## PERCEPTION OF CLASSROOM COMMUNICATION BARRIERS OF THE UNDERGRADUATE STUDENTS OF GENERAL DEGREE COLLEGES: ITS RELATIONSHIP WITH AND PREDICTION FROM THEIR ATTITUDE TOWARDS COMMUNICATION SKILLS

**Subhas Chandra Roy[1]  and  Suman Jana[2]**
[1] **Assistant Professor, Department of Teacher Education, Scottish Church College, Kolkata, West Bengal.**
[2] **M.Phil. Student, Ramakrishna Mission Sikshanamandira, Belur Math, Howrah, West Bengal.**

**ABSTRACT :**

*Communication is a process of transfer of information through vocal, written, visual or non-verbal media. Being able to communicate effectively is the most important of all life skills that can improve all aspects of a student's life. The present study attempts to measure undergraduate students' perception of classroom communication barriers and their attitude towards communication skills, and tries to detect their relationship. Data was collected from 204 undergraduate students of general degree colleges under Vidyasagar University of West Bengal randomly. The tools used to collect data were: 'Perception of Classroom Communication Barriers' (reliability=0.632) and 'Attitude towards Communication Skills' (reliability=0.642). The students were found to experience moderate to low level of perceived classroom communication barriers (mean=63.324, SD=8.88). Also they had strong positive attitude towards communication skills (mean=79.108, SD=6.94). Significant and negative correlation was found between the perception of classroom communication barriers and attitude towards communication skills (r=-0.210). In this regard, the coefficients of correlation for the perception of physical and psychological barriers were significant whereas the other two coefficients (perception of language and background barriers) were not significant. Further, 4.4% of the variance in the students' perception of classroom communication barriers could be explained through the attitude towards communication skills. The mathematical model was found to be significant at 0.05 level (F=9.308). A regression equation was also developed accordingly to predict the perception of classroom communication barriers from the attitude towards communication skills. This study may prove its importance to detect the existence of different classroom communication barriers among the students across different grade levels, and to find out ways to minimize these barriers by improving their communication skills.*

**KEYWORDS :** *Classroom Communication, Classroom Communication Barriers, Communication Skills, Attitude towards Communication Skills.*

**INTRODUCTION**

Communication is a complex process wherein information is shared between individuals through a common system of symbols, signs, and behaviour expressing feelings, ideas, views, opinions etc. (Behera & Tripathy, 2009). It is basically the act of transferring information from one place to another through vocal (using voice), written (using printed or digital media such as books, magazines, websites or emails), visual (using logos, maps, charts or graphs) or non-verbal (using body language, gestures, tone and pitch of voice) media (Botros, 2014). According to Kumar (1997), there are several elements of any communication process

_____
**Journal for all Subjects : www.lbp.world**

1

_____

which are: a) communication context (physical, social, psychological, temporal), b) source, c) receiver, d) message, e) symbol, f) channel, g) encoding, h) decoding, i) feedback, and j) noise.

Communication is a process of exchange, i.e., give and take of information by message or otherwise (Aggarwal, 2014). To the students, being able to communicate effectively is the most important of all life skills. It can help all aspects of their life, from their professional life to social life and everything in between. So, students are expected to communicate effectively with classmates, teachers and other staffs within their institutional set up in order to make their learning comprehensive and also to make their academic life smooth and successful.

## CLASSROOM COMMUNICATION AND THE BARRIERS

Classroom communication is the primary means by which the teacher and the students interact. In the words of Kieffer, R. E. & Cochran, L. W. (1966), "effective teaching and communications are synonymous, for good teachers are clear communicators and good communicators are effective teachers." Thus, good teaching and learning are both, in fact, is intercommunication. Good communication between teacher and students takes place when its context and the meaning are understood properly. Any difficulty which partly or fully prevents any activity at any stage of the communication process is called a barrier in communication (Roy & Guha, 2013). This poor (or ineffective or unsuccessful or failed) communication is caused by a large number of barriers. These communication barriers are negative and detrimental forces to create effective communication (Mangal & Mangal, 2009). The barriers to effective classroom communication generally fall into four categories (Kumar, 1997; Pathak & Chaudhary, 2012) which include: i) Physical Barriers (noise, invisibility, poor audibility, discomfort, distraction etc.), ii) Language Barriers (handicap in understanding verbalism, verbosity, unclear graphics & symbols, semantic problems etc.), iii) Background Barriers (poor background in previous learning, poor general knowledge about the content, lack of planning, cultural disparities etc.), and iv) Psychological Barriers (prejudices, disinterest, inattention, imperceptions, redundancy, dissatisfaction, anxiety, unfulfilled curiosity, insecurity, depression etc.).

## COMMUNICATION SKILLS

Good communication skills are one of the essential skills for both teachers and students at all levels. The teaching process involves constant transmission of ideas, thoughts, information, instruction, questions and responses between the teacher and the learners either by speech, writing or through signs. Unless the student has good skills in communicating, part or all of what he or she intends to receive may be lost on the way. How well this information can be transmitted and received is a measure of how good a student's communication skills are. Hence, communication skills are essential for teaching-learning process, and can be taught and learned. Development of effective communication skills is an important part of students' achievement in every aspect of the teaching process at all levels, beginning from the school and up to the university level, to become a successful professional in their life (Ihmeideh, Al-Omari & Al-Dababneh, 2010). The development of these skills enhances their potential as a socially responsible citizen.

Students face many classroom communication barriers at undergraduate level and which can affect proper teaching-learning situation severely. It can be assumed that proper development of communication skills can resolve this problem through partial reduction as well as large extent of removal of the communication barrier. Therefore, the present study attempts to find out also whether proper attitude towards development of communication skills is related to the reduction or removal of communication barriers among the undergraduate students of general degree colleges.

## REVIEW OF THE RELATED LITERATURE

A number of research works were found dealing with the attitudes towards learning communication skills and its correlates among the medical and dental students (Cleland, Foster & Moffat, 2005; Anvik et al., 2007; Fazel & Aghmolaei, 2011; Lumma-Sellenthin, 2012; Ullah, Barman & Rahim, 2012; Laurence et al., 2012; Shankar, Dubey, Balasubramanium & Dwivedi, 2013 etc.). Very few research works were available on

_____

_____

the school students' or college students' attitude towards learning communication skills. Iksan et al. (2012) measured the communication skills of university students and found that university students had achieved good communication skills. Ihmeideh, Al-Omari & Al-Dababneh (2010) also reported that the attitudes towards communication skills among university level student-teachers were high. They further reported that there were no significant differences between the students of class teachers and childhood teachers disciplines in their attitude toward communication skills, and senior students had high positive attitudes toward communication skills than sophomore and junior. Cleland, Foster & Moffat (2005) identified significant differences in attitudes to communication skills teaching by year of study and gender.

Frymer (2005) found that students' communication effectiveness was positively associated with positive learning outcome. Ismail & Idris (2009) found that effective classroom communication is important in ensuring that teaching take place. Osakwe (2009) observed a significant relationship between teachers' attitude, knowledge base, communication skill & effective classroom interaction. The authors through their research works established the importance of communication in teaching-learning process.

Very few research works were also available on the classroom communication barriers. Hallberg (2010) showed that communication barriers were caused because of not enough account was taken on both the individual's background. Collins (1997) suggested that emotional, psychological, practical and social factors inhibited pupils and thus formed barriers to communication. Ismail & Idris (2009) studied on the relationship between classroom communication and students' academic achievement and no significant effect was reported. Also, no significant difference was observed with respect to secondary level school students' gender and locality of residence (Roy & Guha, 2013). Collins (1997) mentioned that there emotional, psychological, practical and social factors inhibit pupils and thus form barriers to communication, and these should be removed to enable the students to play more active role in their own education. However, from the perspectives of the teachers, barriers were not raised due to the source of communication (teacher) but the problem lies with the other elements of the process like the classroom environment, the curriculum and the students (Pal, Halder & Guha, 2016).

The review of related literature revealed that though there are few studies available which were conducted on either students' attitude towards communication skills or occurrence of classroom communication barriers but no prominent research work is available so far on the influence of students' attitude towards learning communication skills on their perception of classroom communication barriers, and there seems to be little documentation about the same. Therefore, the present research work pertaining to the aforementioned subject and context is highly essential to understand the nature of relationship between these two variables and also the role of students' attitude towards learning communication skills to determine their perception of classroom communication barriers.

## OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY
1. To study the level of perceived classroom communication barriers existing among the undergraduate students of general degree colleges.
2. To study the level of attitude of the undergraduate students of general degree colleges towards communication skills.
3. To study the effect of gender, locality of college, subject stream and year of graduation classes on the perception of classroom communication barriers of the undergraduate students of general degree colleges and their attitude towards communication skills.
4. To study the effect of gender, locality of college, subject stream and year of graduation classes on the attitude of the undergraduate students of general degree colleges towards communication skills.
5. To find out the nature of relationship between the perception of classroom communication barriers of the undergraduate students of general degree colleges and their attitude towards communication skills.
6. To find out the contribution of the attitude of undergraduate students towards communication skills in determining their level of perception of classroom communication barriers.

_____

_____

## HYPOTHESES OF THE STUDY

$H_0 1$: There is no significant difference between male and female students of general degree colleges in relation to their perception of classroom communication barriers.

$H_0 2$: There is no significant difference between the students of general degree colleges of rural and urban areas in relation to their perception of classroom communication barriers.

$H_0 3$: There is no significant difference between the B.A. and B.Sc. students of general degree colleges in relation to their perception of communication barriers.

$H_0 4$: There is no significant difference among the $1^{st}$, $2^{nd}$ and $3^{rd}$ year students of general degree colleges in relation to their perception of classroom communication barriers.

$H_0 5$: There is no significant difference between the male and female students of general degree colleges in relation to their attitude towards communication skills.

$H_0 6$: There is no significant difference between the students of general degree colleges of rural and urban areas in relation to their attitude towards communication skills.

$H_0 7$: There is no significant difference between the B.A. and B.Sc. students of general degree colleges in relation to their attitude towards communication skills.

$H_0 8$: There is no significant difference between the $1^{st}$, $2^{nd}$ and $3^{rd}$ year students of general degree colleges in relation to their attitude towards communication skills.

$H_0 9$: There is no significant relationship between the attitude of the students of general degree colleges towards communication skills and their perception of physical classroom communication barriers.

$H_0 10$: There is no significant relationship between the attitude of the students of general degree colleges towards communication skills and their perception of language classroom communication barriers.

$H_0 11$: There is no significant relationship between the attitude of the students of general degree colleges towards communication skills and their perception of background classroom communication barriers.

$H_0 12$: There is no significant relationship between the attitude of the students of general degree colleges towards communication skills and their perception of psychological classroom communication barriers

$H_0 13$: There is no significant relationship between the attitude of the students of general degree colleges towards communication skills and their overall perception of classroom communication barriers.

## METHODOLOGY

### Population:

For the research work, the undergraduate students of general degree colleges under Vidyasagar University of West Bengal (i.e. general degree colleges of Purba Medinipur, Paschim Medinipur and Jhargram districts of West Bengal) were selected as the target population.

### Sample and Sampling:

Four general degree colleges under Vidyasagar University were selected randomly to collect data where the institutional authorities permitted the researchers to undertake the research work. 204 students (84 male and 115 female) from those colleges constituted the sample from both panchayat (126) and municipality (78) areas. Among those 204 students, 102 were from B.A. stream and rest 102 were from B.Sc. stream. The entire scheme of sampling is mentioned below (Table 1):

**Table 1: Sample categories and size**

| Categorical Variables | | No. of Individuals | Total Sample |
|---|---|---|---|
| Gender | Male | 89 | 204 |
| | Female | 115 | |
| Locality of college | Rural | 126 | 204 |
| | Urban | 78 | |

_____

_____

| Subject stream | B.A. | 102 | **204** |
|---|---|---|---|
| | B.Sc. | 102 | |
| **Year of graduation classes** | 1st year | 76 | **204** |
| | 2nd year | 58 | |
| | 3rd year | 70 | |

### Tools and Techniques of Data Collection

Two questionnaires, one for measurement of 'Perception of Classroom Communication Barriers', and another for 'Attitude towards Communication Skills' were utilized for data collection. One 30-item questionnaire was used to measure the 'Perception of Classroom Communication Barriers' which was originally developed by Roy & Guha (2013) with the reliability coefficient of 0.632 (Cronbach's Alpha). The scale used was Likert type (5 point scale). Both positive and negative statements were included.

The tool to measure the 'Attitude towards Communication Skills' was developed by the researchers with reference to the similar tool used by Rees, Sheard & Davies (2002). It was consisted of 20 items. The scale used was a 5 point Likert type scale. Both positive and negative statements were included. The questionnaires were distributed among the college students to collect their personal opinions regarding the topic. The validity of the items was ensured initially through a thorough checking of the items done by the experts with respect to the construction and meaning of the items. Then item-total correlation was also calculated (N=204) to check if any item is inconsistent with the averaged behaviour of the total score. All the items were found to be positively and significantly correlated with the total score at the 0.01 level (2-tailed) except the item number 4 (Table 2). But since the item number 4 was at least positively correlated with the total score (0.116), the researchers finally decided to retain that item. The Reliability of scale was determined through calculation of Cronbach's Alpha which was found to be 0.642 (N=204).

**Table 2: Item-Total Correlation for 'Attitude towards Communication Skills' Tool**

| | | Item Number | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | 01 | 02 | 03 | 04 | 05 | 06 | 07 | 08 | 09 | 10 |
| **Total Score** | **Pearson Correlation** | 0.286 | 0.422 | 0.347 | 0.116 | 0.402 | 0.384 | 0.416 | 0.422 | 0.383 | 0.231 |
| | **Sig. (2-tailed)** | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.098 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.001 |
| | | Item Number | | | | | | | | | |
| | | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 17 | 18 | 19 | 20 |
| **Total Score** | **Pearson Correlation** | 0.367 | 0.361 | 0.546 | 0.435 | 0.523 | 0.248 | 0.277 | 0.389 | 0.362 | 0.447 |
| | **Sig. (2-tailed)** | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 |

For scoring of the first questionnaire (Perception), numerical values were assigned to the five categories of the responses as: Always=5, Frequently=4, Sometimes=3, Rarely=2 and Never=1 for negative items, and reverse for positive items. Obtainment of high scores indicated the existence of high level of classroom communication barriers as perceived by the undergraduate students of general degree colleges and vice versa. For scoring of the second questionnaire (Attitude), numerical values were assigned to the five categories of the responses as: Strongly Agree=5, Agree=4, Neutral=3, Disagree=2 and Strongly Disagree=1 for positive items, and reverse for negative items. Obtainment of high scores indicated high degree of attitude of the undergraduate students of general degree colleges towards communication skills and vice versa.

Descriptive survey method was employed to collect necessary data. Descriptive statistics were conducted to understand the nature of distribution of the scores across the variables. The hypotheses formed earlier were tested through independent samples t-test, One-way ANOVA and Pearson Product-Moment Correlation by using IBM SPSS Statistics 22.0 software. Also, Linear Regression was conducted to determine the relative contribution of undergraduate students' attitude towards communication skills to predict their perception of classroom communication barriers.

_____

## DATA ANALYSIS & INTERPRETATION
### Descriptive Statistics:

**Table 3: Descriptive Statistics for the Scores on 'Perception of Classroom Communication Barriers'**

| Perception of Classroom Communication Barriers | N | Range | Mean | Std. Error of mean | Std. Deviation |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 204 | 63.0 | 63.324 | 0.6219 | 8.8831 |

From the descriptive statistics of the 'Perception of Classroom Communication Barriers' (Table 3), it can be observed that the mean score is 63.324 with standard deviation of 8.8831. Here, the mean score is calculated out of maximum possible total score of 150 (30×5) taking all questionnaire items together, indicating the existence of a level of perception of classroom communication barriers among undergraduate students which is moderate to low.

**Table 4: Descriptive Statistics for the Scores on 'Attitude towards Communication Skills'**

| Attitude towards Communication Skills | N | Range | Mean | Std. Error of mean | Std. Deviation |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 204 | 47.0 | 79.108 | 0.4860 | 6.9416 |

The descriptive statistics of the 'Attitude towards Communication Skills' (Table 4) shows that the mean score is 79.108 with standard deviation of 6.9416. Here, the mean score is calculated out of maximum possible total score of 100 (20×5) taking all questionnaire items together, which indicates the existence of strong positive attitude towards communication skills among undergraduate students.

### Testing of $H_0 1$:

**Table 5: Result of Independent Samples T-Test for Testing $H_0 1$**

| | Test variable | Groups | N | Mean | S.D. | df | t | Sig. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| $H_0 1$ | Perception of Classroom Communication Barriers | Male | 204 | 64.517 | 10.2238 | 202 | $1.696^{NS}$ | 0.091 |
| | | Female | | 62.400 | 7.6063 | | | |

$^{NS}$ = Not significant at 0.05 level

In the Table 5, the result of independent samples t-test reveals that the calculated t value for $H_0 1$ is not significant at 0.05 level ($t_{202}=1.696$, P=0.091). So, the null hypothesis is not rejected; there is no significant difference between the male and female students of general degree colleges with respect to their perception of classroom communication barriers.

### Testing of $H_0 2$:

**Table 6: Result of Independent Samples T-Test for Testing $H_0 2$**

| | Test variable | Groups | N | Mean | S.D. | df | t | Sig. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| $H_0 2$ | Perception of Classroom Communication Barriers | Rural | 204 | 62.016 | 8.6042 | 202 | -2.714* | 0.007 |
| | | Urban | | 65.436 | 8.974 | | | |

*= Significant at 0.05 level

In the Table 6, the result of independent samples t-test reveals that the calculated t value for $H_0 2$ is significant at 0.05 level ($t_{202}=-2.714$, P=0.007). So, the null hypothesis is rejected; there exists significant difference between the rural and urban students of general degree colleges with respect to their perception of classroom communication barriers.

**Testing of $H_0 3$:**

**Table 7: Result of Independent Samples T-Test for Testing $H_0 3$**

|  | Test variable | Groups | N | Mean | S.D. | df | t | Sig. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| $H_0 3$ | Perception of Classroom Communication Barriers | B.A. | 204 | 63.716 | 9.8316 | 202 | $0.630^{NS}$ | 0.530 |
|  |  | B.Sc. |  | 62.931 | 7.8504 |  |  |  |

$^{NS}$ = Not significant at 0.05 level

From the Table 7, it can be observed that the calculated t value for $H_0 3$ is not significant at 0.05 level ($t_{202}$=0.630, P=0.530). So, the null hypothesis is not rejected; there is no significant difference between B.A. and B.Sc. students of general degree colleges with respect to their perception of classroom communication barriers.

**Testing of $H_0 4$:**

**Table 8: Result of One-Way ANOVA for Testing $H_0 4$**

|  | Test variable | Groups | N | Mean | S.D. | df | F | Sig. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| $H_0 4$ | Perception of Classroom Communication Barriers | 1st year | 204 | 63.355 | 0.8286 | 203 | $0.345^{NS}$ | 0.708 |
|  |  | 2nd year |  | 62.586 | 1.2520 |  |  |  |
|  |  | 3rd year |  | 63.900 | 1.1925 |  |  |  |

$^{NS}$ = Not significant at 0.05 level

In the Table 8, the result of one-way ANOVA shows that the calculated F value for $H_0 4$ is not significant at 0.05 level ($F_{203}$=0.345, P=0.708). So, the null hypothesis is not rejected; there is no significant difference among 1st, 2nd and 3rd year students of general degree colleges with respect to their perception of classroom communication barriers.

**Testing of $H_0 5$:**

**Table 9: Result of Independent Samples T-Test for Testing $H_0 5$**

|  | Test variable | Groups | N | Mean | S.D. | df | t | Sig. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| $H_0 5$ | Attitude towards Communication Skills | Male | 204 | 77.618 | 7.8675 | 202 | -2.740* | 0.007 |
|  |  | Female |  | 80.261 | 5.9118 |  |  |  |

*= Significant at 0.05 level

In the Table 9, the result of independent samples t-test reveals that the calculated t value for $H_0 5$ is significant at 0.05 level ($t_{202}$=-2.740, P=0.007). So, the null hypothesis is rejected; there exists significant difference between male and female students of general degree colleges with respect to their attitude towards communication skills.

**Testing of $H_0 6$:**

**Table 10: Result of Independent Samples T-Test for Testing $H_0 6$**

|  | Test variable | Groups | N | Mean | S.D. | df | t | Sig. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| $H_0 6$ | Attitude towards Communication Skills | Rural | 204 | 79.770 | 7.0497 | 202 | $1.740^{NS}$ | 0.083 |
|  |  | Urban |  | 78.038 | 6.6693 |  |  |  |

$^{NS}$ = Not significant at 0.05 level

In the Table 10, the result of independent samples t-test reveals that the calculated t value for $H_0 6$ is not significant at 0.05 level ($t_{202}$=1.740, P=0.083). So, the null hypothesis is not rejected; there is no

_____

_____

significant difference between rural and urban students of general degree colleges with respect to their attitude towards communication skills.

**Testing of $H_0 7$:**

**Table 11:  Result of Independent Samples T-Test for Testing $H_0 7$**

|  | Test variable | Groups | N | Mean | S.D. | df | t | Sig. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| $H_0 7$ | Attitude towards Communication Skills | B.A. | 204 | 79.480 | 6.9063 | 202 | 0.766[NS] | 0.445 |
|  |  | B.Sc. |  | 78.735 | 6.9907 |  |  |  |

[NS] = Not significant at 0.05 level

From the Table 11, it can be observed that the calculated t value for $H_0 7$ is not significant at 0.05 level ($t_{202}$=0.766, P=0.445). So, the null hypothesis is not rejected; there is no significant difference between B.A. and B.Sc. students of general degree colleges with respect to their attitude towards communication skills.

**Testing of $H_0 8$:**

**Table 12:  Result of One-Way ANOVA for Testing $H_0 8$**

|  | Test variable | Groups | N | Mean | S.D. | df | F | Sig. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| $H_0 8$ | Attitude towards Communication Skills | 1st year | 204 | 80.313 | 5.5293 | 203 | 2.616[NS] | 0.076 |
|  |  | 2nd year |  | 77.983 | 7.5195 |  |  |  |
|  |  | 3rd year |  | 78.514 | 7.6305 |  |  |  |

[NS] = Not significant at 0.05 level

In the Table 12, the result of one-way ANOVA shows that the calculated F value for $H_0 8$ is not significant at 0.05 level ($F_{203}$=2.616, P=0.076). So, the null hypothesis is not rejected; there is no significant difference among 1st, 2nd and 3rd year students of general degree colleges with respect to their attitude towards communication skills.

**Testing of $H_0 9 – H_0 13$:**

**Table 13: Pearson Product Moment Correlation between the Perception of Classroom Communication Barriers and Attitude towards Communication Skills (N=204)**

|  |  | Attitude towards Communication Skills |
|---|---|---|
| Perception of Physical Barriers | Pearson Correlation | -0.271[**] |
|  | Sig. (2-tailed) | 0.000 |
| Perception of Language Barriers | Pearson Correlation | 0.039 |
|  | Sig. (2-tailed) | 0.578 |
| Perception of Background Barriers | Pearson Correlation | 0.085 |
|  | Sig. (2-tailed) | 0.228 |
| Perception of Psychological Barriers | Pearson Correlation | -0.251[**] |
|  | Sig. (2-tailed) | 0.000 |
| Perception of Classroom Communication Barriers (Total) | Pearson Correlation | -0.210[**] |
|  | Sig. (2-tailed) | 0.003 |

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed)

The coefficients of correlation between the undergraduate students' perception of different categories of classroom communication barriers and their attitude towards communication skills are calculated as -0.271, 0.039, 0.085 and -0.251 for the perception of physical, language, background and psychological barriers respectively (Table 13). Of these, the coefficients for the perception of physical and psychological barriers (-0.271 and -0.251) are observed to be significant at 0.01 level; and thereby the null

_____

_____

hypotheses $H_0 9$ and $H_0 12$ are rejected. The relationship in both the cases is detected as 'negative' and 'low correlation; present but slight' (r ranges from 0.20 to ±0.40) (after Garrett, 1966). So, in case of undergraduate students, with increase in the level of attitude towards communication skills, a decrease in the perception of physical and psychological classroom communication barriers can be observed and vice versa. However, the other two coefficients for the perception of language and background barriers (0.039 and 0.085) are not significant at 0.01 level. Therefore, the null hypotheses $H_0 10$ and $H_0 11$ cannot be rejected; there is only 'indifferent or negligible relationship' (r ranges from 0.00 to ±0.20) (after Garrett, 1966) between the undergraduate students' perception of language barriers as well as background barriers and their attitude towards communication skills.

In case of the correlation between overall perception of classroom communication barriers and attitude towards communication skills, the coefficient of correlation is calculated as -0.210 (Table 13) which is significant at 0.01 level. It indicates that the undergraduate students' perception of overall classroom communication barriers and their attitude towards communication skills are significantly related. Therefore, the null hypothesis $H_0 13$ is rejected. The relationship between total perception of classroom communication barriers and attitude towards communication skills is detected as 'negative' and 'low correlation; present but slight' (r ranges from 0.20 to ±0.40) (after Garrett, 1966). The result indicates that in case of undergraduate students, with increase in the level of attitude towards communication skills, a decrease in the overall perception of classroom communication barriers will be observed and vice versa.

**Linear Regression & Prediction of Perception of Classroom Communication Barriers from Attitude towards Communication Skills:**

**Table 14: Model Summary (Dependent Variable: Perception of Classroom Communication Barriers)**

| Model | R | R Square | Adjusted R Square | Std. Error of the Estimate |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | .210[a] | 0.044 | 0.039 | 8.707 |

a. Predictors: (Constant), Attitude towards Communication Skills

The model summary (Table 14) indicates that the amount of change in the perception of classroom communication barriers can be determined by the attitude towards communication skills. The R square value (0.044) indicates that 4.4% (0.044×100) of the variance in an undergraduate student's perception of classroom communication barriers (dependent variable) can be explained by their attitude towards communication skills (independent variable).

**Table 15: Result of ANOVA (Dependent Variable: Perception of Classroom Communication Barriers)**

| Model | | Sum of Squares | df | Mean Square | F | Sig. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | Regression | 705.583 | 1 | 705.583 | 9.308[b] | 0.003[a] |
| | Residual | 15313.064 | 202 | 75.807 | | |
| | Total | 16018.647 | 203 | | | |

a. Predictors: (Constant), Attitude towards Communication Skills
b. Significant at 0.05 level

The ANOVA table (Table 15) indicates that the regression model that is run can accurately explain the variation in the dependent variable (i.e., it is a good fit for the data). The value of F (F=9.308, P=0.003) provides evidence that the changes in the attitude towards communication skills results in the significant changes in perception of classroom communication barriers.

_____

_____

**Table 16: Coefficients of Linear Regression**
**(Dependent Variable: Perception of Classroom Communication Barriers)**

| Model | | Unstandardized Coefficients | | Standardized Coefficients | t | Sig. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | B | Std. Error | Beta | | |
| 1 | (Constant) | 84.570 | 6.991 | | 12.097 | 0.000 |
| | Attitude towards Communication Skills | -0.269 | 0.088 | -0.210 | -3.051 | 0.003 |

From the Table 16, the intercept (constant) is determined as 84.570. The value -0.269 represents the slope for the attitude towards communication skills. Attitude towards communication skills contributes significantly to the model (P=0.003). Substituting the regression coefficients (i.e. the slope and the intercept) into the equation Y=a+bX, the following regression equation can be developed:

**Perception of Classroom Communication Barriers = 84.570 + (–0.269 × Attitude towards Communication Skills)**
**OR**
**Perception of Classroom Communication Barriers = 84.570 – (0.269 × Attitude towards Communication Skills)**

Through the data analysis, it was observed that the undergraduate students' perceived communication barriers in their classroom did not differ significantly with respect to gender, subject stream or graduation class year. But it differed significantly with respect to the locality of college. On the other hand, the undergraduate students' attitude towards communication skills did not differ significantly with respect to locality of college, subject stream or graduation class year. But it differed significantly with respect to the gender. It was shown that the undergraduate students' perception of physical, psychological and total classroom communication barriers are significantly and negatively correlated (r= -0.271, -0.251 and -0.210 respectively) to their attitude towards communication skills. From the results, it also can be said that the development of positive attitude towards communication skills among the students can act as a significant factor ($F_{203}$=9.308) in removing at least some categories of classroom communication barriers existing in any teaching-learning process.

**CONCLUSION**

In classroom situation, a gap in meaning between the intended and the received message (distorted) can cause serious problems in the learning outcome of the students even if the teaching-learning system is properly organised. So, in order to become effective communicators, the educators must be aware of the potential problems in communication (like poor listening skills, ambiguous use of verbal and nonverbal language, poor semantics etc.) and consciously work to eliminate them from their classroom interactions during teaching (Akpinar, 2009). Also, the strategies adopted in the teaching-learning process should not reflect the barrier-caused limitations (Isman, Dabaj, Altinay & Altinay, 2003). Development of positive attitude towards communication skills may help in removing classroom communication barriers in certain aspects (physical and psychological barriers) as reflected from the study. This helps the students to learn new subject matter more quickly and effectively which is highly required in this era of globalization. Also it helps in achieving quality education in the traditional classrooms of India minimizing diverse educational issues and problems like overpopulated classroom, inadequate infrastructural facilities, outdated teaching methods, cultural diversities, gender biasness etc. For this, communication skills development programmes can be organized for both the teachers and the students by the institutions as well as the Government. This may lead to better communication in the classroom resulting into better achievement and better job prospects. The classroom communication will be more scientific and meaningful, the teaching-leaning system will be improved and the society will be benefitted at large.

_____

_____

The present study may prove its importance to detect the existence of different classroom communication barriers among the students across different grade levels (from the school level up to university level), and to find out various ways to minimize these barriers by improving their communication skills. Further studies can be conducted considering the wide area for survey. Also, empirical studies like the impact of perception of classroom communication barriers and attitude towards communication skills on the students' achievement of educational and instructional objectives can also be initiated in terms of further research activities.

## REFERENCES

Aggarwal, J. C. (2014). *Essentials of educational technology* (3rd ed.)*.* Noida: Vikas Publishing House Pvt. Ltd.

Akpinar, K. D. (2009). Developing communication skills of EFL teacher trainees. *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies, 5*(1), 110-126.

Anvik, T., Gude, T., Grimstad, H., Baerheim, A., Fasmer, O. B., Hjortdahl, P., … & Per Vaglum, P. (2007). Assessing medical students' attitudes towards learning communication skills – which components of attitudes do we measure? *BMC Medical Education*, *7*(4). Retrieved from https://bmcmededuc.biomedcentral.com/ articles/10.1186/1472-6920-7-4.

Behera, A. K., & Tripathy, B. K. (2009). Barriers to effective communication and how to overcome them. *Academe, 13*(1), 14-15.

Botros, S. (2014). *Communication skills introduction*. United States: CreateSpace Independent Publishing Platform.

Cleland, J., Foster, K., & Moffat, M. (2005). Undergraduate students' attitudes to communication skills learning differ depending on year of study and gender. *Medical Teacher*, *27*(3), 246-251.

Collins, J. (1997). *Barriers to communication in schools*. Paper presented at the British Educational Research Association Annual Conference, University of York. Retrieved from http://www.leeds.ac.uk/educol/documents/000000331.htm.

Fazel, I., & Aghamoaei, T. (2011). Attitudes toward learning communication skills among medical student of an university in Iran. *Acta Medica Iramica, 49*(9), 625-629.

Frymier, A. B. (2005). Students' classroom communication effectiveness. *Journal of Communication Quarterly, 53*(2), 197-212.

Garrett, H. E. (1966). *Statistics in psychology and education*. New Delhi: Paragon International Publishers.

Hallberg, D. (2010). Socioculture and cognitivist perspectives on language and communication barrier in learning. *International Journal of Human and Social Science, 5*(8), 533-539.

Ihmeideh, F. M., AL-Omari, A. A., & AL-Dababneh, K. A. (2010). Attitudes toward communication skills among students-teachers in Jordanian Public University. *Australian Journal of Teacher Education, 35*(4), 1-11.

Iksan, Z.H., Zakaria, E., Meerah, T. S. M., Osman, K., Lian, D. K. C., Mahmud, S. N. D. & Krish, P. (2012). Communication skills among university students. *Procedia- Social and Behavioral Sciences, 59,* 71-76.

Ismail, N., & Idris, K. N. (2009). The effects of classroom communication on students' academic performance at the International Islamic University Malaysia (IIUM). *Unitar E-Journal, 5*(1), 37-42.

Isman, A., Dabaj, F., Altinay, F., & Altinay, Z. (2003). Communication barriers in distance education. *The Turkish Online Journal of Educational Technology, 2*(4). Retrieved from https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED495703.pdf.

Kieffer, R. E., & Cochran, L. W. (1966). *Manual of audiovisual techniques*. New Delhi: Prentice Hall.

Kumar, K. L. (1997). *Educational technology* (Rev. ed.)*.* New Delhi: New Age International (P) Limited, Publishers.

Laurence, B., Bertera, E. M., Feimster, T., Hollander, R., & Stroman, C. (2012). Adaptation of the Communication Skills Attitude Scale (CSAS) to dental students. *Journal of Dental Education, 76*(12), 1629-1638.

_____

_____

Lumma-Sellenthin, A. (2012). Students' attitudes towards learning communication skills: Correlating attitudes, demographic and metacognitive variables. *International Journal of Medical Education, 3,* 201-208.

Mangal, S. K. & Mangal, U. (2013). *Essentials of education technology.* Delhi: PHI Learning Private Limited.

Osakwe, R. N. (2009). Dimension of communication as predictore of effective classroom interaction. *Stud Home Comm Sci., 3*(1), 57-61.

Pal, N., Halder, S., & Guha, A. (2016). Study on communication barriers in the classroom: A teacher's perspective. *Online Journal of Communication and Media Technologies, 6*(1). Retrieved from http://www.ojcmt.net/download/study-on-communication-barriers-in-the-classroom-a-teachers-perspective.pdf

Pathak, R. P., & Chaudhary, J. (2012). *Educational technology.* New Delhi: Dorling Kindersley (India) Pvt. Ltd.

Rees, C., Sheard, C., & Davies, S. (2002). The development of a scale to measure medical students' attitudes towards communication skills learning: The Communication Skills Attitude Scale (CSAS). *Medical Education, 36*(2), 141-147.

Roy, S. C., & Guha, A. (2013). A study on the existence of classroom communication barriers and the comparison of experiences of secondary students facing the communication barriers. *Proceedings of UGC Sponsored National Seminar-Cum-Workshop on Teaching Learning Strategies in 21st Century Classrooms*, 48-53.

Sankar, P. R., Dubey, A. K., Balasbramanium, R., & Dwivedi, N. R. (2013). Student attitude towards communication skills learning in a Caribbean medical school. *Australasian Medical Journal, 6*(9), 466-475.

Ullah, A., Barman, A., & Rahim, A. F. A. (2012). Validity of communication skills attitude scale among Malaysian medical students. *South East Asian Journal of Medical Education, 6*(1), 1-13.

_____