

Exploring the Role of Classroom Environment in Hampering L2 Communicative

Interaction: A Case Study of the South Punjab

* Dr. Muhammad Ahsan, Lecturer (Corresponding Author)

** Dr. Noshaba Younus, Assistant Professor

*** Dr. Zahoor Hussain, Lecturer

Abstract

The prime focus of this research was exploring the role of classroom situation in hampering L2 communicative interaction at the public sector colleges, universities, and the sub-campuses of these universities located in the South Punjab, Pakistan. The present study was duly prearranged to employ a mixed-method technique that utilizes both the qualitative and quantitative data. The outcomes of the study determined that 86.5% of learners claimed that their classmates are not interested in communicative interaction. Similarly, 47.5% viewed outdated syllabus, 52.5% classroom atmosphere, 69.5% learners' prohibited participation during L2 lecture, 37.5% badly imitation by classmates and 95.5% teachers' use of grammar-translation method as communicative barriers and these barriers ruin L2 learners' communicative ability. This paper also reinforces the outlook that the teachers have to expose the students to the interactive communication so that the learners can easily perform their various roles in the L2 atmosphere. At this point, it is the most crucial duty of the teacher to encourage and motivate his students to practice and to have more communicative interaction in the EFL classroom because most of the non-native countries students don't have the chance to use it outside the classroom.

Keywords: EFL Classroom, Environment, Hamper, L2, Communication, Interaction

Introduction

According to Richards (1990) in EFL classrooms the learning of English-speaking skills has been the most important preference for several L2 learners and most frequently English language learners assess their achievement in L2 learning based on the fact that how well they have developed their communicative language skill. In the EFL atmosphere teachers and the curriculum used is meant for either direct methodologies that focus on specific aspects of verbal communication such as turn-taking and topic controlling or indirect methods which make circumstances for oral interaction with the help of group work and task work. Further, in this context Harmer (2007) and Gilakjani (2016) extended the scope of discussion and said that human communication is a complex process by which people need communication when they want to communicate something and convey information about the people or some events. Speakers converse in the language according to their aims, needs, and objectives. In this way, speakers should be both listeners as well as speakers at the same time through turn taking activity for the active communication.

Communicative abilities from the students' context is very significant in foreign language learning. Even though spoken English is crucial, its importance has always been overlooked in colleges and universities due to diverse causes such as grammar and disapproving of teacher-student magnitudes. Communicative capabilities have always been absent from the testing system of these institutions because of the problem in evaluating it objectively and the time it takes to carry out communication tests (Clifford, 1987).

Communication skill needs attention in both first and second language. Learning communication skills is the most important aspect of learning L2 and success in a foreign language is

* Department of English, Ghazi University Dera Ghazi Khan, Pakistan. Email: mahsan@gudgk.edu.pk

** Department of English, Riphah International University Faisalabad Campus

Email: noshaba.younus@riphahfsd.edu.pk

*** Department of English, Bahaudin Zakariya University, Layyah Campus, Pakistan.

Email: zahoor_linguist@bzu.edu.pk

measured based on communicative abilities in the EFL classroom (Nunan, 1995). Interactive communication is given extra importance among all the four language skills because learners who learn a language are referred to as the speakers of that language as well (Ur, 1996). In the previous context, Davies & Pearse (2000) were thinking that the foremost intention of English language teaching is to make learners capable to use English language more effectively and appropriately in L2 and everyday communication. Somehow it seems apparent that L2 learners in Pakistani colleges where BS in English program is continued, universities located in the South Punjab and their sub-campuses are unable to communicate fluently and accurately inside and outside of the foreign language classroom because they do not have enough knowledge in this field. Bashir, Azeem, & Dogar (2011) have rightly strengthened this notion and relate that when we talk about spoken English, we do not mean just saying some words through the mouth rather it means transmitting the message through the words of mouth. This crucial skill is repeatedly ignored in the most of Pakistani L2 classrooms. Learners of L2 do not find adequate chance either in their inside the classrooms or outside to speak English with their parents, elders, or friends. Unfortunately, in Pakistani perspective measuring the communication skills of the students is not an important part of the examination system from school to university level. Teachers in Pakistani L2 classrooms in general and in the South Punjab in particular only give their students some structures, hand-outs and ask them to repeat and cram. This activity cannot remove their learners' hesitation and shyness.

Definition of Communicative Interaction

Different scholars, linguists, and teachers have proposed various definitions of speaking or communication according to their own choice, opinion, and knowledge. Some of them are as under:

According to Nunan (1995), speaking is to say words verbally, to communicate as by talking, making a request, and to make a speech. Similarly, Chaney (1998) views communication as the process of making and sharing meaning by using verbal and non-verbal symbols from a diverse perspective. Brown (2001) and Burns and Joyce (1997) well-defined speaking as an interactive communication process of making meaning that includes generating, receiving, and processing information. Bygate (1987) has enlarged the concept and defined it as the speakers' production of auditory signals to produce different verbal responses in their listeners. It is observed as merging sounds scientifically to form meaningful sentences. Eckard and Kearny (1981), Florez (1999), Howarth (2001), and Abd El Fattah Torky (2006) demonstrated communication as a two-way traffic including a true communication of opinions, information, or emotions. This horizontal concept favors the spoken texts as the association between two or more than two learners at the same time and in the same context.

Factors Affecting Communicative Interaction

English language teachers are the key figures in L2 classrooms if they are willing to help their learners to mitigate their learning barriers in the wake of learning communication skills, they should detect those factors that can upset their speaking routine. Learners' communicative competence is influenced by the features like performance environments, emotional aspects, listening skill, topical knowledge, and feedback during speaking activities (Tuan & Mai, 2015). The above-mentioned factors are discussed as under:

1. Performance Conditions

The first factor affecting communicative interaction is related to learners' involvement in a speaking activity under different conditions. Performance conditions usually influence on communicative competence and these conditions include time pressure, planning, the quality of performance, and the amount of support from the teachers, family, and friends (Nation & Newton, 2009).

2. Affective Variables

Krashen (1982) disclosed several affective variables have been associated with L2 learning and these factors are motivation, self-confidence, and anxiety.

3. Listening Skill

Regarding listening skills, Doff (1998) views that students could not be able to swell their speaking capacity until they cultivate their listening aptitude. Students should recognize what is expressed in front of them to have a constructive communication. Shumin (1997) implied that when students converse, the other learners respond to them through the listening process. Speakers perform the role of both listeners and speakers. From the above discussion, the conclusion can easily be

determined that learners are not capable to answer if they stay incapable to understand what is said before them. It can be deduced that speaking is very carefully associated with listening.

4. Topical Knowledge

Bachman and Palmer (1996) explained it as speakers' knowledge of correlated up-to-date facts. It enables students to apply language concerning the modern world in which the students live. Bachman and Palmer (1996) proclaim that current knowledge has countless impressions on the learners' speaking competence.

5. Feedback during Speaking Activities

The next factor is related to the feedback during speaking activities. A lot of students expect their English teachers to provide them the required feedback on their communicative performance. According to Harmer (1991), the choices that the teachers opt towards their students' performance are influenced by the stages of the lesson, the tasks, and the kinds of mistakes they frequently make. Harmer (1991) also continued his perception towards the issue and said that if the teachers directly correct their students' mistakes and point out their barriers in this regard, the purpose of the speaking task and flow of the lesson will be damaged. In above-mentioned idea was supported by Baker and Westrup (2003) when they articulated that if L2 learners are uninterruptedly amended, they will be demoralized, downhearted, and will feel apprehension during conversation. At this, it has been commended that instructors should enduringly correct their learners' errors in a constructive sense and provide them motivational strength and energy, backing and encouragement during conversational activity. Apart from psychosomatic features. Mahripah (2014) viewed that EFL learners' speaking skill is influenced by some linguistic constituents of language such as phonetics, phonology, syntax, morphology, vocabulary, and semantics.

Research Questions

- i. What are the perceptions and beliefs of the students regarding the L2 classroom environment in impeding communicative interaction?
- ii. How can English teachers and students improve the classroom environment by minimizing the obstruction of communicative interaction?

Materials and Methods

Strydom and Venter (2002) were of the view that the user research methodology must feasibly contain the account of the target institutes, contributors, data gathering processes, sampling plan, and instruments. The present study was duly prearranged to employ a mixed-method technique that utilizes both the qualitative and quantitative data to respond to a particular question or the group of questions (Hesse-Biber, 2010). The nominated locations of this study were 10 government colleges and universities of the South Punjab and 200 questionnaires were returned by the selected population. The required sample contained within-subject to the age group of 17 to 21 years. The students (male & female on equal ratio) who were selected for the current study were from the BS English program of the selected colleges and the universities in the 2020 academic year. For this research plan data was collected from 10 government colleges and universities of the South Punjab. Three divisions of the South Punjab i.e. D. G. Khan, Bahawalpur, and Multan were selected for collecting the sample and the required data was collected from those government colleges and universities where BS English program is running and these government institutions are gender-integrated from Degree to Ph.D. level. The questionnaire was employed as a data collection tool at these particular institutions. The justification of this work is to analyze the perceptions and beliefs of the students regarding the L2 classroom environment in impeding communicative interaction and to identify the influence of English teachers and students to improve the classroom environment by minimizing the obstruction of communicative interaction. A structured questionnaire was utilized in which the learners were requested to point out their level of consent or discrepancy on a four-point rating scale, including "1= Yes, 2= No, 3= No Idea, 4= No Comments. Students' questionnaire was developed from the studies by Thornbury, S. (2007), C. Richards, J. (2006), Al-Sibai, D. (2004), Ellis, R. (2003), Crystal, D. (2003), and Braine, G. (Ed.) (1999) as models.

Students Responses Analysis**Table 1: My class fellows do not interact in English in the L2 classroom.**

Four-point rating scale	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Yes	173	86.5	86.5	86.5
No	14	07.0	07.0	93.5
No Idea	04	02.0	02.0	95.5
No Comments	09	04.5	04.5	100.0
Total	200	100.0	100.0	

Note: Numerical statistics in columns refer to the analyzed account and their percentage about “my class fellows do not interact in English in L2 classroom.”

In response to the statement that “my class fellows do not interact in English in L2 classroom” the majority of the students indicated that in the EFL classroom most of the students refrain from communicative interaction with each other which always results in a bigger classroom barrier. Around 173 out of 200 students which were 86.5% who were excited and motivated to learn the English language in an L2 atmosphere but they cannot do that as their class fellows refrain from communicative interaction in EFL classrooms with each other and it is a big barrier in this regard. The valid and cumulative percentage of the first scale is also 86.5. Similarly, 14 out of 200 students which were 07.0% of the total number of the learners were of the remark that they do not think if there is no communicative interaction with each other in the class it causes any type of barrier or hurdle during learning the English language in EFL classroom. This second category of the students has 14.0 valid and 93.5 cumulative percentages. On the contrary to the previous two points of the four-point rating scale only 04 students out of 200 which were merely 02.0% of the whole number, valid percentage remains same as 02.0 while cumulative reached to 95.5 and they were of the view that they do not have idea whether hampering communicative interaction in L2 classroom causes as a barrier or not. 09 out of 200 students said that they do not have any notes on the topic and it was only 04.5% of the total number, a valid percentage was also 04.5 while the cumulative percentage reached to 100.0. And if we have a comparison between the students who revealed that their class fellows do not interact in English in the L2 classroom then around 173 out of 200 students which were 86.5 %. On the other hand, only 07.0% of the total number were of the view that according to them it is not a barrier whether their class fellows interact in English in L2 classroom or not and they were 14 out of 200. It is recognizable from the data that there is a substantial dissimilarity between the ‘Yes’ and ‘No’ scale category of the students.

Table 2: The syllabus taught in the class scarcely focuses on verbal communication.

Four-point rating scale	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Yes	95	47.5	47.5	47.5
No	77	38.5	38.5	86.0
No Idea	08	04.0	04.0	90.0
No Comments	20	10.5	10.5	100.0
Total	200	100.0	100.0	

Note: Numerical statistics in columns refer to the analyzed account and their percentage about “the syllabus taught in the class scarcely focuses on verbal communication.”

In response to the statement “the syllabus taught in the class scarcely focuses on verbal communication” a major part of the students indicated that the syllabus taught in the class hardly focuses on verbal communication. 95 out of 200 students which were 47.5% who were enthusiastic and encouraged to learn and understand the English language in an L2 atmosphere but they cannot do that as they believed that the syllabus taught in the class scarcely focuses on verbal communication in an EFL atmosphere and it is a big barrier in this respect. The valid and cumulative percentage of the first scale is also 47.5. Similarly, 77 out of 200 students which were 38.5% of the total number of the learners who were of the observation that the syllabus taught in the class scarcely focuses on verbal communication and it causes no hurdle during perceiving verbal concepts and ideas in the EFL classroom. This second category of the students has 38.5 valid and 86.0 cumulative percentages. On the contrary to the previous two points of the four-point rating scale only 08 students out of 200 which were merely 04.0% of the whole number, valid percentage remains same as 04.0 while cumulative reached to 90.0 and they were of the view that they do not have an idea whether the syllabus taught in

the class focuses on verbal communication or not. 20 out of 200 students said that they do not have any comment on the issue and it was only 10.0% of the total number, the valid percentage was also 10.0 while the cumulative percentage reached 100.0. And if we have a comparison between the students who displayed that the syllabus taught in the class scarcely focuses on verbal communication then around 95 out of 200 students which were 47.5 % of the total number of the students. On the other hand, 38.0% of the total number were of the view that according to them it is not a barrier whether the syllabus taught in the class focuses on verbal communication or not and they were 77 out of 200. There is sufficient variation between the 'Yes' and 'No' scale category of the students.

Table 3: The atmosphere of the class is not healthy for speaking English.

Four-point rating scale	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Yes	105	52.5	52.5	52.5
No	35	17.5	17.5	70.0
No Idea	25	12.5	12.5	82.5
No Comments	35	17.5	17.5	100
Total	100	100	100	

Note: Numerical statistics in columns refer to the analyzed account and their percentage about the "atmosphere of the class is not healthy for speaking English."

In reaction to the statement "atmosphere of the class is not healthy for speaking English" table 7.3 indicated that the majority of the learners were of the view that the atmosphere of the class is not healthy for speaking English. 129 out of 200 students which were 52.5% who were invigorated and inspired to speak the English language but the atmosphere of the class was not healthy for speaking English for them and it was an enormous obstruction in this regard. The valid and cumulative percentage of the first scale is also 52.5. On the contrary, 35 out of 200 students which were 17.5% of the total number of the learners were of the view that the atmosphere of the class is healthy for speaking English and it was not a hurdle for them during speaking the English language. This second category of the students has only 17.5 valid and 70.0 cumulative percentages. On the contrary to the previous two points of the four-point rating scale only 25 students out of 200 which were merely 12.5% of the whole strength, valid percentage remains same as 12.5 while cumulative reached to 82.5 and they were of the view that they have no idea whether the atmosphere of the class is healthy for speaking English or not. Only 35 out of 200 students said that they do not have any notes on the concern and it was only 17.5% of the total number, valid percentage was also 17.5 while the cumulative percentage reached 100.0. And if we have a comparison between the students who indicated that the atmosphere of the class is not healthy for speaking English then around 105 out of 200 students which were 52.5 %. On the other hand, only 17.5% of the total number were of the view that it is not a barrier that the atmosphere of the class is not healthy for speaking English and they were 35 out of 200. There is marginally a big difference between the two main categories of the respondents.

Table 4: Speaking English in EFL class is not required during the lecture on students' part.

Four-point rating scale	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Yes	139	69.5	69.5	69.5
No	24	12.0	12.0	81.5
No Idea	27	13.5	13.5	95.0
No Comments	10	05.0	05.0	100.0
Total	200	100.0	100.0	

Note: Numerical statistics in columns refer to the analyzed account and their percentage about "speaking English in EFL class is not required during the lecture on students' part."

In table 5.4 the majority of the students indicated that speaking English in EFL class is not required during the lecture on students' part. 139 out of 200 students which were 69.5% who were selected for this research project and were enthusiastic and encouraged to learn and speak the English language in an L2 atmosphere but they cannot do that as they thought that the speaking English in the class is not mandatory during the lecture on students' behalf and it is a big barrier in this respect. The valid and cumulative percentage of the first scale is also 69.5. Similarly, 24 out of 200 students which were 12.0% of the total number of the learners who believed that if the speaking English in EFL class is not required during the lecture on students' part then it's not a hurdle for them in learning and

speaking English as they can fulfill this gap at differ other forums such as at home or with outdoor friends. This second category of the students has only 12.0 valid and 81.5 cumulative percentages. On the contrary to the previous two points of the four-point rating scale only 27 students out of 200 which were merely 13.5% of the whole number, valid percentage remains same as 13.5 while cumulative reached to 95.0 and they were of the view that they do not have an idea whether the speaking English in EFL class is essential during the lecture on students' part or not. 10 out of 200 students said that they do not have any comment on the issue and it was only 05.0% of the total number, valid percentage was also 05.0 while the cumulative percentage reached 100.0. And if we have a comparison between the students who demonstrated that speaking English in EFL class is not required during the lecture on students' part then around 139 out of 200 students which were 69.5 %. On the other hand Only 12.0% of the total number were of the view that according to them it is not a barrier whether the speaking of English in EFL class is required during the lecture on students' part or not and they were 24 out of 200. There is an adequate discrepancy between the 'Yes' and 'No' scale category of the learners.

Table 5: Students in the class badly imitate me when I speak the wrong English word.

Four-point rating scale	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Yes	75	37.5	37.5	37.5
No	65	32.5	32.5	69.0
No Idea	46	23.0	23.0	93.0
No Comments	14	07.0	07.0	100.0
Total	200	100.0	100.0	

Note: Numerical statistics in columns refer to the analyzed account and their percentage about “students in the class badly imitate me when I speak a wrong English word.”

In response to the statement “students in the class badly imitate me when I speak a wrong English word” the majority of the students responded that students in the class badly imitate them when they speak a wrong English word. 75 out of 200 students which were 37.5% who were eager and encouraged to learn and understand English language in L2 classroom but they cannot do that as they believed that the students in the class badly imitate them when they speak a wrong English word and it is a big barrier in this respect. The valid and cumulative percentage of the first scale is also 37.5. Similarly, 65 out of 200 students which were 32.5% of the total number of the learners who were of the observation that the students in the class although badly imitate them when they speak a wrong English word but it causes no hurdle during perceiving verbal concepts and ideas in EFL classroom. This second category of the students has 32.5 valid and 70.0 cumulative percentages. On the contrary to the previous two points of the four-point rating scale only 46 students out of 200 which were merely 23.0% of the whole number, valid percentage remains same as 23.0 while cumulative reached to 93.0 and they were of the view that they do not have an idea whether the students in the class badly imitate them when they speak a wrong English word or not. 14 out of 200 students said that they do not have any comment on the issue and it was only 07.0% of the total number, valid percentage was also 07.0 while the cumulative percentage reached 100.0. Relationship between the students who demonstrated that they were of the thought that the students in the class badly imitate them when they speak a wrong English word then around 75 out of 200 students which were 37.5 %. Reverse to it 23.0% of the total number were of the view that according to their perception it is not a barrier whether the students in the class badly imitate them when they speak a wrong English word or not and they were only 46 students out of 200. It is visible that there is an ample incongruity between the ‘Yes’ and ‘No’ scale group of the students.

Table 6: The teachers teach English through the Grammar Translation Method.

Four-point rating scale	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Yes	185	92.5	92.5	92.5
No	06	03.0	03.0	95.5
No Idea	05	02.5	02.5	98.0
No Comments	04	02.0	02.0	100
Total	Total	200	100.0	

Note: Numerical statistics in columns refer to the analyzed account and their percentage about “the teachers teach English through Grammar Translation Method.”

In table 5.6 majority of the selected population indicated that the teachers teach English through Grammar Translation Method. 185 out of 200 students which were 92.5% were selected for this research project and were excited and fortified to learn the English language in an L2 atmosphere but they were of the thought that their teachers teach English through the Grammar Translation Method and it is a big barrier in this vivacious activity. The valid and cumulative percentage of the first scale is also 92.5. On the contrary, only 06 out of 200 students which were 03.0% of the total number of the learners who believed that their teachers teach English through Grammar Translation Method is not a hurdle for them in learning and speaking English as they can fulfill this breach with different other settings such as at home or with outdoor friends. This second category of the students has only 03.0 valid and 95.5 cumulative percentages. On the contrary to the previous two points of the four-point rating scale only 05 students out of 200 which were merely 02.5% of the whole number, valid percentage remains same as 02.5 while cumulative reached to 98.0 and they were of the thought that they have no idea whether the teachers teach English through Grammar Translation Method or not. 04 out of 200 students said that they do not want to comment on the matter and it was 02.0% of the total number, a valid percentage was also 02.0 while cumulative percentage extended to 100.0. Comparison between the students who demonstrated that the teachers teach English through the Grammar Translation Method revealed that around 185 out of 200 students which were 92.5 % of the total number. Reverse to it only 03.0% of the total number were of the view that according to their perception it is not a barrier whether the teachers teach English through Grammar Translation Method or not and they were only 06 students out of 200. There is an ample inconsistency between the 'Yes' and 'No' scale group of the students.

Findings and Discussions

The central aim of this work was to explore the role of the classroom environment in hampering L2 communicative interaction of BS English students, studying in different public sector colleges, universities, and their sub-campus situated in the South Punjab. First of all, the perceptions and beliefs of the students regarding the L2 classroom environment in impeding communicative interaction are offered.

Research Question# 01

What are the perceptions and beliefs of the students regarding the L2 classroom environment in impeding communicative interaction?

Effective interaction is the foundation of constructive human relationships among different walks of people. In the same way for daily life interaction, students have to be taught to be active speakers of the target language. But there are certain classroom environment difficulties in hampering L2 communicative interaction. Results from the analyzed data indicated that there is a significant positive relationship between the classroom environment and L2 communicative interaction. Ever since as the classroom environment becomes conducive for the learners their interactive communicative capabilities are increased. Similarly, as the classroom environment becomes unfavorable for the students their interactive communicative competence is decreased.

The findings of the students' questionnaire exposed that the majority of the students indicated that in L2 classrooms most of the students refrain from communicative interaction with each other which always results in a bigger classroom barrier regarding communicative interaction. Around 173 out of 200 students which were 86.5% who were excited and motivated to learn the English language in an L2 atmosphere but they cannot do that as their class fellows refrain from communicative interaction in EFL classroom with each other; the syllabus taught in the class hardly focuses on verbal communication. 95 out of 200 students which were 47.5% who were enthusiastic and encouraged to learn communicative interaction in an L2 atmosphere but they cannot do that as they thought that the syllabus taught in the class scarcely focuses on verbal communication in an EFL atmosphere; the atmosphere of the class is not healthy for speaking English. 129 out of 200 students which were 52.5% responded like that; speaking English in EFL class is not required during the lecture on the students' part. 139 out of 200 students which were 69.5% who were selected for this research project and were stimulated to learn and speak the English language in an L2 atmosphere but they cannot do that as they believed that the speaking English in the class is not mandatory during the lecture on students' behalf and it is a big barrier in this respect; the majority of the students were of the view that they do not have English speaking friends inside and outside the class. 75 out of 200 students which were 37.5% who were eager and encouraged to learn and understand the English language in the L2

classroom but they cannot do that as they believed that the students in the class badly imitate them when they speak the wrong English word and it is a big barrier in this respect; their teachers teach English through Grammar Translation Method and it is a big barrier in this energetic activity. The valid and cumulative percentage of the first scale is also 92.5; the students responded that the teachers hardly correct their verbal mistakes during class so they remain confused whether they are speaking right or wrong.

Research Question# 02

How can English teachers and students improve the classroom environment by minimizing the obstruction of communicative interaction?

Results and findings of the learners' questionnaire uncovered that most of the learners indicated that they refrain from communicative interaction with each other due to certain classroom barriers such as students' lack of interaction in L2 classroom; EFL syllabi lack of basis of certain oral communication; Lack of appropriate atmosphere for interactive communication; during the lecture, no need to speak in English; teachers' avoidance appropriate activities in L2 class; lack of English speaking friends inside and outside the class; poorly imitation on wrong words becomes the cause of embarrassment; GTM is the biggest hindrance in communication; L2 teachers hardly correct verbal mistakes of the students. All these student-centered and teacher-centered barriers need the attention of both of the stakeholders in the EFL classroom so that the interactive condition can be made more beneficial. The outcomes of the study showcased that a big number of the respondents expressed that they are most ambitious to improve their interactive communication, accordingly communication skill is the most preferred language skill to improve by English learners. Consequently, for the improvement of learners' communicative interaction both the stakeholders should join hands together. Particularly, L2 instructors should allocate sufficient time and space to their disciples to improve their interactive abilities. English syllabi designed for BS class should mostly focus on speaking events and activities and this will also help the students to improve the remaining three skills of the English language with their communication skills. This paper also reinforces the outlook that the teachers have to expose the students to the interactive communication so that the learners can easily perform their various roles in the L2 atmosphere.

Conclusions and Policy Recommendations

The findings and results of 'exploring the role of classroom environment in hampering L2 communicative interaction' discovered that there is a noteworthy constructive relationship between classroom environment and the students' communicative interaction in the public sector colleges, universities, and the sub-campuses of these universities located in the South Punjab, Pakistan. Since the classroom environment affects positively on the students in the L2 classroom than their communicative interaction increase inside and outside the class. Similarly, as the classroom environment affects negatively on the students in the L2 classroom than their communicative interaction decrease in and outside the L2 classroom. *The outcomes of the study determined that 86.5% of learners claimed that their classmates are not interested in communicative interaction. Similarly, 47.5% viewed outdated syllabus, 52.5% classroom atmosphere, 69.5% learners' prohibited participation during L2 lecture, 37.5% badly imitation by classmates and 95.5% teachers' use of grammar-translation method as communicative barriers and these barriers ruin L2 learners' communicative ability.* Consequently, English syllabi designed for BS class should mostly emphasize speaking events and activities and this will also help the students to improve the remaining three skills of the English language. This paper also reinforces the outlook that the teachers have to expose the students to the interactive communication so that the learners can easily perform their various roles in the L2 atmosphere. At this point, it is the most crucial duty of the teacher to encourage and motivate his students to practice and to have more communicative interaction in the EFL classroom because most of the non-native countries students don't have the chance to use it outside the classroom. Keeping this basic aspect in mind, English teachers can persuade their students to emphasize the other three skills i.e. reading, writing, and listening by executing innumerable speaking activities. Meanwhile learners not only requisite English for communication, but they also need to read textbooks, course books and to understand teachers' delivered lectures. This paper also relates that one of the principal hurdles concerning speaking features is the lack of eagerness and unwillingness to communicate in English by the students because of certain reasons i.e. obsolete syllabus, overfilled classrooms, fright of committing mistakes, lack of self-reliance, fear of teachers' undesirable feedback

and deficient vocabulary level of the students. In most of the Outer Circle countries like Pakistan teacher is considered the custodian of the class and most authoritative figure in L2 situation so, it's his foremost duty of the teachers to direct the students in a positive direction so that he can be able to achieve their communicative competence. Yet the most critical job which the government of the Punjab and the federal government have to accomplish is that they have to revise the course contents and segregate the roles of teachers and students in L2 classroom according to the requirement to solve the issue and with this, they will have to provide all the required facilities to the students in general but to the students of the South Punjab in particular so that they can get the best use of their interactive communication in L2.

Originality of the Work

The work is momentous since it attempted to identify the role of classroom environment in hampering L2 communicative interaction faced by the learners of BS (English) studying in public sector colleges and universities of the South Punjab, its importance reduced to the following concerns:

- i. The current study is significant since it investigates the role of the classroom environment in hampering L2 communicative interaction.
- ii. Statistics from the current study investigates the perceptions and beliefs of the students regarding the L2 classroom environment in impeding communicative interaction.
- iii. The research is significant as it explores the influence of English students and teachers to improve the classroom environment by minimizing the obstruction of communicative interaction.
- iv. The recent study would contribute curriculum designers in planning a suitable curriculum to make foreign language learning more accommodating in the background of Pakistan and unambiguously for the students of the Southern Punjab.

References

- Abd El Fattah Torky, S. (2006). The Effectiveness of a Task-Based Instruction Program in Developing the English Language Speaking Skills of Secondary Stage Students. Ph.D. Dissertation. Curricula and Methods of Teaching Department, Women's College, Ain Shams University.
- Al-Sibai, D. (2004). Promoting oral fluency of second language learners: Educational linguistics. Department of English. King Saud University.
- Bachman, L., & Palmer, A. S. (1996). *Language Testing in Practice*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Baker, J., & Westrup, H. (2003). *Essential Speaking Skills: A Handbook for English Language Teachers*. London: Continuum.
- Bashir, M., Azeem, M., & Dogar, A. H. (2011). Factor Affecting Students' English Speaking Skills. *British Journal of Arts and Social Sciences*, 2(1), 34-50.
- Braine, G. (Ed.) (1999). *Non-Native Educators in English Language Teaching*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Brown, H. (2001). *Teaching by principles: an interactive approach to language pedagogy*. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall.
- Burns, A., & Joyce, H. (1997). *Focus on Speaking*. Sydney: National Center for English Language Teaching and Research.
- Bygate, M. (1987). *Speaking*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Chaney, A. (1998). *Teaching Oral Communication in Grades K-8*. USA. A Viacom Company.
- Clifford, R. T. (1987). Language Teaching in the Federal Government: A Personal Perspective. *Annals, AAPSS*, 490.
- C. Richards, J. (2006). *Communicative Language Teaching Today*. Cambridge University Press.
- Crystal, D. (2003). *English as a Global Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Davies, P., & Pearse, E. (2000). *Success in English Teaching*. Oxford University Press.
- Doff, A. (1998). *Teach English: A Training Course for Teachers*. Cambridge University Press.
- Eckard, R., & Kearny, M. (1981). *Teaching Conversational Skills in ESL*. Washington: Center of Applied Linguistics.
- Ellis, R. (2003). *Task-based language learning and teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Florez, M. A. (1999). *Improving Adult English Language Learners' Speaking Skills*. ERIC Digest. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED: 435204)

- Gilakjani, A. P., & Sabouri, N. B. (2016). Learners' Listening Comprehension Difficulties in English Language Learning: A Literature Review. *English Language Teaching*, 9, 123-133. <https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v9n6p123>
- Harmer, J. (2007). *The Practice of English Language Teaching* (4th ed.). London: Pearson Longman.
- Harmer, J. (1991). *The Practice of English Language Teaching*. Essex: Longman Group UK Ltd.
- Hesse-Biber, S. N. (2010). *Mixed method research; Merging theory with practice*. New York: Guilford Press.
- Howarth, P. (2001). Process Speaking. Preparing to Repeat Yourself. *MET*, 10(1), 39-44.
- Johnson, D. M. (1992). *Approaches to Research in Second Language Learning*. London: Longman.
- Krashen, S. D. (1982). *Principles and Practice in Second Language Acquisition*. New York: Pergamon Press.
- Mahripah, S. (2014). Exploring Factors Affecting EFL Learners' Speaking Performance: from Theories into Practices. Proceedings of the 3rd UAD TEFL International Conference 2014 "Materials Development in Asia and Beyond: Directions, Issues, and Challenges." English Education Department, Universitas Ahmad Dahlan, Yogyakarta, Indonesia.
- Nation, I. S. P., & Newton, J. (2009). *Teaching ESL/EFL Listening and Speaking*. ESL & Applied Linguistics Professional Series. Routledge Taylor & Francis Group.
- Nunan, D. (1995). *Language Teaching Methodology: A Textbook for Teachers*. NY: Phoenix Ltd., p. 593. Sentot Ali Basa Islamic Boarding School of Bengkulu, Indonesia. *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science*, 2(20), 127-134.
- Richards, J. C. (1990). *Conversationally Speaking: Approaches to the Teaching of Conversation*. In Jack. C. Richards. *The Language Teaching Matrix*. New York: Cambridge University Press. 67-85.
- Shumin, K. (1997). Factors to Consider: Developing Adult EFL Students' Speaking Abilities. *English Teaching Forum*, 35(3), 8. Retrieved from <http://eca.state.gov/forum/vols/vol35/no3/p8.htm>
- Strydom, H. and Venter, L. (2002) Sampling and Sampling Methods. In: De Vos, A.S., Ed., *Research at Grass Roots: For the Social Sciences and Human Service Profession*, Van Schaik, Pretoria, 197-211.
- Thornbury, S. (2007). *How to Teach Speaking*. Harlow: Pearson Education Limited.
- Tuan, N. H., & Mai, T. N. (2015). Factors Affecting Students' Speaking Performance at LE Thanh Hien High School. *Asian Journal of Educational Research*, 3(2), 8-23.
- Ur, P. (1996). *A Course in Language Teaching. Practice and Theory*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.