d.). Gender. In *Oxford Learner's Dictionary*. Retrieved from <https://www.oxfordlearnersdictionaries.com/definition/english/gender?q=gender>

Petruskevich, L. (1997). *Individual differences: The effects of diversity in the ESL classroom* (Master's Thesis).

Ellis, R., et al. (2008). The effects of focused and unfocused written corrective feedback in an English as a foreign language context.

Reynolds, M., & Miller, E. (2003). *Handbook of Psychology*. New Jersey: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Richard, J. C., & Schmidt, R. (2002). *Longman dictionary of language teaching and applied linguistics* (3rd ed.). London: Pearson Education.

Richards, J. C., Platt, J., & Weber, H. (1985). *Longman dictionary of applied linguistics*. London: Longman.

Robson, M., & Stockwell, P. (2005). *Language in theory: A source book for students*. London: Routledge.

Sari, E. K. (2014). A descriptive study on the fourth semester students of Muhammadiyah University of Purwokerto.

Segalowitz, N. (2010). *Cognitive bases of second language fluency*. London: Routledge.

Slavin, R. E. (2006). *Educational psychology: Theory and practice*. USA: Pearson Education.

Soibova, G. B., & Rahimboeva, H. G. (2021). Assessment for speaking skill.

- Sunderland, J. (2000). Issues of language and gender in second and foreign language education. *Language Teaching*, 33, 203-223.
- Tannen, D. (1989). Interpreting interruption in conversation. Paper presented at the 25th annual meeting of the Chicago Linguistics Society. Part 2: Parasession on Language and Context, University of Chicago.
- Tavakoli, P., & Skehan. (2005). Strategic planning, task structure, and performance testing. In R. Ellis (Ed.), *Planning and task performance in a second language* (Vol. 11). John Benjamins Publishing.
- Thornbury, S. (2008). *How to Teach Speaking*. England: Pearson Education Limited.
- Wakatobi, T. M., Men, N., & Wakatobi, T. M. (2022). Interseksionalitas Perempuan dan Laki-Laki Bangsawan dalam “Tula-Tula Mia Wakatobi.” *1*(2), 226–241.
- Weisberg, Y. J., DeYoung, C. G., & Hirsh, J. B. (2011). *Frontiers in psychology. Gender differences in personality across the*. USA: Washington University.
- Wierzbicka, A. (1987). *English Speech Act Verbs: A Dictionary*. Sydney: Academic Press.
- Wood, D. (2009). Effects of focused instruction of formulaic sequences on fluent expression in second language narratives: A case study. *The Canadian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 12(1), 39–57. Retrieved from <https://journals.lib.unb.ca/index.php/CJAL/article/view/19898>
- Yang, Y. I. J. (2014). Is speaking fluency strand necessary for the college students to develop in the EFL class?
- Yang, Z. (2014). *Strategies of Improving Spoken English for Learners*.

- Yosia, A. (2020). Mendedah Lokalitas, Menuju Interseksionalitas. *Indonesian Journal of Theology*, 8(2).
- Yu, G. (1995). Implementing cooperative learning approach in an EFL class in Taiwan. NKNU.
- Zimmerman, D., & West, C. (1975). Sex roles interruptions and silences in conversations. In B. Thorne & N. Henley (Eds.), *Language and Sex: Difference and Dominance*. Rowley: Newbury House.

Appendix

The observation's checklist

Gender Differences during Debates	Female	Presence	Male	Presence
Speaking patterns	_May demonstrate a cooperative speaking style, resulting in a smoother flow of speech through the use of inclusive language and active listening.		_May potentially dominate speaking turns and interrupt more frequently, possibly exhibiting a more rapid speaking pace.	
Non-verbal Communication	_ Might exhibit more nodding and engaged listening behaviors, conveying attentiveness and understanding.		_Might display more dominant body language, projecting confidence.	
Argumentation Style	_May incorporate emotional appeals and storytelling into their arguments.		_ May have a tendency towards assertive and direct argumentation styles, and might deliver their points with clarity and conviction.	
Response to Opposition	_May employ indirect strategies to counter opposing arguments, and maintain a more composed and fluent discourse by defusing tension and avoiding confrontational exchanges.		_May be more defensive to criticism, might experience interruptions or hesitations as they formulate counterarguments.	
Leadership and Dominance	_May exercise leadership through collaboration and consensus-building.		_ May assume leadership roles with assertiveness.	
Language and Vocabulary	_ Might use inclusive language and nuanced expression to articulate complex ideas with richness and depth.		_May use assertive, technical language, ensuring clarity and precision in their expression.	

Emotional Expression	_May exhibit a wider range of emotional expression, and enhance conveying passion and conviction.		_May be less expressive of emotions, and maintain a more consistent and controlled speaking pace.	
Negotiation and Compromise	_ May prioritize relationship preservation and compromise by fostering cooperative dialogue and finding common ground.		_ May approach negotiation with a competitive mindset, and prioritize delivering persuasive arguments to assert their position.	
Receptivity to Feedback	_May be more open to feedback.		_ May be less receptive to feedback.	

Resumé

Cette étude examine comment les différences entre les sexes affectent la fluidité orale des étudiants en anglais langue étrangère (EFL) lors des débats. Elle vise à déterminer l'existence de ces disparités entre les sexes, si elles ont un impact sur la fluidité orale et si cet impact est bénéfique ou négatif. Trois questions de recherche sont posées afin de déterminer l'influence et d'examiner la nature de celle-ci en fonction du contenu de l'étude. La méthode idéale pour recueillir les données nécessaires est une approche de recherche descriptive. Ainsi, vingt-huit étudiants du Département des Langues Étrangères du Centre Universitaire de Mila ont été soumis à une méthode d'observation. Les principales conclusions de la recherche indiquent que des disparités entre les sexes existent, bien que dans des degrés variés. En plus de leur existence, elles ont un effet mixte sur la fluidité orale des apprenants. Cependant, il s'avère qu'il existe d'autres facteurs qui affectent la fluidité orale en plus du sexe, et l'influence du sexe est marginale par rapport aux compétences et aux capacités personnelles de chacun. En fin de compte, la recherche présente un large éventail de suggestions pour la pédagogie et les études futures afin de mettre en lumière les différences entre les sexes et les nombreuses façons dont elles peuvent affecter divers aspects des apprenants, des enseignants et des environnements d'EFL.

ملخص

تبحث هذه الدراسة الحالية في كيفية تأثير الفروق بين الجنسين على طلاقة الطلاب في اللغة الإنجليزية كلغة أجنبية أثناء المناقشات. تهدف إلى تحديد وجود هذه الفروق بين الجنسين، وما إذا كان لها تأثير على طلاقة الكلام، وإذا كان هذا التأثير إيجابياً أو سلبياً. تطرح الدراسة ثلاثة أسئلة بحثية لتحديد التأثير والنظر في طبيعته بناءً على محتوى الدراسة. النهج المثالي لجمع البيانات المطلوبة هو نهج البحث الوصفي. لذا، تم إعطاء ثمانية وعشرين طالباً في قسم اللغات الأجنبية بمركز جامعة ميلا طريقة الملاحظة. تشير النتائج الرئيسية للبحث إلى أن الفروق بين الجنسين موجودة، وإن كانت بدرجات متفاوتة. بالإضافة إلى وجودها، فإنها تؤثر بشكل مختلط على طلاقة المتعلمين في الكلام. لكن تبين أن هناك عوامل أخرى تؤثر على طلاقة الكلام بخلاف الجنس، وأن تأثير الجنس هامشي مقارنةً بالمهارات والقدرات الشخصية للفرد. تقدم الدراسة في النهاية مجموعة واسعة من الاقتراحات للبيداغوجيا والدراسات المستقبلية في محاولة لتسليط الضوء على الفروق بين الجنسين والطرق العديدة التي قد تؤثر بها على العديد من جوانب متعلمي اللغة الإنجليزية كلغة أجنبية والمدرسين والبيئات التعليمية