

**A conversation analysis of Egyptian EFL learners' performance
in using turn-taking strategies: A TEFL perspective**

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Marghany Mahmoud Marghany
Head
Dept., of Languages & Translation
Higher Institute for Specific Studies, Haram

Abstract

There is no doubt that turn-taking strategies are indispensable factors for developing the interactional competence of FL learners. The present study investigated the ability of some Egyptian EFL learners to differentiate between various types of turn-taking strategies in FL conversation. Eighty English-majoring Egyptian students took part in the current study. They were divided into two groups: a control group and an experimental group with forty participants each. A pretest was administered to both groups on the identification of the types of FL turn-taking strategies. The experimental group participants were taught training activities to practice the types of FL turn-taking strategies during the second term of the academic year 2018-2019. Both control and experimental groups were post-tested. Data were analyzed quantitatively and qualitatively. Quantitatively, the Paired Samples T-Test and the Independent Samples T-Test were conducted. Qualitatively, the participants' errors in identifying types of FL turn-taking strategies were discussed. Findings indicated improvement of the experimental groups' performance in identifying the FL turn-taking strategies. The present study introduced implications for the teaching of FL conversation in the Egyptian context.

Keywords: turn-taking strategies, teaching of FL conversation, Egyptian EFL learners, performance, interactional competence

تحليل محادثات أداء الطلاب المصريين الدارسين للغة الإنجليزية كلغة أجنبية في استخدام استراتيجيات تبادل الأدوار: منظور لتدريس اللغة الإنجليزية كلغة أجنبية

أستاذ مشارك د/ مرغنى محمود مرغنى
رئيس قسم اللغات و الترجمة
المعهد العالى للدراسات النوعية الهرم

الملخص

تعتبر استراتيجيات تبادل الأدوار دون شك عوامل لا غنى عنها فى تطوير الكفاءة التفاعلية للطلاب الدارسين للغة الإنجليزية حيث بحثت الدراسة الحالية قدرة بعض الطلاب المصريين الدارسين للغة الإنجليزية كلغة أجنبية على التمييز بين الأنواع المتعددة لإستراتيجيات تبادل الأدوار فى المحادثة باللغة الأجنبية حيث شارك فيها ثمانون طالب مصرى متخصص فى دراسة اللغة الإنجليزية، و تم تقسيمهم إلى مجموعتين: المجموعة الضابطة و المجموعة التجريبية ضمت كل منهما أربعون مشاركاً، و خضعت المجموعتان للأختبار القبلى للتعرف على الأنواع المتعددة لإستراتيجيات تبادل الأدوار فى اللغة الأجنبية، و تم تدريس برنامج تدريبي للمشاركين فى المجموعة التجريبية للتدريب على ممارسة أنواع إستراتيجيات تبادل الأدوار خلال الفصل الدراسى الثانى للعام الجامعى ٢٠١٨-٢٠١٩ ، و تم تحليل البيانات البحثية كما و كيفاً، و أتمتت الدراسة من الناحية الكمية على أختبار (ت) للعينات المقترنة و أختبار (ت) للعينات المستقلة، و من الناحية الكيفية ناقشت الدراسة أخطاء المشاركين فى التعرف على أنواع إستراتيجيات تبادل الأدوار فى اللغة الأجنبية، و أشارت النتائج إلى تحسن أداء المشاركين فى المجموعة التجريبية فى التعرف على أنواع إستراتيجيات تبادل الأدوار فى اللغة الأجنبية، و قدمت الدراسة مضامين لتدريس محادثة اللغة الأجنبية فى السياق المصرى.

الكلمات المفتاحية:

إستراتيجيات تبادل الأدوار، تدريس المحادثة فى اللغة الأجنبية، الطلاب المصريين الدارسين للغة الإنجليزية كلغة أجنبية، الأداء، الكفاءة التفاعلية

Background of the study

Marlina (2014) and Young (2018) highlighted the importance of turn-taking as a crucial factor in developing the interactional competence of FL learners. However, FL teachers do not pay much attention to its instruction. The importance of turn taking emanates from the fact that language is functional in nature; its main purpose is the realization of effective communication within the boundary of the context in which it is used. For instance, turn-taking is fundamental for FL learners in performing the various speech acts. Bayyurt and Akcan (2015) and Elkommos (2018) asserted that the mastery of FL turn-taking strategies is the pedagogical instrument that helps FL learners to realize communicative learning. That is, FL teaching is viewed as a process in which FL learners and teachers collaborate together within the parameters of the interactive communicative approach.

In this regard, Wong and Waring (2010), Kellas (2012) and Marlina (2018) attributed the difficulty which FL learners encounter in learning turn-taking to its insufficient treatment in FL instruction and curricula. Young (2013), (2015) and (2018) explained that the successful turn-taking instruction to the Japanese EFL learners entails their ample understanding of the transition points of turns. That is, the elements of grammar, semantics, and phonology which determine when the turn should be given. These transition points which are mainly linguistic features usually differ between the mother tongue and the target language. For example, the Japanese EFL learners are affected by their L1 transition points and usually have moments of silence while conversing in English due to the L1 effect. Furthermore, Williamson (2019) accounted the inability of Japanese EFL to develop their turn-taking skills to the effect of cross-cultural pragmatic rules particularly in expressing agreement and disagreement. That is, the Japanese EFL learners had to adopt different pragmatic behavior when conversing in English which is opposed to their L1.

In this concern, Elkommos (2018) explained that teaching FL turn-taking strategies is indispensable for FL pragmatic instruction. Turn-taking strategies develop the EFL learners' discourse, sociolinguistic, pragmatic competences. That is, how to open or close conversation; how to express different speech acts; how to overlap at the same time; how to interrupt; how to give the turn; how to prompt the turn; how to express agreement and/or disagreement; how to ask for others' opinions; how to use fillers; how to develop their speaking skills, etc. In other words, FL turn-taking strategies enable FL learners to run conversation and communicate effectively. The teaching of FL turn-taking strategies makes EFL learners practice natural and functional knowledge where language

teaching becomes an enhancement of language knowledge and use instead of being a process of teaching abstract language. Therefore, it was necessary to investigate the ability of Egyptian EFL learners to identify different types of FL taking strategies.

Statement of the problem

Just like other EFL learners, Egyptian EFL students encounter difficulty in identifying and using FL turn-taking strategies. They are unable to differentiate between different types of turn-taking strategies. Therefore, the present study investigated the ability of some Egyptian EFL learners to differentiate between various types of turn-taking strategies in FL conversation. It discussed the effectiveness of using FL turn-taking instruction in improving performance in the examined FL conversation strategies. It also verified the statistically significant differences that might exist between the control and experimental groups in using the FL turn-taking strategies properly.

Questions

The current study attempted to answer the following questions:

1. Why is the teaching of turn-taking strategies important to the Egyptian EFL learners?
2. How do the control and experimental groups generally use FL turn-taking strategies in the pretest?
3. What is the difference between the control and experimental groups' performances in the posttest?
4. Is there a statistically significant difference between the performances of both groups in the posttest?

Aims

The present study aimed to:

1. Emphasize the importance of teaching turn-taking strategies to the Egyptian EFL learners.
2. Determine the performance of the control and experimental groups in using FL turn-taking strategies in the pretest.
3. State the difference between the performance of both control and experimental groups in the posttest.
4. Verify the statistical significance of the performance of both groups in the posttest.

Significance of the study

The present study is significant because it highlights the importance of turn-taking instruction in the process of FL teaching in the Egyptian context. It clarifies the necessity of developing the Egyptian

EFL learners' performance in mastering the different types of turn-taking strategies. It also asserts the role of pedagogical intervention in developing the FL conversation skills in the Egyptian context. The significance of the present study emanates as well from the fact that it discussed an aspect of the productive speaking skills of the Egyptian EFL learners, i.e. turn-taking strategies.

Delimitations

The findings of the present study are delimited to the teaching of FL conversation to the Egyptian EFL third-year students at the Department of Languages and Translation, Higher Institute for Specific Studies, Haram. In addition, these findings can be useful to the FL conversation courses being taught at other higher learning institutions in Egypt.

Literature review

Ghilzai and Baloch (2016) examined how males and females differ in using turn-taking strategies. Data were elicited from various types of radio and TV programs; in some programs the interlocutors were only males, in other programs the interlocutors were only females and in the rest programs the interlocutors were males and females. The results indicated that there were statistically insignificant differences among males on the one hand and among females on the other hand in taking the turns. However when comparing the two types of gender, it was found that female participants exceeded their male counterparts in taking turns while the males were more conservative, silent and less curious. Indeed, the present study differs from that of Ghilzai et al. in the sense that it pedagogically handles the performance of turn-taking strategies in relation to the FL teaching and learning context. However, the study of Ghilzai et al. is useful in the sense that it sheds light on a literature gap and highlights the need to investigate the use of turn-taking strategies among Egyptian EFL learners in terms of gender. Thus, this topic can be handled in further in future research.

Abdul Rahman, Rahmat, and Yunos (2017) examined how Malaysian L2 learners employed turn taking strategies in holding discussions at the undergraduate level classes. Participants were 47 Malaysia ESL undergraduates enrolled at a distance learning program. They comprised 13 males and 34 females. They were trained for an academic term on how to use strategies of discussion to express agreement or disagreement. Data were elicited using a questionnaire based task. The findings indicated that the Malaysian ESL learners used different turn-taking strategies in holding class discussion. These strategies include turn holding, yielding and taking over the turn. The

participants were also found to employ different strategies of expressing agreement such as keeping silent, making conclusion, and giving suggestions. Meanwhile, the participants expressed disagreement by refuting others' views, rejecting irrelevant suggestions and exerting dissimilarity.

Ibraheem (2017) conducted a review study to reflect the importance of discourse particles and turn-taking strategies in facilitating interaction and avoiding misunderstanding in FL conversation. Thus, the present study is distinguished from that of Ibraheem in applying the FL strategies of turn-taking in the Egyptian EFL context. Ibraheem clarified that the turn-taking strategies refer to the interchangeable roles between speakers and listeners in a way that helps to organize conversation. Thus, turn-taking is interchanged due to the principles of conversation analysis that determine which of the two conversation parties has the right to speak. In conversation analysis, discourse particles can essentially indicate the speakers' intentions in expressing specific meanings. These discourse particles include the speakers' pitches, pauses and intonation patterns. Ibraheem added that FL learners should be taught the FL turn-taking strategies like gesturing or gazing in order to succeed in performing FL conversation. He pointed out that there are other factors that determine the FL learners' success in performing FL conversation. These factors include FL and L1 cultures, age, and discourse variation from one situation to another. Ibraheem recommended that FL learners should be taught how to handle problems of understanding while conversing in the foreign language and this can be attainable through the mastery of FL turn-taking strategies.

Lestary, Krismanti, and Hermaniar (2017) examined the reasons why the interlocutors used to interrupt or complete each other's turns. Data were collected through different recorded informal conversation. Lestary et al. found that the interruption strategy of turn-taking served as an indication of the common opinions and knowledge between the interlocutors. In this sense, interruption and completion of the interlocutors' turns reflect the close social relations which exist between the two interlocutors. For example, Lestary et al. (2017, p. 57) quoted how the listener (R) interrupted the speaker (T) who was talking about his activities after quitting his job "T: Two years, just imagine for two years. What I have done during that= R: =you have done many things right? (The symbol = refers to interruption). In addition, the researchers explained that completion and interruption of the interlocutors' turns can function as a means of making relationship by attempting to have more

information about the speaker. Lestary et al. (2017, p. 56) gave an example of this purpose of interrupting the interlocutor “R: yes I mean I also try to find the right one I mean if we have no idea what kind of person he is [if we do not try] Y: [you yourself] you yourself having no intention?” (The symbol [] refers to interruption). As for silence, the researchers found that silence usually weakens the conversation and its interpretation depends largely on the preceding utterance. It can be viewed as a change of the conversation topic or an expression of disagreement with the speaker’s utterance.

Dewi, Suharsono and Munir (2018) discussed the influence of EFL learners’ social context, including social personality, surroundings, and relationships, on performing FL conversation. Data were collected from 15 undergraduates enrolled at the Universitas Negeri Surabaya, Indonesia. Data were collected through observation and recording of natural interaction among the participants. The findings highlighted the importance of practicing conversation in FL teaching. Successful performance of FL conversation highly depends on turn-taking strategies. In addition, the Indonesians EFL learners varied in their performance of FL conversation according to their different types of social personality and social power. The Indonesian participants employed three turn-taking strategies mainly starting up the turn, holding the turn and interrupting due to the influence of the social contexts. Some participants hesitated to start the conversation due to their social personality as indicated in using some discourse markers like “uhm” or “uh”. Dewi et al. (2018, p. 295) gave an example of the participants’ hesitance in starting up the conversation “Uhm..any..any..ideas for Ok. Everybody must have idea uh...”. The participants used to interrupt the turn by using alters like “hey” and “look”. The researchers (p. 298) gave an example of the turn-taking interrupting strategy “Ok, **LOOK** at this!” As for holding the turn, the researchers indicated that some participants employed the strategies of elaborate speech and others used linguistic devices like pause fillers and repetition of words.

Method

Research design

The study adopted the mixed method of qualitative and quantitative analysis (e.g. McMillan and Schumacher, 2010; Johnson and Christensen, 2014; and Creswell and Creswell, 2018). The quantitative analysis provides descriptive statistics of the participants’ performance in the pre and posttests. It also relied on the verification of statistical significant differences between the two examined groups’ performances in the

pretest and posttest. For that purpose, the Paired Samples T-Test and the Independent Samples T-Test were conducted (e.g. Seiffedin and El-Sakka, 2017). Furthermore, the qualitative analysis provides examples of the participants' performance in using the FL turn-taking strategies (e.g. Cohen, Manion, and Morrison, 2011).

Participants

Eighty EFL third-year students at the Department of Languages and Translation, Higher Institute for Specific Studies, Haram participated in the present study during the second term of the academic year 2018-2019. They were divided into two groups: a control group and an experimental group with forty students each.

Procedure

The participants were pretested and post-tested. They were asked to identify the different types of turn-taking strategies contained in the test. Participants were instructed to choose the number which represents their chosen strategy as follows: starting up strategy= 1, taking over strategy= 2, interrupting strategy= 3, holding the turn strategy= 4, prompting strategy= 5, appealing strategy= 6 and giving up strategy= 7. Each of the pre and posttests lasted for one and a half hours. The test of turn-taking strategies identification was piloted earlier using a sample of thirty participants. As for the test reliability, the Cronbach alpha coefficient estimated .93 suggesting high reliability according to Johnson and Christensen (2014). In terms of validity, participants found no difficulty in understanding the test items as all included dialogues were clear and understandable. Therefore, the test was valid since it managed to measure the participants' performance in identifying the types of turn-taking strategies. Participants of the experimental group were, then, taught activities of various types of turn-taking strategies. These activities include materials selected from different sources to train the experimental group participants on how to differentiate between various types of turn-taking strategies in FL conversation. They were also taught expressions that helped them to employ various strategies of turn-taking. For instance, they learned the use of 'pause fillers', repetition of lexis as ways of holding the turn strategy. The training activities spanned ten weeks with two hours weekly during the second term of the academic year 2018-2019.

Data collection Instruments

Data were collected through the turn-taking strategies test (Appendix A). The test consists of twenty one items that comprise the seven types of turn-taking strategies of FL conversation with three items

for each strategy. The twenty one items were adapted from different sources like (Toronto Catholic Report, 2009; Gravano & Hirschberg, 2009; Nomlomo, 2011; Lynch & Anderson, 2012; Dayalbagh Educational Institute, 2013; Lestary, Krismanti, & Hermaniar, 2017; Ibraheem, 2017; Habibi 2020; and Banerjee, 2020). In addition, other electronic sources were also used to for devising the test. These sources include electronic websites of the British Council, BBC, “*How To Teach Turn-Taking*”, “*Seven Turn-taking Strategies That Will Boost Student Speaking Time*”, etc. The test was marked out of forty two marks where two marks were allocated for each item. It was administered as a pretest and a posttest.

Data analysis

The Paired Samples T-Test was conducted for two purposes. First, it compared the performances of the control group in the pre and posttests in order to determine whether such performances statistically and significantly differed in both tests. Second, it was carried out to verify the statistical significant differences in the performances of the experimental group in the pretest and the posttest. In addition, the Independent Samples T-Test was carried out for the purpose of verifying the statistical significant differences between the performances of both control and experimental groups.

Table 1 indicates that the minimum and maximum scores of the control and experimental groups ranged between 7-23 and 9-23 in the pretest respectively. The pretest mean score of the control was 15.30 compared to that of 15.34 for the experimental group suggesting relatively similar performances for both groups in the pretest. As such, the participants of both groups showed weak performance in differentiating between the various types of turn-taking strategies. The standard deviation of the control group pretest score 3.02 was relatively less than that of the experimental group 3.13. This indicates that variance was quite similar among the participants of both groups. Table 3 provides examples of both groups’ errors in the pretest in identifying turn-taking strategies.

Tale 1: Paired-Samples T-Test Statistics

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	Minimum	Maximum
Posttest control score	40	17.1230	3.21015	.48240	8.00	24.00
Posttest experimental score	40	39.9642	7.24360	.9756	29.00	41.00
Pretest control score	40	15.3031	3.02101	.63121	7.00	23.00
Pretest experimental score	40	15.3462	3.13123	.50163	9.00	23.00

Table 2: Paired-Samples Test

Test	M	SD	N	DF	t-value	Sig.		
Pretest control group score	15.3031	3.02101	40	39	1.740	.076		
Posttest control group score	17.1230	3.21015	40	39				
Pretest experimental group score	15.3462	3.13123	40	39	23.641	.000		
Posttest experimental group score	39.9642	7.24360	40	39				

Table 3: Pretest errors of identifying types of turn-taking strategies

Sentences	Errors	Corrections
“Can I just say something about your attitude?”	Appealing Strategy	Interrupting Strategy
“(I’m afraid) I can’t let you keep on talking without (saying) the truth”	Prompting/Appealing Strategies	Interrupting Strategy
How about you?	Taking over Strategy	Giving up Strategy
“Would you mind to close the window, please?”	Appealing Strategy	Prompting Strategy (request)
“Would you like to have a cup of tea?”	Interrupting Strategy	Prompting Strategy (offer)
“I have to apologize for that mistake”	Appealing Strategy	Prompting Strategy (apology)
“S2: First, I have breakfast and turn on my computer,	Holding the Turn Strategy	Taking over Strategy

<i>then I turn on my phone.”</i>		
“There are different ways to summarize the story, you know”	Taking over Strategy	Appealing Strategy
“The door was locked, wasn’t it?”	Taking over Strategy	Appealing Strategy
“....And that was just the beginning of the story.”	Starting up Strategy	Holding the Turn Strategy
“I’d like to know your opinion before I proceed.”	Appealing Strategy	Giving up Strategy
“I have something to say on this matter”	Holding the Turn Strategy	Interrupting Strategy
“... Furthermore, I have to explain it in detail”	Taking over Strategy	Holding the Turn Strategy
“however”, “on the contrary”, “as a result” help you to have longer turn	Taking over Strategy	Holding the Turn Strategy
“S1: It is terribly hot this afternoon”	Taking over Strategy	Starting up Strategy
“S2: Yeah, true”	Starting up Strategy	Taking over Strategy

As for the posttest, the minimum and maximum scores of the two groups’ performances largely differed in the posttest. Whereas the minimum and maximum scores of the control group ranged between 8-24, they ranged between 9–41 for the experimental group. In other words, the experimental group’s mean score in the posttest (39.96) highly exceeded that of the control group (17.12). That is, the experimental group’s performance in identifying the various types of turn-taking strategies was improved largely compared to that of the control group. The higher value of the experimental group’s standard deviation (7.24) compared to (3.21) for the control group suggests higher variance of the experimental group’s performance compared to that of the control group. The control group’s performance did not statistically differ significantly from its performance in the posttest as the p value was > 0.05 . On the contrary, experimental group’s performance in the posttest had statistical significant differences from its performance in the pretest as the p value was < 0.05 as shown in Table 2. In addition, Table 4 presents the results of the Independent Samples T-Test. It indicates that the performance of experimental group in the posttest statistically and significantly differed from that of the control as the p value was < 0.05 .

Table 4: Independent Samples T-Test

	N	M Gain score	SD	DF	t-value	Sig.
Control	40	1.81	0.18	39	21.90	0.000
Experimental	40	24.61	4.11	39		

The experimental group participants had improved their interactional competence as they became more familiar with the different types of turn-taking strategies. They became aware of the proper use of some confusing turn-taking strategies. In other words, they became familiar with the use of strategies like “appealing”, “prompting”, and “giving up the turn”. They also managed to differentiate between different types of prompting strategies such as “request”, “offer”, and “apology”. They understood the functions of “appealing strategy” through using question tags or a phrase like “you know”. They also managed to understand ways that helped them to hold the turn such as the use of conjunctions such as “however”, “on the contrary”, “as a result”, “furthermore”, etc. They also realized the sequence of “starting up the turn” and “taking over strategy”. Even though there was slight improvement in the posttest performance of the control group participants, they largely lagged behind their experimental group counterparts.

Discussion, TEFL implications and conclusion

1. Why the teaching of turn-taking strategies is important in the Egyptian FL context?

The teaching of turn-taking strategies is indispensable for the Egyptian EFL learners in order to properly manage FL conversation and be able to attain FL interactional competence. In this regard, Bayyurt and Akcan (2015) and Elkommos (2018) asserted that the ability to interact and communicate effectively among FL learners can be attained through the instruction of turn-taking strategies. The awareness of FL turn-taking strategies helps Egyptian EFL learners to vary their conversation strategies and successfully negotiate different conversational topics in a sound way. In other words, the Egyptian EFL learners will know how to use various types of prompting strategies through requesting, apologizing or offering. They will also be able to properly use appealing strategy through making question tags or using certain phrases like “you know”. The Egyptian EFL learners will also be able to apply holding the turn strategies like the use of conjunctions and linking words. Therefore, it is imperative for the Egyptian EFL instructors to teach the different types of

FL turn-taking strategies and train them how to differentiate between the functions of various categories of strategies like “prompting” which entails speech acts such as request, apology, and offer. As such, the Egyptian EFL learners will have adequate instruction of turn-taking strategies as generally recommended by Wong and Waring (2010), Kellas (2012), Ibraheem (2017) and Marlina (2018). This fact also highlights the interrelation between turn-taking strategies and pragmatics which the Egyptian EFL instructors are advised to teach to their students. It is also advisable that the Egyptian EFL instructors should select authentic materials when teaching turn-taking strategies to their students. This selection will ensure that their students will be exposed to English-native-speaking conversations in order to acquire knowledge about the performance of turn-taking strategies and their subcategories. Such exposure will lessen the impact of the Egyptian EFL learners’ L1 on their performance of FL conversation. This due to the fact that the Egyptian EFL learners will be exposed to the transition points of turns which include knowledge of grammar, semantics, and phonology as Young (2013) and (2015) suggested.

2. How do the control and experimental groups generally use FL turn-taking strategies in the pretest?

Indeed, the performance of both groups in the pretest was unsatisfactory indicating poor knowledge of the classification of different types of the FL turn-taking strategies. Both groups failed to identify the holding turn strategy as they did not have enough knowledge of the linguistic devices that enable the speakers to hold conversational turns. Both groups of participants could not properly classify the speech acts of request, apology and offer as subcategories of prompting strategy. They were not aware as well of the different ways of realizing the appealing strategy and giving up strategy. The poor performance of the control and experimental groups in the pretest emphasized the importance of teaching FL turn-taking strategies in the Egyptian context. This finding conforms those reported by Marlina (2014), Young (2018), and Williamson (2019).

3. What is the difference between the control and experimental groups’ performances in the posttest?

The control group participants made roughly the same mistakes of their earlier performance in the pretest. Although their performance witnessed a slight improvement compared to the pretest, it remained unsatisfactory and classified as a low achievement. On the other hand, the training activities provided to the experimental group participants were useful and effective in altering their performance at the posttest. They

became knowledgeable of the different types of turn-taking strategies and their subcategories. They managed to differentiate between the three subcategories of the prompting strategy, namely request, apology and offer. They were capable of identifying the different ways of expressing the interrupting and appealing strategies. They mastered the linguistic devices of holding the turn strategy like conjunctions and linking words. They became familiar with the sequential order of the starting up the turn and taking over strategies. The finding is compatible with those reported by Abdul Rahman (2017), Lestary et al. (2017), and Dewi et al. (2018).

4. Is there a statistically significant difference between the performances of both groups in the posttest?

The present study verified that the performance of experimental group was statistically significant when compared to that of their control group participants. The present study also emphasized the importance of teaching turn-taking strategies and their sub-categories to the Egyptian EFL learners. It is evident that the training provided to the experimental group participants was effective in improving their performance in the posttest.

Recommendations for further research

The current study recommends the following suggestions for further research:

1. A study can investigate the impact of Egyptian EFL learners' L1 on developing their turn-taking skills.
2. The current study can be replicable using different participants at other educational stages like preparatory or secondary schools.
3. A study can be carried out to determine the relationship between the Egyptian EFL learners' linguistic competence and their performance in FL turn-taking strategies.
4. A study can discuss the impact of Egyptian EFL learners' ability to tolerate cross cultural differences on developing their FL turn-taking strategies.
5. A TEFL perspective study can be conducted to examine gender differences in using turn-taking strategies among Egyptian EFL learners.
6. A study can be conducted to examine the influence of FL pragmatic aspects on the performance of Egyptian EFL learners of turn-taking strategies.

References

- Abdul Rahman, S. A., Rahmat, N. H. & Yunos, R. M. (2017). Analyzing turn taking strategies among adult learners in ESL class discussion. *International Journal of Social Sciences*, 1,1, pp. 1121-1131.
- Banerjee, S. (2020). A preliminary investigation of completion and interrupting behaviors during interaction involving adults who stutter. *Interdisciplinary Journal of Linguistics*, 13, pp. 80-100.
- Bayyurt, Y., & Akcan, S. (2015). *Current perspectives on pedagogy of English as a lingua franca*. Berlin, Germany: De Gruyter Mouton.
- Cohen, L., Manion, L., & Morrison, K. (2011). *Research methods in education* (7th ed.). London: Routledge.
- Creswell, W. J., & Creswell, J. D. (2018). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches*, (5th ed.,). USA: SAGE Publications.
- Johnson, B., & Christensen, L. (2014). *Educational research; Quantitative, qualitative, and mixed approaches* (7thed.). California: SEGE publications.
- Dayalbagh Educational Institute. (2013). *Spoken English section III: Conversations for all occasions*. Retrieved August, 14, 2018. <https://www.dei.ac.in/dei/books/files/pdf/spokenEnglish/SpokenEnglish-TOC>.
- Dewi, R. F., Suharsono, & Munir, A. (2018). Turn taking strategies and its relation to EFL learners' personality and power in the interaction of English conversation class. *English Teaching, Learning and Research Journal*, 4, 2, pp. 288-305.
- Elkommos, O. F. (2018). Teaching turn-taking rules and pragmatic principles to empower EFL students and enhance their learning in speaking modules. *World Academy of Science, Engineering and Technology International Journal of Cognitive and Language Sciences*, 12,8, pp. 1131-1137.
- Ghilzai, S. A., & Baloch, M. (2016). Conversational analysis of turn taking and gender differences in multimodal conversation. *Perspectives in Language, Linguistics and Media*, 1, pp. 1-13.
- Gravano, A., & Hirschberg, J. (2009). Turn-yielding cues in task-oriented dialogue. *Proceedings of SIGDIAL 2009: the 10th Annual Meeting of the Special Interest Group in Discourse and Dialogue, Queen Mary University of London, September 2009*, pp. 253–261.
- Habibi, F., (2020). Turn-taking in Mata Nagwa talk show *Ragu-Ragu Perpu* Episode. *Journal of Pragmatics Research*, 2, 1, pp. 80-97. <https://doi.org/10.1836/jopr.v2i1.80-97>.
- Ibraheem, S. J. (2017). Turn-taking strategies in English language teaching (ELT). *Educational Studies*, 1, October, pp. 291-308.
- Kellas, R. (2012). Balancing discussion and improving turn-taking. *New Directions in Teaching and Learning English Discussion*, 1, 1, 27-30.

- Lestary, A., Krismanti, N., & Hermaniar, Y. (2017). Interruptions and silences in conversations: A turn-taking analysis. *Journal of Linguistics and Education*, 7, 2, pp. 53-64. <http://ejournal.undip.ac.id/index.php/parole>
- Lynch, Y., & Anderson, k. (2012). Effective English Learning, Unit: 7: speaking. *English Language Teaching Centre, University of Edinburgh*. <https://docobook.com/effective-english-learning-unit-7-speaking.html>.
- Marlina, R. (2014). The pedagogy of English as an international language: More reflections and dialogues. In R. Marlina & R. Giri (eds.), *The pedagogy of English as an international language: Perspectives from scholars, teachers, and students* (pp. 1–19). Cham, Switzerland: Springer.
- Marlina, R. (2018). Teaching language skills. In John I. Liontas, (eds.), *The TESOL Encyclopedia of English Language Teaching, First Edition*, (pp. 1-15) John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
DOI: 10.1002/9781118784235.eelt0665
- McMillan, J., & Schumacher, S. (2010). *Research in education; Evidence-based inquiry* (7th ed.). Boston: Person.
- Nomlomo, V. (2011). Classroom interaction: Turn taking as a pedagogical strategy. *Per Linguam*, 26, 2, pp. 50-66. <http://dx.doi.org/10.5785/26-2-21>.
- Seiffedin, A. H. and El-Sakka, S. M. F. (2017). The impact of direct-indirect corrective e-feedback on EFL students' writing accuracy. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 7, 3, pp. 166-175.
- Toronto Catholic District School Board Report. (2009). *Building turn-taking and conversational skills*. Retrieved July, 20, 2018. <https://www.tcdsb.org/ProgramsServices/SpecialEducation/Speech/Documents/Building%20Turn%20Taking%20and%20Conversational%20Skills.pdf>
- Williamson, J. (2019). A pragmatics explanation for Japanese-English turn-taking contrasts and the need for pedagogical intervention: A response to Davey Young's TLT article. *The Language teacher*, 43, 1, pp. 14-18. DOI: [10.37546/JALTTLT43.1-3](https://doi.org/10.37546/JALTTLT43.1-3)
- Wong, J. & Waring, H.Z. (2010). *Conversation Analysis and Second Language Pedagogy: A guide for ESL/EFL teachers*. New York: Routledge.
- Young, D. (2013). Whose turn is it? Participation and passing the floor. *New Directions in Teaching and Learning English Discussion*, 1, 2, 50-54.
- Young, D. (2015). A conversation analysis of the acquisition and use of turn-taking practices in an English discussion class. *New Directions in Teaching and Learning English Discussion*, pp. 320-330. DOI: [10.14992/00015992](https://doi.org/10.14992/00015992)

Young, D. (2018). Contrastive models for turn-taking in English and Japanese. *The Language teacher*, 42, 3, pp. 9-12.
DOI:[10.37546/JALTTLT42.3-2](https://doi.org/10.37546/JALTTLT42.3-2)

<http://jalt-publications.org/tlt>

Electronic Resources:

How to teach turn taking <https://www.usingenglish.com/teachers/articles/how-to-teach-turn-taking.html>

Seven Turn-taking Strategies That Will Boost Student Speaking Time
<https://busyteacher.org/20571-7-turn-taking-strategies-boost-student-speaking.html>

Appendix A

Test of Turn-Taking Strategies Identification

Identify the types of the turn-taking strategies by writing the numbers which represent your answer in front of each dialogue. The turn-taking strategies are classified as follows:

starting up strategy= 1, taking over strategy= 2, interrupting strategy= 3, holding the turn strategy= 4, prompting strategy= 5, appealing strategy= 6 and giving up strategy= 7

Item	Starting 1	Taking 2	Interrupting 3	Holding 4	Prompting 5	Appealing 6	Giving up 7
"S1: <i>The first thing I do after I wake up is check my phone</i> "							
"S1: How about you?"							
"S2: <i>First, I have breakfast and turn on my computer, then I turn on my phone.</i> "							
"however", "on the contrary", "as a result" help you to have longer turn							
"(I'm afraid) I can't let you keep on talking without (saying) the truth"							
"The door was locked, wasn't it?"							
"Would you mind to close the window, please?"							
"Can I just say something about your attitude?"							
"I have to apologize for that mistake"							
"Good afternoon, Sir"							
"....And that was just the beginning of the story."							
"I'd like to know your opinion before I proceed."							
"S1: This is John Smith, a							

representative of the publisher”							
“S2” Hello, Mr. Smith, how do you do?”							
“There are different ways to summarize the story, you know”							
“Would you like to have a cup of tea?”							
“I have something to say on this matter”							
“... Furthermore, I have to explain it in detail”							
“You have more knowledge about this, so explain it please.”							
“S1: It is terribly hot this afternoon”							
“S2: Yeah, true”							