## Available Online

# IMPACT OF PSYCHOLOGICAL AND COMMUNICATION BARRIERS TOWARDS ENGLISH SPEAKING AT SECONDARY SCHOOL LEVEL IN DISTRICT TOBA TEK SINGH 

Mubshar Gul *and Noor Muhammad<br>Institute of Agricultural Extension, Education and Rural Development, UAF Sub-campus Toba Tek Singh, Pakistan


#### Abstract

The students make mistakes and face difficulties during the process of language learning and managing it accurately. The emotional and communication factors may impact upon learning and usage of the English language. The objective of this research study was to inquire about the impact of psychological and communication barriers toward English speaking at the secondary school level in the district Toba Tek Singh. The population for the research study was comprised of secondary schools students and teachers of $10^{\text {th }}$ grades in the district of Toba Tek Singh. The Tehsil area of Toba Tek Singh was chosen for research work. Twenty secondary schools of tehsil Toba Tek Singh were chosen for a sample and the sample size comprised of 200 personnel, including 160 students and 40 teachers. The research was descriptive in nature, and the researcher developed a questionnaire that was used as a research tool for the collection of data from the sampled teachers and students. Statistical Testing was conducted from the experimentally collected data, and it was analyzed through different statistical approaches by using SPSS to find out and analyze the results for their reliability. It is concluded that English language learning plays significant role to change environment of society. The secondary school students and teachers lack in speaking English language in schools and classrooms. Their learning and speaking ability is hindered by some psychological and communication hurdles. It is also concluded from research study that these psychological and communication hurdles can be removed or minimized by imparting various communication skills and motivational training programs.
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## INTRODUCTION

Every student makes mistakes and faces difficulties during the process of language learning and managing it accurately. According to Hillesheim (2002), adult and teenager students don't acknowledge the missteps effectively in this process which is a big problem in the way of language learning and speaking effectively. These students use to hide their skills behind a barrier they work keeping in mind the end goal to ensure their own glad and confidence. These barriers are considered as utmost obstructions for the teacher to achieve appropriate progress in the pupils' learning process. These barriers are named and categorized as psychological and communication barriers (Tam, 2013). Vemuri et al. (2013) expressed that there are many emotional and communication factors that may impact students' ability to learn and use of English language. These factors incorporate essential personality attributes such as shyness, apathy, enthusiasm, anxiety, boredom, behaviour towards speaking the English language, and so on. Feelings are often considered as a feature of language classes. In classes, some of the students have positive feelings and energy and others show a sentiment of negative energy such as boredom and disinterests. They also feel fear of stress and anxiety during classroom activities.

Researchers such as Team (2013) stated that the cognition of student is affected by these sentimental factors of psychology and communication. The process of language learning includes interaction with each other which stimulates feelings and emotions of students and this can be a hurdle for successful English language learning. Macintyre et al. (2015) expressed that students' cooperation in classrooms can affect their effort to use English language in classes. This directly relates to their learning styles and emotional attitudes. It is a factor that has been connected to factors for example identity, self-assurance, dispositions and inspiration, and is connected to tension, and additionally students' perspectives of their own open capability. Be that as it may, other situational factors are additionally included, for example, theme, assignment, bunch estimate and social foundation. Asher (2007) again stated that English language learning plays significant role to change environment of society. The secondary school students of district Toba Tek Singh lack in speaking English in schools and classrooms. In constructing and enhancing their fluency in speaking English has become a major concern for educationalists. The challenge is to build and enhance English speaking ability of secondary school students of district Toba Tek Singh.

## METHODOLOGY

The study was experimental and descriptive to analyze the Impact of Psychological and Communication Barriers towards English Speaking at Secondary School Level in District Toba Tek Singh. The area of the study was District Toba Tek Singh. In Toba Tek Singh district, there are total 192 high schools. Population for research study included all students and teachers of 10th grades of Toba Tek Singh district. The secondary schools of Toba Tek Singh tehsil were selected for research study. There were total 76 high schools in tehsil Toba Tek Singh out of which 30 schools were male high schools and 46 schools were female high schools.

The nature of the present research study was descriptive. It was used to describe impact of psychological and communication barriers towards English speaking. The survey method was used to collect data. The data collection process took about one day for visiting each sample school. The questionnaire was distributed to teachers and students of high schools in order to collect their response. The interviews were conducted with sampled personals of schools in a pleasant and convenient way to get the unbiased answers by taking the interviewee in confidence that all the information was kept in secret. The analysis of collected data was done through different statistical approaches such as frequency distribution, percentage, mean, mod, standard deviation, chi square test and $t$-test using computer generated statistical software SPSS (Statistical Packages for Social Science).

## RESULT AND DISCUSSION

Table 1 shows the data regarding the teacher's experience is necessary for successful communication. The respondents were asked a question that teacher's experience is necessary for successful communication. Their responses were collected and the data was analysed, which show that $44.5 \%$ of the respondents were disagreed with the question statement that teacher's experience is necessary for successful communication while $13.5 \%$ and $19.0 \%$ respondents were agreed and strongly agreed that teacher's experience is necessary for communication.

Table 1. Teacher's experience is necessary for successful communication.

| Categories | Frequency | Percentage | Mean | Standard <br> Deviation | Chi Square | P-value |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Stronglv Agree | 38 | 19.0 |  |  |  |  |
| Agree | 27 | 13.5 |  |  |  |  |
| Undecided | 20 | 10.0 | 3.19 | 4 | 1.354 | 0.661 |
| Disagree | 89 | 44.5 |  |  |  |  |
| Stronglv Disagree | 26 | 13.0 |  |  |  |  |
| Total | 200 | 100.0 |  |  |  |  |

Table 2. Students cannot speak English due to lack of confidence.

| Categories | Frequency | Percentage | Mean | Standard <br> Deviation | Chi Square | P-value |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Stronglv Agree | 29 | 14.5 |  |  |  |  |
| Agree | 35 | 3.14 | 4 | 1.272 | 3.833 |  |
| Undecided | 46 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Disagree | 62 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Stronglv Disagree | 28 | 14.0 |  |  |  |  |
| Total | 200 | 100.0 |  |  |  |  |

Table 2 shows the respondents were asked a question that students cannot speak English due to lack of confidence. Their responses were collected and the data was analysed which describe that $31 \%$ of the respondents disagreed with the question statement that students cannot speak English due to lack of confidence. There were $23 \%$ respondents who remained with undecided response about the question statement. About $14.5 \%$ of the respondents were strongly agreed with the question statement. The crosstab analysis calculated the chi square value as 1.272 and $p$-value as 3.833 . P -value $>0.05$ shows that there is no significant effect or association.

Table 3. Students' anxious behaviour creates communication gap.

| Categories | Frequency | Percentage | Mean | Standard <br> Deviation | Chi Square | P-value |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Stronglv Agree | 32 | 16.0 |  |  |  |  |
| Agree | 20 | 10.0 | 3.32 | 4 | 1.313 | 8.397 |
| Undecided | 35 | 17.5 |  |  |  |  |
| Disagree | 79 | 39.5 |  |  |  |  |
| Stronglv Disagree | 34 | 17.0 |  |  |  |  |
| Total | 200 | 100.0 |  |  |  |  |

Table 3 shows the respondents were asked a question students' anxious behaviour creates communication gap. Their responses were collected and the data was analysed which is presented below in table 3 . The results clearly describe that $39.5 \%$ of the respondents with mean score $3.32 \pm 1.313$ disagreed with the question statement that that students' anxious behaviour creates communication gap while $17.5 \%$ respondents showed undecided response. About $16 \%$ respondents were strongly agreed to statement.

Table 4. Students do not understand English language due to lack of interest.

| Categories | Frequency | Percentage | Mean | Standard <br> Deviation | Chi Square | P-value |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Stronglv Agree | 27 | 13.5 |  |  |  |  |
| Agree | 13 | 6.5 | 3.47 | 4 | 1.264 | 4.253 |
| Undecided | 39 | 19.5 |  |  |  |  |
| Disagree | 81 | 40.5 |  |  |  |  |
| Stronglv Disagree | 40 | 20.0 |  |  |  |  |
| Total | 200 | 100.0 |  |  |  |  |

Table 4 shows the respondents were asked a question that students do not understand English language due to lack of interest. Their responses were collected and the data was analysed which is presented below in table 4. The results clearly describe that $40.5 \%$ of the respondents with mean score $3.47 \pm 1.264$ disagreed with the question statement that that students do not understand English language due to lack of interest. There were $19.5 \%$ respondents who remained with undecided response about the question statement. $20 \%$ of the respondents strongly disagreed with the question statement. The mod value 4 shows the agreement level of the respondents towards the question statement. The significant association of the variable profession was checked on the question statement. The crosstab analysis calculated the chi square value as 1.264 and $p$-value as 4.253 . $P$-value $>0.05$ shows that there is no significant effect or association
of profession on the question statement that that students do not understand English language due to lack of interest.

Table 5. Students do not speak in English due to shyness.

| Categories | Frequency | Percentage | Mean | Standard <br> Deviation | Chi Square | P-value |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Strongly Agree | 36 | 18.0 |  |  |  |  |
| Agree | 43 | 21.5 |  |  |  |  |
| Undecided | 59 | 29.5 | 2.85 | 3 | 1.255 | 5.199 |
| Disagree | 39 | 19.5 |  |  |  |  |
| Strongly | 23 | 11.5 |  |  |  |  |
| Total | 200 | 100.0 |  |  |  |  |

Table 5 shows that students do not speak in English due to shyness. Their responses were collected and the data was analysed which is presented below in table 5 . The results clearly describe that $21.5 \%$ of the respondents with mean score $2.85 \pm 1.255$ agreed with the question statement that that students do not speak in English due to shyness. There were $29.5 \%$ respondents who remained with undecided response about the question statement. 19.5\% of the respondents disagreed with the question statement.

Table 6. Students prefer other subjects over English.

| Categories | Frequency | Percentage | Mean | Standard Deviation | Chi Square | P-value |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Stronglv Agree | 23 | 11.5 | 3.32 | 4 | 1.234 | 5.976 |
| Agree | 32 | 16.0 |  |  |  |  |
| Undecided | 33 | 16.5 |  |  |  |  |
| Disagree | 83 | 41.5 |  |  |  |  |
| Stronglv | 29 | 14.5 |  |  |  |  |
| Total | 200 | 100.0 |  |  |  |  |

Table 6 shows that students prefer other subjects over English. Their responses were collected and the data was analysed which is presented below in table 6. The results clearly describe that $41.5 \%$ of the respondents with mean score $3.32 \pm 1.234$ disagreed with the question statement that students prefer other subjects over English. There were $16.5 \%$ respondents who remained with undecided response about the question statement. About $16 \%$ of the respondents strongly agreed with the question statement. The standard deviation 4 shows the agreement level of the respondents towards the question statement. The significant association of the variable profession was checked on the question statement. The crosstab analysis calculated the chi square value as 1.234 and $p$-value as 5.976 . P -value $>0.05$ shows that there is no significant effect or association of profession on the question statement that students prefer other subjects over English.

Table 7. Students' chances of failure increase due to poor English proficiency.

| Categories | Frequency | Percentage | Mean | Standard <br> Deviation | Chi Square | P-value |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Strongly Agree | 24 | 12.0 |  |  |  |  |
| Agree | 8 | 4.0 |  |  |  |  |
| Undecided | 41 | 20.5 | 3.58 | 4 | 1.225 | 6.679 |
| Disagree | 82 | 41.0 |  |  |  |  |
| Strongly | 45 | 22.5 |  |  |  |  |
| Total | 200 | 100 |  |  |  |  |

Table 7 shows that data about the students' chances of failure increase due to poor English proficiency. Their responses were collected and the data was analysed which is presented in table 7. The results clearly describe that $41 \%$ of the respondents with mean score $3.58 \pm 1.225$ disagreed with the question statement that students' chances of failure increase due to poor English proficiency. About $20.5 \%$ respondents showed undecided response about statement. This study examined the relationship between the effects of
student language development in relation to other student background variables. The researcher chooses 200 schools respondents' answers from the Toba Tek Singh district (Fulmer and Turner, 2014). Smith (2010) stressed that simple communication should be used to convey the message between people and he added that talk and communication are two separate factors affecting the communication process between people. Different teaching styles play a key part in the academic performance of students, which has a positive or negative impact on students' academic achievement (Wu et al., 2011). Faculty members' verbal and non-verbal communication has a positive long-term impact on student life and academic achievements (McHugh et al., 2013; Fulmer and Turner, 2014).

Essentially, correspondence is the procedure of exchange of message from sender to beneficiary (Ahadian, 2001). The people are essentially seeking to build relationships with others. The key sources for communicating people among themselves are family, educational conditions, playing gatherings and various places. People use mail to search for and share their thoughts with others (Memarian, 2004). Freeman (2009) they required an attractive and very comfortable environment for the excellent performance of students in academia that would have a positive effect on their mica status. Effective communication between faculty members had a positive impact on university students' academic achievements (Roorda et al., 2011; Dunlosky et al., 2013).

## CONCLUSIONS

The research study concluded that English language learning plays significant role to change environment of society. The secondary school students and teachers of district Toba Tek Singh lack in speaking English language in schools and classrooms. Their learning and speaking ability is hindered by some psychological and communication hurdles. It is also concluded from research study that these psychological and communication hurdles can be removed or minimized by imparting various communication skills and motivational training programs to the respondents of the study. Hence, their difficulty for speaking English language at schools can be reduced.
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