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Abstract:
This study aimed to explore the factors influencing EFL learners’ unwillingness to communicate in English oral communication. Data were collected through a questionnaire that assessed three key dimensions: teacher-related factors, affective factors, and environmental factors. The findings revealed that among the three dimensions, teacher-related factors had the most significant impact on learners’ unwillingness to communicate. The results regarding affective factors showed that lack of family support and motivation, fear of peer criticism, and poor listening skills were considerable predictors of learners’ reluctance to engage in oral communication. Additionally, unfamiliar topics and vocabulary deficiencies further negatively influenced their willingness to speak. Furthermore, findings about environmental factors, large class size, lack of learner autonomy, insufficient use of ICT tools, and noisy classrooms, were found to inhibit EFL learners’ willingness to communicate in English. The study highlights the critical role of teachers in creating a supportive, student-centered environment and fostering positive teacher-student rapport to enhance learners’ willingness to speak in English class.
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Introduction
English language learning has become increasingly important in today's globalized world, where proficiency in English opens up opportunities for international communication, education, and career advancement. Within the realm of English language education, the ability to effectively communicate in English is a crucial skill that students strive to develop (Savill-Troik, 2003). However, despite the emphasis placed on communication skills in English as a foreign language (EFL) classrooms, majority students exhibit a reluctance or unwillingness to oral communication. Earlier studies found that a lack of willingness to communicate (WTC) in the English language leads to ineffective interaction and language production (Freiermuth & Jarrel, 2006).

The notion of unwillingness to communicate (UTWC) proposed by Burgoon (1976) explains a “chronic tendency to avoid or devalue oral communication”. It refers to the learner’s choice to deny or avoid interaction with others (MacIntyre et al., 1998). Studies asserted that
learners who are unwilling to speak in the target language may fail to attain their desired language outcomes (Joe et al., 2017; Lee et al., 2022), further affects the frequency of second language (L2) student’s oral communication in the classroom (Elvstrand, 2015; Ghani & Azhar, 2017), higher L2WTC increases the opportunities of participation and authentic language usage (MacIntyre et al., 2003; Kang, 2005, Tarone, 2007, Zarrinabadi, 2014).

The literature suggests that several factors have been identified as predictors of WTC during L2 learning (MacIntyre et al., 1998), including self-perceived communicative competence (McCroske & Richard, 1987; Barraclough, Christophel & McCroskey’s, 1988; Hashimoto, 2002; Ghonsooly et al., 2012), perceived communication apprehension (Dörnyei, 2005; MacIntyre & Charos, 1996; MacIntyre & Charos, 1996, p.6), motivation (Dörnyei, 2005, p.65; Schuman, 1986; Dörnyei & Csizér’s, 2002), ideal L2 self (Kim, 2009; Noels, 2009; Teimouri, 2017), Foreign language enjoyment (FLE) (Khajavy et al., 2018; Dewaele, 2019).

The main objective of this study is to examine the factors contributing to Afghan English as a foreign language (EFL) university learners’ unwillingness to communicate in the classroom setting at Laghman University. By identifying and analyzing these factors, the study aimed to gain a deeper understanding of the challenges faced by Afghan EFL learners in their L2 communication and contribute to the existing body of knowledge in the field of EFL education.

Review of Related Literature

Studies regarding EFL/ESL WTC started with the seminal study conducted by MacIntyre et al. (1998) where they defined L2WTC as “a readiness to enter into discourse at a specific time with a specific person or persons, using an L2” (p. 547). It is a multi-faceted construct that integrates affective, social-psychological, linguistic, and communicative factors and can predict the learners’ behavior in L2. There are several factors that directly and indirectly predict students’ WTC in L2 including communication anxiety (Hodis, 2009), motivation (Yu, 2009), personality (Cao, 2009), learners’ autonomy (Kang, 2005), perceived self-efficacy (Haghi, 2009), social support (MacIntyre & Bake, 2001), teaching style (Aksak & Cubukeu, 2020), content and the context (Clement, 1986; MacIntyres, 2000; Yashima & Nishide, 2008), frequency and quality of L2 contact (Clement et al., 2003).

MacIntyre et al. (1998) added the concept of WTC in language education and further elaborated the complex process of decision-making regarding individual participation in communication. They further proposed a six-layer pyramid describing the linguistic and psychological contribution in developing students’ L2WTC (See Figure 1). According to MacIntyre et al. (1998, p. 547), the major goal of studying second/foreign languages should be to “engender in language students the willingness to seek out communication opportunities and the willingness actually to communicate in them”.

In this model, they have classified various emotional personal, and contextual sources of second language learners into two six layers. Further, they grouped these six layers into three lower and three top layers. The three lower layers represent “distal, enduring, and widely applicable influences on L2 communication”. The top three layers highlight the “immediate, transient, situation-specific effect on L2WTC at a given moment” (MacIntyre and Wang, 2021, p. 4). Concerning all six layers, the learners’ intention to communicate in L2 as mentioned in the model is subject to various factors including communication behavior, behavioral intention, situational factors, motivation, and affective and social context. Similarly, motivation provides a reason to participate and remain active during second language learning (Rotgans and Schmidt, 2012) and stands as a strong predictor to students L2WTC (Hashimoto, 2002; Peng, 2007; Peng, 2012; Falah, 2014; Karimi & Abaszadeh, 2017; Ma et al., 2019; Al-Hoorie et al., 2022).

Earlier literature further suggests that self-confidence significantly influences learners’ L2WTC (Aoyama & Takahashi, 2020; Zhu,
2022) classroom atmosphere and context profoundly augment learners’ L2WTC (Cao & Philp, 2006; Cao, 2011; Lee., et al 2019), students communication behavior is also affected by certain personality traits such as shyness, self-esteem and lack of self-confidence (McCrockey & Richmond 1982), shy and low self-confident students are unwilling to communicate while learners with high self-esteem are more likely to engage in L2 classroom communication (Sener, 2005).

Figure 1. Heuristic Model of WTC in L2
Source: MacIntyre et al., 1998

Research Question
In this study, the following research question is investigated.

1. What factors affect Afghan EFL learners’ L2UWTC in EFL-speaking classrooms at Laghman Public University of Afghanistan?

Methodology
Setting and Participation
This study was conducted in Laghman Public University located in the Eastern Part of Afghanistan. The participants of the study were students from the 1st and 2nd grades of the English Language Department. A sample consisting of 70 students is selected through a stratified random sampling technique.

Reliability and Validity of the Tool
The present questionnaire is evaluated in terms of reliability and validity. The results of reliability showed that the instrument is reliable to use in the study with a coefficient alpha value (7.86) which is high. Furthermore, the content validity is examined by a panel of experts in this field who recommended the scale as it is.

Data Collection Tool and Procedure
A questionnaire developed by Yaseen (2018) includes three dimensions namely; Affective factors that influence students speaking skills. The second dimension is about the teacher’s role in teaching speaking skills and the third one is related to the instructional environment that affects students speaking skills. The respective questionnaire allows the researcher to conduct a holistic investigation of the mentioned factors.
concerning EFL learners’ speaking skills. In addition, at first, a consent form was given to the participants of the study with information regarding the goal and their role in this research. Participants of the study were assured that the collected data was used for research purposes only and their identity was completely secured. After voluntarily signing the consent form, the researcher started distributing the questionnaire and collected the data respectively.

Data Analysis

The collected data is arranged, tabulated, and subjected to Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS, V30) software for Analysis. Descriptive statistics mainly (Means, and standard deviations) of each item are calculated to assess the EFL learners’ perception of the factors leading to their reluctance to communicate in English. The mean scores were divided into three categories as shown in table 2 below to demonstrate how closely the questionnaire items relate to the variables influencing students’ unwillingness to interact (Wimolmas, 2013).

Table 1/ Degree of Unwillingness to Communicate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mean Range</th>
<th>Interpretation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.00—2.33</td>
<td>Low Degree of Unwillingness to Communicate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.34—3.67</td>
<td>Moderate Degree of Unwillingness to Communicate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.68—5.00</td>
<td>High Degree of Unwillingness to Communicate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Findings

Looking at table 2, the teacher-related factors have the highest mean score and ranked 1st, with a moderate mean of 3.65 and a standard deviation of 1.04. Similarly, the affective factors have the second-highest mean score of 3.44 and a standard deviation of 1.13 ranked 2nd. The environmental factors have the lowest mean score of 3.13 with a standard deviation of 1.17 and ranked 3rd in this case.

Table 2. Means and Standard Deviation of Degrees of Unwillingness to Communicate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S/No</th>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Mean Score</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Ranking</th>
<th>Interpretation/Degree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Teacher Related Factors</td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Moderate Degree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Affective Factors</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Moderate Degree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Environmental Factors</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Moderate Degree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3. Means and Standard Deviation of Affective Factors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Affective Factors</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Degree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I enjoy discussing events and situations with my teacher and classmates in the English speaking lesson.</td>
<td>4.14</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>High Degree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I like watching TV shows and programs in English.</td>
<td>4.12</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>High Degree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel motivated and confident while speaking English in class.</td>
<td>4.01</td>
<td>.875</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>High Degree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My family encourages and supports me to speak English.</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>High Degree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel that my listening skills are good.</td>
<td>3.76</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>High Degree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I struggle to find the right vocabulary; I want to speak English but I don’t know the words needed for a certain topic.</td>
<td>3.49</td>
<td>.990</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I read about the topic, prepare for the speaking practice in advance, and prepare ideas for it.</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td>.989</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I fear criticism from others while speaking.</td>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Results regarding items from affective factors indicate for example “I enjoy discussing events and situations with my teacher and classmates in the English speaking lesson." is ranked first with a high mean of 4.14 and standard deviation of 1.04 whereas the item “I don’t feel self-confident and I feel pressured by the teacher and other students” is in the last rank with a low mean of 2.82 and a standard deviation of 1.21. The top-ranked items suggest that learners have a strong preference for engaging in discussions with their teachers and classmates, as well as a tendency to watch and listen to English-language learning materials. They also report feeling motivated and confident when speaking English in class and receiving encouraging support from their families. These findings point to a generally positive affective disposition towards communicating in the target language, which is a key facilitator of willingness to communicate.

### Table 4. Mean and Standard Deviation of Teacher-Related Factors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher Related Factors</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Degree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The teacher encourages me to speak English in class.&quot;</td>
<td>4.14</td>
<td>.936</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>High Degree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The teacher lets us do role-playing, group work, and presentations in English.&quot;</td>
<td>4.14</td>
<td>.908</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>High Degree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The teacher gives us enough time to prepare for the speaking activity.</td>
<td>3.76</td>
<td>.942</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>High Degree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no pressure from the teacher when I am doing the speaking activity.</td>
<td>3.74</td>
<td>.932</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>High Degree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The teacher waits until I finish what I am saying then corrects it for me.</td>
<td>3.73</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>High Degree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The teacher introduces the idea of the lesson and gives us enough vocabulary to use for our speaking activity.&quot;</td>
<td>3.59</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The teacher speaks a mix of English and the mother tongue in class.&quot;</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The teacher corrects my speaking mistakes all the time while I am speaking.&quot;</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The teacher speaks only English in class.</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The teacher allows me to use the mother tongue if I don’t know the words in English.</td>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The findings of table 4 show the highest mean score for item “The teacher encourages me to speak English in class.” is 4.14 with a standard deviation of .908 followed by “The teacher lets us do role-playing, group work, and presentations in English." with a mean score of 4.13 and a standard deviation of .908 fall in the first rank whereas items “The teacher gives us enough time to prepare for the speaking activity” with a highest mean score of 3.76 and a standard deviation of .942, “There is no pressure from the teacher when I am doing the speaking activity”, with a highest mean score 3.74 and a standard deviation of .932 and the mean score for item “The teacher waits until I finish what I am saying then corrects it for me” came out to be 3.73 with
a standard deviation of 1.02 are ranked third, fourth and fifth respectively. On the other hand, item “The teacher introduces the idea of the lesson and gives us enough vocabulary to use for our speaking activity” moderate mean value was found to be 3.59 with a standard deviation of 1.09 is ranked sixth by the rest of the items in this dimension.

Lastly, the analysis of environmental factors in terms of mean and standard deviation revealed that the item “The class has a friendly atmosphere which enhances the learning procedure.” is ranked first with a moderate mean score of 3.59 and a standard deviation of 1.05 followed by an item “In my class, there are more than 30 students.” with a moderate mean score of 3.50 and a standard deviation of 1.51 which is ranked second. Similarly, the last item of the environmental dimension “The class is too noisy” has the lowest mean score of 2.41 with a standard deviation of 1.06 and falls into the last rank in this study.

### Discussion

This study aimed to explore the factors contributing to unwillingness to communicate in the English language inside the classroom. A questionnaire developed by Yaseen (2018) was distributed to EFL university learners to discover the perception of the reasons for reluctance to speak English. The questionnaire has three dimensions namely affective factors (13 items), teacher-related factors (10 items), and environmental factors (7 items) respectively. The finding revealed that out of all three dimensions, teacher-related factors showed a significant strong effect on learners’ unwillingness to communicate in English (see Table 3). The finding is in line with an earlier study conducted by (Gol et al., 2014; Sheybani, 2019) in which teacher-related factors were found to be significant predictors of EFL learners’ UWTC.

The items in the teacher-related factors are analyzed in detail. The results revealed that students strongly attribute their reluctance to communicate in the absence of teacher support, lack of time, teacher pressure, and teacher attitude. To carefully analyze the items “The teacher encourages me to speak English in class” with mean score 4.14, “The teacher lets us do role-playing, group work, and presentations in English” mean score 4.14, “The teacher gives us enough time to prepare for the speaking activity” mean score 3.76, “There is no pressure from the teacher when I am doing the speaking activity” mean score 3.74 and “The teacher waits until I finish what I am saying then corrects it for me” with mean score of 3.73 respectively. All the items fall in the high-degree category indicating an alarming condition, which asserts that lack of encouragement, pressure from the teacher, and lack of opportunity/time to speak considerably demotivate EFL learners WTC. The findings are in line with the results of the study carried out (Joe et al., 2017; Riasati & Rahimi, 2018). Previous studies also found that EFL instructors may boost learners’ L2WTC by encouraging
continuous efforts to initiate English communication (Lee, 2020; Alrabai, 2022).

Furthermore, looking at the mean scores of items 6-10 in the respective table, it is also asserted that introducing new ideas and vocabulary from the teacher with a mean score of 3.59, mixed use of target and native languages with a mean score of 3.45, teacher correction while speaking with a mean score of 3.58, and using the mother tongue with a mean score of 3.19 fall in the category of moderate degree indicating that EFL learners may not feel comfortable when the teacher provides new topics with a bundle of vocabulary, mix use of both target and mother tongue and error correction during speaking in the classroom. It is further noted that EFL learner's reluctance to communicate is the time the teacher gives and the opportunity the teacher provides to speak in the classroom.

The results of the affective factors analysis in table 4 showed that lack of enjoyment in class discussions, limited exposure to English outside the classroom, low levels of motivation and confidence, lack of family support, shyness, fear of making mistakes, and perceived weaknesses in listening skills are the factors that negatively influence EFL learners’ willingness to communicate in English. Looking at the mean score of 4.14, the majority of EFL learners perceive that lack of enjoyment while discussing events and situations with teachers and classmates is one of the reasons why they are reluctant to speak in English. This is in line with the findings of (Fathi et al., 2023), who found foreign language enjoyment positively influences L2WTC. Previous literature suggests that higher L2WTC significantly develops L2 proficiency (Pawlak et al., 2016), and uses language more frequently (Pawlak & Wiertelak, 2015). Likewise, the mean score of 4.12 for watching TV shows and programs in English reveals that most EFL learners lack watching TV shows and programs in English, making them demotivated and less comfortable in classroom discussions. Watching TV shows and relevant English language programs motivates students to select an idle in speaking.

When learners lack opportunities to engage with the target language outside the classroom, they may feel less equipped to participate actively in discussions and express themselves fluently, leading to feelings of anxiety, low self-efficacy, and reluctance to communicate in English. This finding relates to the concept of the Ideal L2 Self and ought to L2 Self which are the key components of the L2 Motivational Self System (Dörnyei, 2009). Previous studies revealed that the Ideal L2 self and Ought to L2 self are significant positive predictors of WTC in English (Munezane, 2013; Lu, 2021; Sadoughi & Hejazi, 2023).

Besides, students further perceive their reluctance to lack of motivation and self-confidence. The mean score of 4.01 demonstrates less motivation and self-confidence among EFL learners hindering their willingness to communicate in the classroom.

The data shows a mean score of 3.88 for the factor of "family encouragement and support for English," suggesting that learners perceive low levels of family support. Lack of family support can weaken learners' confidence and their willingness to communicate orally in English, as they may not feel that their efforts are valued at home. This, in turn, can lead to a reluctance to participate actively in English-speaking activities and discussions in the classroom. Aydin (2017) reported that EFL learners may lose their motivation to speak English due to no or little support from their families.

Another significant factor is the learners' perceived listening skills. The mean score of 3.76 for "perceived good listening skills" indicate that some learners may not feel confident in their ability to comprehend spoken English. Poor listening skills can negatively impact a learner's willingness to communicate as they may fear not understanding their classmates or the teacher, or not being able to respond appropriately. Yaseen (2018) also found an association between listening skills and willingness to communicate.

Comparatively, the mean score of 3.49 for lack of vocabulary and 3.46 for unfamiliar topics asserts that students may not be very keen to speak. Additionally, the fear of being negatively
evaluated or criticized by their peers and shyness can also hinder EFL learners’ willingness to engage in oral communication. This fear of criticism can stem from cultural norms, previous negative experiences, or a lack of a supportive classroom environment. The finding is in line with an earlier study carried out by (Heidari, 2024).

In terms of environmental factors, the class size, classroom environment, lack of suitable academic rapport among students, noise, and lack of learning-related materials, and activities all contribute to students’ unwillingness to communicate in English. For instance, the mean score of 3.59 for class atmosphere showed that most EFL learners perceive that the class does not have a friendly environment and that they do not support each other when they speak. The classroom environment plays a crucial role in shaping EFL learners’ willingness to communicate in the target language. Previous research found that a friendly and supportive classroom environment positively augments EFL learners’ willingness to speak English inside the classroom (Khajavy et al., 2016; Aomr et al., 2020). Relatively, the mean score of 3.50 for class size showed that in instances where the class size is perceived as large, with more than 30 students, the learning environment may become less conducive for individual attention and practice, potentially discouraging learners from actively engaging in oral communication (Khazaei et al. 2012).

Similarly, the mean score of 3.46 for the level of autonomy and agency granted to students within the classroom revealed that the majority of EFL learners perceive a lack of autonomy in terms of choosing learning activities and relevant games in the English class. When learners are allowed to choose learning activities and games that are motivating and engaging, they may be more enthusiastic in the learning process, including the oral practice components. Conversely, if the instructional materials and activities are perceived as static or uninteresting, students may be less inclined to show willingness to speak in English. Also, the use of technology, such as interactive whiteboards for watching videos and playing games associated to the lesson content can provide a more dynamic and exciting learning environment. In their review of related literature, Nabilou et al. (2018) concluded that learner’s autonomy positively influences EFL WTC. The mean score of 3.28 asserts that EFL learners perceive interactive boards as a critical factor in their willingness to communicate where they also showed support for the role of pre-speaking activities before listening to audio resources also influence learners’ confidence and readiness to engage in oral communication. When these preparatory tasks are effectively integrated into the lesson, they may help students feel more equipped to express themselves in the target language. Conversely, the lack of such preliminary materials can decrease students' motivation to speak English. Additionally, the level of peer support and collaborative learning opportunities within the classroom can impact learners’ willingness to communicate. If students do not perceive their classmates as supportive during English-speaking activities, they may be less inclined to take part or engage him/herself in oral practice.

Also, the level of noise in the classroom can also play a significant role in hindering learners' ability to focus and participate actively in target language communication. Excessive noise and disruptions can make it challenging for students to hear and comprehend the discussion, ultimately discouraging them and further negatively affecting EFL learners’ willingness to communicate. Aydin (2017) also reported similar results regarding the negative effect of too much noise on EFL learners WTC.

Conclusion

This study sought to explore the factors affecting EFL learners’ unwillingness to communicate in English. Data were collected through a questionnaire that included three dimensions related to teacher, affective, and environmental factors. After data analysis, it was found that out of all three dimensions, the teacher-related dimension exerted a significant impact on EFL learners’ unwillingness to communicate. Students reported their reluctance to speak in English are lack of foreign language
enjoyment during discussions with teachers and classmates, no access to English TV shows and English programs, lack of motivation and support from family, low self-confidence, lack of vocabulary, and fear of teacher and peer pressure.

In these findings, teacher-driven variables highlight the English instructor's central role and impact in either facilitating or inhibiting learners' willingness to speak in English and active participation in the learning process. When teachers fail to create a supportive, student-centered environment, and positive teacher-student rapport, students are more likely to experience anxiety, lack of motivation, low self-confidence, and excessive feelings of pressure from teachers and classmates resulting in unwillingness to speak in English.

In terms of affective factors, the findings asserted the significant impact of affective factors on EFL learners' unwillingness to communicate in the target language. Specifically, the data analysis reveals that lack of family support and motivation, fear of criticism from peers, and poor listening skills emerge as considerable predictors of learners' reluctance to engage in oral communication. Besides, topics outside student knowledge and lack of vocabulary further negatively influence their willingness to speak. The results of environmental-related factors further revealed that class atmosphere, size of the class, lack of learners' autonomy, lack of ICT tools, and noisy class strongly inhibit EFL learners' willingness to communicate in English class.

**Recommendations**

**Teacher-Related Factors**

Concerning the teacher-related variables, the findings clearly show the pivotal function of the English teacher in either promoting or impeding students' inclination to communicate orally. EFL teachers should constantly prioritize encouraging their students by applauding their accomplishments and providing positive feedback to create a more favorable learning atmosphere. Additionally, they ought to provide opportunities for student-centered activities like role-playing and group discussions, which allow students to practice speaking in a situation with fewer hazards. Furthermore, excessive reliance on the learners' mother tongue could undermine target language exposure and practice. Hence, EFL teachers should carefully balance the use of the target and learners' mother tongue while utilizing both languages.

**Affective Factors**

The significance of affective factors, like limited family support, anxiety about receiving negative feedback from peers, and poor listening abilities, shows the importance of a comprehensive, learner-centered approach to language teaching. EFL curricula need to include strategies that support students' intrinsic motivation, like aligning course material to their goals and areas of interest. They should also create a supportive, positive environment in the classroom so that students can develop their confidence.

**Environmental Factors**

The impact of environmental factors such as class size, ICT tools availability, and physical classroom conditions highlight the significance of institutional support. To improve learners' engagement and exposure to the target language, policymakers and educational administrators should attempt to guarantee that EFL learning spaces are equipped with sufficient technical instruments, such as audio-visual equipment and language learning software. To foster a favorable learning environment, they should also take into account restrictions on class sizes and provide spacious comfortable classrooms.
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