

## Student Silence and Spoken Response in EFL Classes: A Case Study at the Faculty of Education, Elmergib University, Al-Khums

Abdussalam Ali Faraj Mousa

Department of English, Faculty of Education, Elmergib University, Al-Khums, Libya

[aamousa@elmergib.edu.ly](mailto:aamousa@elmergib.edu.ly)

<p><b>Article information</b> Key words student silence; spoken response; Arabic support; classroom interaction; Libyan higher education</p> <p>Received 14/06/2026, Accepted 30/06/2026, Available online 30/06/2026</p>	<p><b>Abstract</b> This qualitative case study examines patterns of student silence and spoken response in second-year EFL classes at the Faculty of Education, Elmergib University, Al-Khums. Data were collected during March and April 2023 through classroom observation of ten lectures, semi-structured interviews with three lecturers, and a short supporting written student survey. Thematic analysis identified four main patterns: spoken responses were limited and unevenly distributed across sessions; lecturers used Arabic and translation regularly to maintain comprehension and lesson flow; lecturers responded to hesitation in different ways, and this appeared connected with whether students attempted spoken responses; and participation appeared connected with students' confidence, preparation habits, vocabulary anxiety, and assessment expectations. The findings suggest that limited spoken response in this setting cannot be explained by language level alone. It is connected with classroom habits, teacher questioning patterns, the role of Arabic support, and students' perception that speaking carried limited weight in formal assessment. The paper offers practical suggestions for lecturers working in similar EFL settings.</p>
---	---

### I. INTRODUCTION

In many EFL classrooms, student talk is limited and unevenly distributed. A lecturer asks a question, a small number of students respond, and the rest remain quiet. Some give very short answers and then wait. Others say nothing at all. It is easy to attribute this to weak language ability, and that explanation is not always wrong. It is, however, incomplete.

In the classes observed for this study, a more varied picture emerged. Some students appeared to follow parts of the lesson in English but gave no spoken response when addressed. Others waited consistently for Arabic explanation before attempting any answer. A few participated readily when they had prepared material in advance but stayed silent during unstructured questioning. The pattern of limited spoken response was consistent across

sessions and did not appear to depend on language level in any simple way. This pattern forms the central concern of the present study.

This study examines that pattern at the Faculty of Education, Elmergib University, Al-Khums, with second-year students in the Department of English. The setting reflects a classroom situation that may be familiar in similar EFL university contexts in Libya: students have typically studied English for several years before entering university, but many arrive with limited experience of using it in spoken situations. Lecturers work with mixed-ability groups, and Arabic is used regularly to support comprehension and maintain lesson flow.

The Department of English has particular reason to attend to this issue. Many of its students are preparing to become English language teachers. If they move through their degree with limited practice speaking in front of others, the habits formed during their own education may carry into the classrooms they will eventually teach. A department training future language teachers has reason to consider what space its classroom routines create for spoken participation.

Student silence does not carry a single meaning. A student may be quiet because they have not understood the English explanation, because they are anxious about making errors in front of classmates, because they have learned through habit to wait for Arabic, because they lack the vocabulary to express their meaning, or because they know that examination success does not require them to speak in class. These are different situations, and they call for different responses.

The aim of this study is to describe the patterns of silence and spoken response that appeared in these classes and to examine what classroom factors appeared to be connected with them. Three research questions guided the study:

1. What patterns of silence and spoken response appeared during classroom work in this setting?
2. How did lecturers use Arabic support and translation during lessons, and how did this appear to be connected with students' spoken responses?
3. What did students say about their own participation and reluctance to speak in English?

## **II. LITERATURE REVIEW**

### *A. Student Silence, Reticence, and Anxiety in EFL Classrooms*

Research on EFL classroom participation consistently shows that silence reflects a range of pressures and cannot be adequately explained by ability alone. Tsui (1996) argued that students may avoid speaking even when they possess relevant knowledge of the language. She identified anxiety, concern about others' reactions, low confidence in spoken performance, and the sense that making errors in public carries social risk as the main factors behind reticence. Her account separates reticence from inability: a student who knows something but does not say it is in a different position from one who has nothing to say, and the classroom response to each should differ accordingly.

Liu and Littlewood (1997) studied reticence in Asian university EFL contexts and found that students who appeared reluctant to participate were not generally opposed to communicative classroom activity. What held them back was mainly a lack of confidence in speaking without preparation and anxiety about producing incorrect language in front of others. This pattern has been reported in different contexts and suggests that silence often reflects anxious habit rather than absence of knowledge or motivation.

Horwitz, Horwitz, and Cope (1986) examined foreign language anxiety as a distinct dimension of classroom experience, arguing that many students experience anxiety in language classes that does not appear in their other courses. Language learning requires public performance in a code not yet under full control, under time pressure, in front of peers. They identified communication apprehension, fear of negative evaluation, and test anxiety as its main components. In EFL classrooms where oral participation is expected and visible, these pressures can reduce both the frequency and length of student speech.

King (2013) argued that silence in second language classrooms should be treated as a meaningful classroom event rather than simply an absence of language. Silence can express hesitation, anxiety, careful thinking, or social strategy. Bao (2014) similarly argued that students who are quiet may be processing or managing anxiety, and that treating all silence as failure to participate may increase anxiety and reduce future attempts.

#### *B. Spoken Participation and Classroom Interaction*

Allwright (1984) argued that classroom interaction is not simply a way of managing lessons but the primary medium through which language learning takes place. Language is negotiated through turns, questions, corrections, repairs, and attempts at meaning. A classroom where most talk belongs to the lecturer and where student turns are brief provides fewer learning opportunities than one where students are regularly supported to produce language.

Spoken participation takes many forms: answering questions, asking for clarification, giving examples, discussing with a partner, presenting to the group. These activities give students practice with the language and allow the lecturer to hear what students can and cannot do. A student may understand a grammar point in a text but be unable to use the same structure when speaking. Spoken participation makes this gap visible; written work alone may not.

#### *C. Teacher Talk, Questioning, Wait Time, and Correction*

Walsh (2002) showed that the way lecturers talk in EFL classrooms can either open or close space for learner involvement. The issue is not simply how much they speak, but what kinds of questions they ask and how they respond to student answers. Questions requiring single-word responses leave little room for students to produce language; questions that invite a short explanation allow more. Corrections that stop a student and draw the class's attention to an error may reduce subsequent attempts, while corrections that allow the student to continue and self-repair create different conditions.

Connected with this is the question of wait time. When lecturers provide Arabic explanation immediately after a student fails to answer, students learn that silence will produce the answer for them. When lecturers allow a pause and signal that a response is expected before offering support, some students who would otherwise have waited may attempt an answer.

#### *D. First Language Use, Arabic Support, and Code-Switching*

Macaro (2001) showed that teachers' decisions about when to use the first language are shaped by specific classroom needs and are not simply failures of target-language teaching. Turnbull and Arnett (2002) found that the quality and purpose of first language use matter as much as its frequency. First language explanation followed by a return to the target language is different from explanation that closes the topic entirely, and the sequencing of languages during a lesson affects what students expect and what they attempt.

Adriosh and Razi (2019) examined lecturer code-switching in Libyan EFL undergraduate classrooms and found that Arabic was used for vocabulary explanation, comprehension checks, managing student anxiety, and classroom management. They argued that code-switching in this context is a functional practice best understood in terms of what it achieves in specific classroom moments.

#### *E. Libyan EFL Classroom Context*

Eshkal (2019) studied teacher talk and learning opportunities in Libyan university EFL classrooms and found that lecturer talk dominated most of the observed sessions, with students contributing relatively little spoken activity. The analysis pointed to the kinds of questions lecturers asked and the time allowed for student response as factors in how much student language was produced. Adriosh and Osmana (2022) examined lecturer and student talking time in Libyan undergraduate EFL classrooms and noted that student talk was limited in both quantity and quality, with questioning patterns and lesson pace identified as contributing factors. These two Libyan studies are directly relevant to the present investigation: Eshkal (2019) focuses on how teacher talk shapes learning opportunities, a concern that runs through the classroom observation data collected here, while Adriosh and Osmana (2022) document the imbalance between lecturer and student talk in a setting similar to the one examined in this study. Together, they show that limited student spoken participation is a documented pattern in Libyan EFL higher education. What remains less examined is how specific classroom factors, including the timing of Arabic support, lecturer responses to hesitation, and students' own perceptions of participation, interact to produce this pattern in a single bounded setting. That gap is the concern of the present study.

### **III. METHODOLOGY**

#### *A. Research Design*

This study used a qualitative case study design. The case was the second-year EFL classroom setting at the Faculty of Education, Elmergib University, Al-Khums. Stake (1995) describes case study research as suitable for questions about how and why things happen in

bounded, specific situations, which fits the purpose of this study. The aim was to describe and interpret classroom practice in this setting, not to measure proficiency across a population or test a hypothesis.

### *B. Setting*

The study was conducted in the Department of English, Faculty of Education, Elmergib University, Al-Khums. The department offers undergraduate programmes in English language and linguistics, and many of its graduates go on to teach English in Libyan schools.

### *C. Participants*

Second-year students in the Department of English formed the student participant group. The observations included the students who were present during the ten observed lectures. Attendance varied from one session to another, so the number of students was not fixed across all observation sessions. Three of the six lecturers working with second-year students were also interviewed. All three were experienced and working regularly with this student group; they were selected on the basis of availability during the data collection period.

### *D. Data Collection*

Three data collection tools were used.

Classroom observation was the primary source of data. Observations were conducted during ten regular second-year EFL lectures in the Department of English. The observed lectures were part of the normal teaching schedule and included classes taught by different second-year lecturers. Observation notes focused on teacher questions, student responses, length of student turns, moments of silence, use of Arabic or translation, lecturer prompts, correction, and student response after support. Notes were taken during each session and developed further immediately afterwards. No structured protocol or checklist was used; the notes were open and descriptive in format, and no audio or video recording was made. The observer did not participate in lessons or intervene during sessions.

Semi-structured interviews provided a second data source. Three lecturers were interviewed individually. Questions covered their experiences of student silence, reasons for using Arabic during lessons, ways of encouraging spoken response, and views on assessment and participation. Guiding questions were used in each interview, and lecturers were encouraged to elaborate on their responses in their own terms. Responses were recorded in written notes during and after each interview.

A short student survey provided supporting data. The survey was distributed in written form to students present during the observed lectures and collected in the same sessions. Because attendance varied across the observed sessions, the survey was used as a supporting qualitative instrument rather than as a representative or statistical sample. It asked students whether they usually spoke in English during class, what made them hesitate or remain quiet, and whether they felt they had enough opportunity to speak. It was not a validated

quantitative instrument and was not subjected to statistical analysis. Responses are treated as indicative of student experience, not as statistical findings.

Table 1 summarises the data sources.

**Table 1: Data Sources and Purposes**

Data source	Details	Purpose
Classroom observation	10 lectures, March–April 2023	Primary: classroom patterns and participation
Lecturer interviews	3 lecturers, semi-structured	Secondary: lecturer perspectives and decisions
Student survey	Short written questionnaire	Supporting: student self-reported experience

*E. Data Analysis*

The data were analysed thematically, following Braun and Clarke (2006). Observation notes, interview responses, and survey answers were read repeatedly in full before any coding began. Initial codes were developed from repeated actions, patterns, and reported concerns in the data. Examples of initial codes included: silence after questions; very short answers; waiting for Arabic explanation before responding; lecturer translation; lecturer prompting after no response; correction followed by reduced participation; prepared participation; pronunciation anxiety; limited vocabulary during a spoken turn; and assessment expectations as a factor in motivation to speak. Similar codes were grouped into broader themes, which were then checked against all three data sources. The final themes were retained only when they were supported by clear patterns in the observation notes and, where possible, by interview responses or survey answers. Themes were linked back to the three research questions. The analysis is qualitative and interpretive; no statistical analysis was applied.

Table 2 shows how the research questions connect to the data sources.

**Table 2: Research Questions and Data Sources**

Research question	Primary data source	Supporting source
Patterns of silence and spoken response	Classroom observation	Student survey
Lecturer use of Arabic and its connection with student response	Classroom observation	Lecturer interviews
Student views on participation and reluctance to speak	Student survey	Lecturer interviews

*F. Researcher Positionality and Ethical Considerations*

The researcher is a member of the same department in which the study was conducted. This is a common position in small-scale educational research and gave practical access to regular teaching sessions and familiarity with the student group. It also means that lecturers were observed and interviewed by a colleague rather than an outside researcher. This insider position may have influenced what lecturers chose to share during interviews, a limitation that should be kept in mind when reading their reported perspectives. The observations and interviews are reported at the level of classroom patterns. Lecturers are not compared with one another, and no lecturer or student is identified at any point in the analysis.

Participants' names were not used at any stage, and individual students are not identifiable in the analysis. Lecturers participated on a voluntary basis and were aware that the interviews were conducted for research purposes.

The classroom setting and data collection period for this study overlap with an earlier study by the same author (Mousa, 2023), which examined a different research question.

#### **IV. RESULTS**

Thematic analysis produced four main themes. Table 3 at the end of this section summarises the themes, their evidence sources, and their connections to the research questions.

##### ***Theme 1: Limited Spoken Response and Repeated Silence***

The most consistent finding across the ten observed lectures was that student talk was limited. In most sessions, the lecturer carried the majority of the spoken work. Students listened, took notes, and responded when directly addressed, but rarely spoke without being invited and did not usually extend their answers beyond what the question required.

When lecturers asked questions, a small number of students responded consistently. In several sessions, the same students answered most of the questions while others remained silent throughout. Some students who appeared to follow the general meaning of the lesson still gave no spoken response when addressed. In a number of observed moments, a student who had given no answer in English responded in Arabic when the question was repeated in the first language, suggesting that comprehension and spoken response were not always connected.

When students did speak, their answers were typically brief: a single word, a repeated phrase from the lecturer's question, or a minimal confirmation. Extended student turns of more than one or two sentences in English were rare. Across several sessions, students gave a very short response and then looked at the lecturer, who completed or reformulated the answer.

Survey responses generally indicated that students spoke mainly when directly asked. Several responses described rarely speaking without a specific invitation to do so.

### ***Theme 2: Arabic Support and Translation During Classroom Work***

Arabic was used regularly in all observed sessions. Lecturers used it to explain vocabulary, check comprehension, manage moments when English explanation produced no student response, and keep the lesson moving when it had stalled. It was not continuous throughout any session, but it was frequent enough that students appeared to expect it as part of normal classroom routine.

A recognisable sequence appeared in many lessons: the lecturer introduced a topic or asked a question in English; if no response followed or students appeared confused, the lecturer explained in Arabic; after that explanation, some students responded, sometimes in Arabic and sometimes in brief English; the lesson then continued in English until the next difficult moment.

In interviews, all three lecturers described Arabic support as a practical necessity. Each said that without some Arabic explanation, a significant part of the class would follow very little of the lesson. None regarded it as ideal, but all three said it was difficult to avoid given the range of English levels in the groups they were teaching.

The observations suggested a secondary pattern connected with the timing of Arabic support. In sessions where lecturers provided Arabic quickly after any hesitation, students tended to wait rather than attempt an answer in English. In sessions where the lecturer paused and signalled clearly that a response was expected, some students who had been silent in other contexts made attempts. These attempts were often incomplete or mixed English and Arabic, but they occurred where they had not before. Survey responses generally indicated that students found Arabic explanation helpful for comprehension, and when asked whether they would attempt to answer in English if Arabic were not available, many expressed uncertainty or said it depended on the difficulty of the question.

### ***Theme 3: Lecturer Response to Student Hesitation***

Across the observed sessions, the handling of silence and hesitation after a question varied from one moment to another rather than following a single fixed pattern. In some moments, a pause followed the question, with the question then repeated or simplified before the lesson moved on. In other moments, a longer pause was sustained, with tone and manner signalling that a response was still expected; in these moments, some students made attempts they had not made in faster-paced exchanges. In other moments, the lesson moved quickly from an unanswered question to Arabic explanation or to a different student, and students who were slow to formulate a response found the answer provided before they had reached it.

Correction was also handled in more than one way across sessions. In some moments, incorrect or incomplete answers were acknowledged briefly and the correct form was invited from the student. In other moments, students were prompted to try again with a partial model. In a small number of sessions, a student's spoken contribution decreased for the rest of that session after a public correction that interrupted their turn.

Interview responses reflected awareness of this variation as a shared feature of teaching this group rather than as an isolated observation. Lecturers described that some students

**Student Silence and Spoken Response in EFL Classes: A Case Study at the Faculty of Education,  
Elmergib University, Al-Khums**

---

would only attempt an answer if addressed individually and without the whole group's attention being drawn to them, that different approaches were sometimes needed to draw out students who appeared to understand the material but would not speak, and that students could lose confidence during prepared presentations after a mistake and revert to silence for the remainder of the activity.

***Theme 4: Confidence, Preparation, Vocabulary Anxiety, and Assessment Habits***

Spoken participation appeared to be connected with preparation, confidence, anxiety about vocabulary and pronunciation, and the place of speaking in assessment.

Students who had prepared material in advance tended to give more frequent and longer responses during those sessions. When a lesson included a prepared reading, a short presentation task, or a structured question students had been given time to think about beforehand, the spoken activity during the session was noticeably greater than in sessions where questions were immediate and unplanned. This was one of the clearest patterns across the observations.

Students who participated regularly appeared more comfortable with incomplete or incorrect turns. They attempted answers, accepted corrections, and continued. Students who rarely participated showed more visible hesitation and appeared more reluctant to take a public risk with their English. Survey responses described avoiding speaking because of uncertainty about pronunciation and concern about being corrected in front of classmates.

Vocabulary difficulty also appeared in survey responses. Several students described stopping mid-response because they did not know the English word they needed, leading either to a switch to Arabic or to silence. When a student stopped because of a missing word rather than a missing idea, the spoken turn ended at that point.

Assessment expectations appeared to shape participation in a structural way. Several students reported that formal assessment consisted mainly of written examinations testing memorised content, and that this gave them limited incentive to invest in spoken classroom participation. Survey responses reflected this: several students indicated that they understood speaking was not part of how they were graded.

**Table 3: Themes, Evidence Sources, and Connections to Research Questions**

<b>Theme</b>	<b>Primary evidence</b>	<b>Supporting evidence</b>	<b>Research question</b>
Limited spoken response and silence	Classroom observation	Student survey	RQ1
Arabic support and translation	Classroom observation	Lecturer interviews	RQ2
Lecturer response to hesitation	Classroom observation	Lecturer interviews	RQ2
Confidence, preparation, vocabulary, assessment	Classroom observation	Lecturer interviews; Student survey	RQ3

## V. DISCUSSION

### A. *What Silence Means in This Setting*

The findings showed that student silence was not a single phenomenon. It appeared in different forms and seemed to be connected with different factors depending on the moment and the student. A student who stayed silent because they had not understood the English explanation was in a different position from one who had understood but lacked the confidence to attempt a response, or from one who had learned through habit that Arabic explanation would follow if they waited.

This distinction matters for practice. Lecturers who respond to all silence by providing Arabic explanation will maintain lesson flow but may not change the classroom habit that produces the silence. As Tsui (1996) argued, reticence is not the same as inability, and the response to each should differ. King (2013) makes a related point: silence in a language classroom is a meaningful event, not simply an absence. Bao (2014) cautions against treating all silence as failure to participate, noting that students who are quiet may be processing or managing anxiety.

### B. *Arabic Support: Useful but Potentially Habit-Forming*

As the results showed, Arabic was used regularly and was seen by all three lecturers as a practical necessity. The more significant question, from a pedagogical point of view, is not whether Arabic should be used, but what happens after it is used. Macaro (2001) argues that first language use has consequences beyond the immediate moment, and Turnbull and Arnett (2002) show that the sequencing of languages matters as much as its frequency. These arguments help explain the pattern observed here: when Arabic followed hesitation immediately and consistently, students had little reason to attempt English first, because the answer was coming regardless.

What the observations add to this picture is that the effect was not the same across all moments. When Arabic came early and closed the topic, students waited. When Arabic was followed by a return to English through a question or short task, some students attempted responses they had not made before. It suggests that the pedagogical value of Arabic support depends less on how much of it is used and more on what it leads to. Adriosh and Razi (2019) describe similar functional patterns in Libyan EFL classrooms, distinguishing between uses of Arabic that open the lesson to more participation and those that reduce it.

### C. *Teacher Questioning and Wait Time*

Sessions where lecturers paused after questions and maintained the expectation of a response before providing support appeared to create more opportunities for student attempts than sessions where Arabic followed quickly after any hesitation. This is consistent with Walsh's (2002) argument that practical changes in how lecturers use language can make a real difference to the amount of student participation.

Wait time did not produce willing speakers across the board. In some moments, a longer pause simply produced a longer silence. The effect was visible in particular students and

particular moments rather than uniformly. The observations suggested that some students who appeared unwilling to speak did attempt responses when classroom conditions shifted slightly in their favour.

Correction also appeared relevant. In a small number of sessions, a public correction that interrupted a student's turn was followed by reduced contribution from that student later in the session. The manner and timing of correction may matter alongside its accuracy.

#### *D. Preparation and Assessment*

The connection between preparation and participation is worth considering carefully. What it suggests is that the barrier for many students was not a lack of English knowledge but a lack of readiness to produce it under pressure. When students had time to work out what they wanted to say, they tended to speak more readily. This is consistent with anxiety-based accounts of reticence: the public risk of speaking decreases when the content is already settled. The implication is that silence in unplanned speaking moments may say less about a student's language ability than about their confidence in producing it without warning.

The role of assessment also appeared clearly. Several students reported that passing a course required no spoken contribution, which made speaking feel less urgent than other demands. A point related to Horwitz, Horwitz, and Cope's (1986) discussion of test anxiety is that when students perceive speaking as carrying no assessment weight, their motivation to invest in it is reduced. A small, low-stakes oral element in existing assessment tasks could signal more clearly what the department values, without requiring wholesale change to assessment practice.

## **VI. CONCLUSION**

This study examined patterns of student silence and spoken response at the Faculty of Education, Elmergib University, Al-Khums. The classroom observations, lecturer interviews, and student survey showed that spoken participation was limited and unevenly distributed. Most student talk consisted of brief responses to direct questions. Many students were silent for much of each session. Arabic support helped maintain comprehension but also appeared to reduce some students' attempts to speak in English when the answer was uncertain.

Four connected factors shaped this pattern: a consistent classroom habit of limited spoken response; the role and timing of Arabic support; differences in how lecturers responded to silence and hesitation; and the influence of confidence, preparation, vocabulary anxiety, and assessment on students' willingness to speak.

These patterns reflect a difficult teaching situation in which lecturers are working under real constraints and students are responding in ways that are reasonable given the conditions they work in. Some practical adjustments to classroom routine, including structured speaking moments, more consistent wait time, careful sequencing of Arabic use, and some acknowledgement of oral participation in assessment, may gradually shift what students

expect of themselves in class. For a department whose students are preparing to become English teachers, these findings also have implications for their professional formation.

## **VII. RECOMMENDATIONS**

The following recommendations are drawn directly from the findings and are intended to be practical within the constraints of this teaching context.

1. Include some form of oral participation in assessment. This is a priority because assessment shapes student priorities. Even a small, low-stakes oral element in existing assessment tasks sends a clear signal that speaking is part of what the department expects and values.
2. Allow more time after questions before providing support. A short pause, with a clear signal that a response is expected, may give students who need longer to formulate their answer the chance to do so. Moving immediately to Arabic or to another student removes that chance before it is taken.
3. Give students preparation tasks and use pair rehearsal before whole-class speaking. Short tasks that require a prepared oral response or brief summary give students something specific to say. Asking students to discuss the answer with a partner first reduces the public pressure of performing in front of the whole group. Both strategies address the same problem from different angles and work well together.
4. Structure Arabic use. Arabic serves real purposes in these classrooms. Arabic explanation followed by a return to English, through a question or short task, appears to create more speaking opportunity than Arabic explanation that closes the topic. A practical routine might be: explain in Arabic, then ask students to produce the English word, phrase, or answer.
5. Correct with care. Correction that allows the student to continue and self-repair keeps the student in the conversation. The manner and timing of correction matter alongside its accuracy.
6. Build short, regular speaking moments into ordinary lessons. Brief oral tasks such as a one-sentence summary or a vocabulary check give students repeated, low-pressure opportunities to produce English during class. Frequent short moments may be more realistic in this context than occasional longer speaking tasks.
7. Coordinate speaking routines across the department. Shared expectations around wait time, Arabic use, and prepared speaking tasks may help students develop more consistent spoken participation habits across their courses.

## **VIII. LIMITATIONS**

This study was conducted at one faculty in one university during a two-month data collection period in March and April 2023. The findings describe patterns specific to this setting and should not be taken as findings about Libyan EFL classrooms in general.

The observations were limited to ten lectures. A longer observation period would provide a more complete picture of how participation patterns develop and change over time.

Three lecturers were interviewed. The views of the remaining three second-year lecturers were not collected, and a broader interview sample might reveal different perspectives.

The researcher's position as a colleague within the department is a limitation of insider research generally and should be kept in mind when interpreting the findings.

Student attendance varied across the observed sessions, so the number of students involved was not fixed. Survey responses should be treated as indicative of experience rather than as findings from a representative sample.

The student survey was a short supporting instrument, not a validated questionnaire, and was not subjected to reliability analysis. It provided context for the observations and interviews but should not be treated as statistically meaningful.

The study did not include any formal measure of students' oral proficiency. It is not possible to determine from the data alone whether the patterns described were primarily related to language level, classroom habit, anxiety, assessment structure, or some combination of these factors.

## IX. REFERENCES

- Adriosh, M., & Osmana, N. (2022). Quantity and quality of teacher talking time (TTT) versus student talking time (STT) in EFL undergraduate classrooms: A case study in Libyan context. *Journal of Human Sciences*, 38, 239–253.
- Adriosh, M., & Razi, Ö. (2019). Teacher's code switching in EFL undergraduate classrooms in Libya: Functions and perceptions. *SAGE Open*, 9(2), 1–13. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2158244019846214>
- Allwright, R. L. (1984). The importance of interaction in classroom language learning. *Applied Linguistics*, 5(2), 156–171. <https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/5.2.156>
- Bao, D. (2014). *Understanding silence and reticence: Ways of participating in second language acquisition*. Bloomsbury Academic.
- Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 3(2), 77–101. <https://doi.org/10.1191/1478088706qp063oa>
- Eshkal, R. (2019). *The role of teacher talk in creating learning opportunity in EFL classroom in the Libyan university context* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Southampton). <https://eprints.soton.ac.uk/433129/>

- Horwitz, E. K., Horwitz, M. B., & Cope, J. (1986). Foreign language classroom anxiety. *The Modern Language Journal*, 70(2), 125–132. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781.1986.tb05256.x>
- King, J. (2013). *Silence in the second language classroom*. Palgrave Macmillan. <https://doi.org/10.1057/9781137301482>
- Liu, N. F., & Littlewood, W. (1997). Why do many students appear reluctant to participate in classroom learning discourse? *System*, 25(3), 371–384. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0346-251X\(97\)00029-X](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0346-251X(97)00029-X)
- Macaro, E. (2001). Analysing student teachers' codeswitching in foreign language classrooms: Theories and decision making. *The Modern Language Journal*, 85(4), 531–548. <https://doi.org/10.1111/0026-7902.00124>
- Mousa, A. A. F. (2023). The impact of grammar translation on communicative skills of second-year students in English language learning: A case study at the Faculty of Education, Al-Khums, Elmergib University. *Medad Al-Manara Journal*, 1, 275–300.
- Stake, R. E. (1995). *The art of case study research*. Sage.
- Tsui, A. B. M. (1996). Reticence and anxiety in second language learning. In K. M. Bailey & D. Nunan (Eds.), *Voices from the language classroom* (pp. 145–167). Cambridge University Press.
- Turnbull, M., & Arnett, K. (2002). Teachers' uses of the target and first languages in second and foreign language classrooms. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 22, 204–218. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190502000120>
- Walsh, S. (2002). Construction or obstruction: Teacher talk and learner involvement in the EFL classroom. *Language Teaching Research*, 6(1), 3–23. <https://doi.org/10.1191/1362168802lr095oa>

صمت الطلاب والاستجابة الشفهية في فصول اللغة الإنجليزية كلغة أجنبية: دراسة حالة  
بكلية التربية، جامعة المرقب، الخمس

عبدالسلام علي فرج موسى

قسم اللغة الإنجليزية، كلية التربية، جامعة المرقب، الخمس، ليبيا

الملخص	
الكلمات المفتاحية: الصمت الطلابي؛ الاستجابة الشفهية؛ دعم اللغة العربية؛ التفاعل الصفي؛ التعليم العالي في ليبيا	تتناول هذه الدراسة النوعية، المصممة وفق منهج دراسة الحالة، أنماط الصمت والاستجابة الشفهية لدى طالب السنة الثانية في فصول اللغة الإنجليزية كلغة أجنبية بكلية التربية، جامعة المرقب، الخمس. جُمعت البيانات خلال شهري مارس وأبريل 2023 عبر ثلاث أدوات: ملاحظة صفية لعشر محاضرات، ومقابلات شبه منظمة مع ثلاثة من أعضاء هيئة التدريس، واستبانة قصيرة وُزعت على الطالب. كشف التحليل الموضوعي عن أربعة أنماط رئيسية: أن الاستجابات الشفهية كانت محدودة وغير موزعة بالتساوي بين الطالب؛ وأن أعضاء هيئة التدريس اعتمدوا على اللغة العربية والترجمة بصفة منتظمة للحفاظ على الفهم وسير الدرس؛ وأن أساليبهم في التعامل مع تردد الطالب تباينت من موقف إلى آخر، وارتبط ذلك بمحاولات الطالب للإجابة باللغة الإنجليزية؛ وأن المشاركة الشفهية ارتبطت بثقة الطالب بأنفسهم ومستوى استعدادهم المسبق والقلق المتعلق بالمفردات وطبيعة متطلبات التقييم. تشير نتائج الدراسة إلى أن محدودية الاستجابة الشفهية في هذا السياق لا يمكن تفسيرها بضعف الكفاءة اللغوية وحدها، بل ترتبط بالعادات الصفية السائدة وأنماط توجيه الأسئلة ودور دعم اللغة العربية وشعور الطالب بأن التحدث ليس له وزن يُذكر في التقييم الرسمي. تطرح الدراسة في ختامها جملة من التوصيات العملية الموجهة للعاملين في سياقات مشابهة.