Examining Primary School Administrators' According to the Perceptions of Teachers and Administrators

Hasan Basri Memduhoğlu [1]

Abstract

The aim of this study is to determine the perceptions of teachers and administrators who are currently employed in primary schools regarding to communication skills of administrators in their schools. A total of 393 primary school teachers and administrators employed in Bitlis city centrum and tatvan district participated in this survey model research. The research data were obtained from Primary School Administrators' Interpersonal Communication Skills Scale that was developed by Şahin (2007). In this research these main results were obtained: administrators have a moderate level of emphatic listening and effectiveness skills. Administrators give feedbacks at a moderate level in the process of communication. However, they give a high confidence in communication process. Perception of attendees does not vary according to their genders, branch and precedence while it varies significantly up to attendees' title.

Introduction

There is no individual or institution without a need for communication within a social structure because communication is a bridge for mutual understanding, and the establishment and progress of interpersonal relationships (Thomson, 2011; Geçimli, 2007; Pondy, 1992). A human community is not a collection of separate individuals but a community of individuals in interaction. If human beings are deprived of socialization effect of communication, they are to remain biologically human but are bound to exist intellectually subhuman (Bilgiç, 2006).

Communication, mentioned as the speaker, speech and the listener in Aristotle's "Rhetoric", is a process which basically takes place between the source and the receiver. If the source intends to share his own opinion or related behaviors with the receiver, he first changes his intention into a message through various symbols and then sends the message to at least one of the receiver's sense organs with the help of a tool or a method. The receiver gets the message and sends it back to the source as feedback through behavior (Başarı, 2007; Akyol, 1986; Nural, 2006; Efiloğlu, 2006; Gibson, Ivancevich and Donelly, 1994).

The role and importance of communication is great in organizations where individuals are together. Organizational communication is a social process which enables a constant exchange of information and views between different organizational units and members and between organizations and surroundings or the establishment of necessary relationships between departments

---

[1] Yüzüncü Yıl University, Faculty of Education, Department of Educational Sciences, Turkey, hasanmemduhoglu@gmail.com

in order to carry out organizational functions and attain organizational goals (Goldhaber, 1990; Cited by Kurt, 2004).

Organizational communication, which is exchange of messages between organizational members and groups to attain organizational goals (Cansu, 2006), contributes to proper fundamental management functioning. In organizational management, communication is considered as the most significant management tool in order to carry out management functions such as planning, coordination, decision making, motivation and supervision (Covington, Erchul, Hughes ve Meyers, 1995; Erbaş, 2008).

Organizational communication process is divided into two main groups: structurally formal (procedural) and structurally informal (non-procedural). Both formal and informal communication tools are indispensible parts of organizational communication and organizational culture (Cansu, 2006). Formal communication, which is related to hierarchical authority structures in organizations, reveals how to establish communication. There are four-way communication channels: downward, upward, horizontal and matrix communication channels (Bolatkıran, 2006). For effective communication in schools, it is particularly important to keep horizontal communication channel open because in horizontal communication, it is highlighted that views and suggestions should be taken into account without reference to orders or enforcements caused by superior-subordinate relationships (Nural, 2006; Akın, 1998).

Informal communication, which appears in cases of lacking formal organizational structures in order to meet natural needs of organizational members, is not based on procedural regulations. No matter how well formal communication channels function, there is inevitably an informal communication system caused by shared interests, friendship and task delegation (Henry, 1973; Cited by Akbaş, 2008). Informal communication is an indispensible part of good organizational communication.

Communication networks in organizations aim at information flow to employees during decision implementation and envisaged strategy implementation (Andrews, 1989). Moreover, they have multidimensional effects such as adapting psychological conditions of employees to organizational goals, manipulating employee preferences and behaviors, convincing employees of the target goal attainment, and ensuring employee motivation for specified organizational goals (Cansu, 2006). In this context, organizational communication is a rather important factor for effective and productive organizational management. Research has shown that communication is the most significant factor which plays an important role in organizational motivation (Akbaş, 2008), organizational commitment (Başyigit, 2006; Erbaş, 2008), better functioning of organizational procedures (Covington, Erchul, Hughes and Meyers, 1995), creativity of organizational members and the overall organizational achievement (Yalçınkaya, 2007) and concluded that productivity and quality decrease when there is poor communication between employees (Akbaş, 2008).

Role of communication in educational organizations where human beings are in the centre as both input and output unlike other organizations cannot be denied as it enables people to act together and understand one another. In educational organizations, goal achievement is difficult without communication since coordination, cooperation and exchange of information all depend on communication. Organizational administrators and employees generally spend three fourths of their time dealing with interpersonal happenings and various types of communication (Baker, 2011). Therefore, communication practices and technologies have become crucial in organizations (Wertheim, 2011).

As necessary, data gathering in administrative decision making process, decision monitoring and output performance assessment, organizational commitment, motivation and creativity of employees and the overall organizational achievement depend on effective communication (Payne, 2005; Bolatkıran, 2006; Dirim, 1997; Başyigit, 2006; Yalçınkaya, 2007; Akbaş, 2008), it is essential to

know what skills are needed for effectiveness. In this context, some of the required communication skills of administrators might be listed as below:

Empathic Listening: Listening forms almost half of mutual communication (Green, 2007). Empathic listening is fundamentally based on an effort to understand the other's thoughts and feelings (Tuna, 2008). Empathic listeners can intuit the other person's intentions, needs (Sayers, Bıngaman, Graham and Wheeler, 1993) and feelings which are not uttered (Canova, 2011). Accordingly, emphatic communication is receiver centered rather than message centered (Kurt, 2004). As a result, one of the basic requirements of benevolent administration is good emphatic listening skills (Sims, 2002).

Effective Talk and Persuasion: Persuasion and influence is the process of deliberate manipulation of other people's views, attitudes and behaviors (Demir, 2003). Organizational Communication aims at manipulation of employee views, attitudes and behaviors, as well (Nelson and Quick, 1995; Thomson, 2011). To this end, it is necessary to strengthen persuasion by avoiding a complicated, technical language and using a clear language and visual materials (Pehlivanloğlu, 2006).

Feedback Giving: Feedback is the process of responding to the received message (Uysal, 2003). Organizational administrators find out organziational functioning and outcomes through feedback. Feedback process facilitates the receiver's understanding of the message content and increases effectiveness of communication (Melcher ve Beller, 1967).

Reassurance: Outcome acceptance by the receiver depends to a certain extent on the receiver's perception of source reliability. Source reliability is not a constant feature of a given source, but a feature attributed to the source by the receiver. For administrators, a sustainable climate of reliability is as crucial as the establishment of such an organizational climate because it only takes moments to destroy the long-established reliability (Newstrom and Davis, 1997).

Research has shown that the above listed management skills positively affect administrative activities and it is more difficult to attain organizational goals under the supervision of administrators who lack such skills (Dirim, 1997; Bolatkıran, 2006; Başyigit, 2006; Yalçınkaya, 2007; Akbaş, 2008). In this respect, it is important to explore to what extent school administrators have communication skills and how communication process applies in schools as human centered organizations.

Purpose
The purpose of the study was to explore primary school administrators' interpersonal communication skills as perceived by teachers and administrators.

Method

Research Design, Population and Sample

A survey research methodology was employed in the study. Primary school administrators and teachers in Tatvan districtand Bitlis province (a town in eastern part of Turkey) were included in the target population of the research. The sample consisted of 393 primary school teachers and administrators from schools in Tatvan district and in Bitlis province. Sample was determined as proportional stratified sampling technique and random sampling. The proportion of the number of the primary school teachers and administrators from the schools and provincial schools to the total target population was taken into account in the distribution of the sample. Accordingly, questionnaire was applied to all accessible administrators   and teachers in 18 schools. Also, the schools where the participants worked were carefully selected to have different socio-economic features and surroundings of different development levels. The teachers' and the administrators' personal data on gender, position, branch and seniority is presented in Table 1.

Table 1. Findings of Personal Variables

Variables	Level	N	Percentage (%)
Gender	Female	176	44,8
	Male	217	55,2
Position	Administrator	37	9,4
	Teacher	356	90,6
Branch	Classroom	206	52,4
	Branch	187	47,6
Seniority	1-3 years	151	38,4
	4-6 years	130	33,1
	7-9 years	49	12,5
	10 years and above	63	16,0
	Total	393	100

Data Gathering and Data Analysis

"The Scale of Primary School Administrators' Interpersonal Communication Skills", designed by Şahin (2007) to explore primary school administrators' interpersonal communication skills, was used to gather data.. In the scale, KMO value was found .909 and Bartlett's Test of Sphericity significance value was found .000. As a result of factor analysis, it was concluded that load factor values of the items ranged from 0.56 to 0.84 for the scale which consisted of the following four factors: "Empathic listening", "effectiveness", "feedback giving" and "reassurance". The percentage of total explained variance by the four factors was found 68.37, and Alpha reliability coefficient of the measurement tool was found .96.

Parametric tests (t- test, Anova) were used when normality and homogeneity tests results supply assumptions in gap analysing concerning personal variables and descriptive statistics (frequency, ratio, arithmetic mean, standard deviation). If normality and homogeneity test results do not supply assumptions, nonparametric tests (Mann Whitney U) were used.   Criteria in Table 2 were the basis for the finding evaluation.

Table 2. Evaluation Range of Arithmetic Means

Aralık	Option	Range Value	Evaluation
1,00-1,80	Never	Very Negative	Poor
1,81-2,60	Rarely	Negative	Low Level
2,61-3,40	Sometimes	Moderate	Moderate Level
3,41-4,20	Often	Positive	High Level
4,21-5,00	Always	Highly Positive	Very High Level

Findings

Findings of Communication Skill Factors
Descriptive statistics of schools administrators communication skills are presented in Table 3.

When Table 3 is examined, it is seen that the school administrators "sometimes" ($\overline{X}$=3, 33) displayed "empathic listening" ($\overline{X}$=3,36), "effectiveness" ($\overline{X}$=3,36) and "feedback giving" ($\overline{X}$ $\overline{X}$=3,33) behaviors, whereas they "often" ($\overline{X}$=3.63) displayed "reassurance". Accordingly, it is clear from the study that the statements in reassurance were agreed most but those in feedback giving were agreed the least.

Table 3. Descriptive Statistics of Participant Views and Item Agreement Ranking For Factors

	School administrators;	$\overline{X}$	S	Agreement Ranking
Empathic Dinleme	are enthusiastic to listen to teachers however significant the matter is.	3,93	1,06	1
	are careful about consistent verbal and non-verbal messages in interactions with teachers.	3,56	1,08	3
	are aware of personal traits that might affect teachers' behaviors.	3,37	1,23	4
	anticipate teachers' responses in communication process.	3,32	1,09	6
	are enthusiastic to communicate with teachers in order to get to know them.	3,25	1,19	7
	try to understand reasons underlying teachers' attitudes and behaviors.	3,09	1,16	11
	make teachers feel they consider teachers' social, economic and cultural differences in administrator-teacher relationships.	3,18	1,19	8
	are enthusiastic to share their own feelings with teachers.	3,13	1,24	10
	think before they give an instant respond to what teachers say.	3,15	1,3	9
	make eye contact with teachers when they listen.	3,66	1,1	2
	try to understand teachers' feelings and opinions.	3,34	1,29	5
	Total	**3,36**	**1,18**	
Effectiveness	are careful about accurate data exploration for intended messages.	3,47	1,07	3
	are enthusiastic to resolve teachers' problems about messages.	3,42	1,16	4
	make teachers feel that they know what is being discussed.	3,58	1,05	1
	are careful to build communication to highlight teachers' skills and strengths.	3,20	1,16	8
	are creative when they use the available materials to give messages.	3,03	1,16	9
	are careful to consider facts when they give messages.	3,56	1,06	2
	are careful to provide teachers with opportunities to express themselves.	3,38	1,23	5
	are careful to involve all teachers in communication process.	3,35	1,18	6
	try to avoid clichés which could provoke negative feelings and thoughts.	3,22	1,25	7
	Total	**3,36**	**1,15**	
Feedback Giving	watch teachers' gestures and mimics of comprehension when they give feedback.	3,39	1,08	1
	try to give examples for a good understanding when they give feedback.	3,39	1,03	2
	are careful to give suitable feedback in terms of quality, time and place.	3,35	1,10	5
	are aware of the effects of their body language and behaviors when they communicate with teachers.	3,31	1,13	7
	make teachers feel that they sincerely give feedback.	3,36	1,14	4
	are careful to use their body language as a reinforcer when they communicate with teachers.	3,25	1,11	8
	are enthusiastic to give teachers feedback for matters under discussion.	3,34	1,11	6
	are careful to give detailed feedback.	3,18	1,03	9
	try to use both verbal and non-verbal communication methods when they give feedback.	3,37	1,08	3
	Total	**3,33**	**1,09**	
Reassurance	show sincere feelings in communication.	3,69	1,12	3
	keep their promises.	3,69	1,06	2
	frankly express their own personal and professional opinions when needed.	3,74	1,03	1
	consider individual differences when they give feedback.	3,40	1,11	4
	Total	**3,63**	**1,08**	
	Grand Total	**3,38**	**28.89**	

In empathic listening, it was clear that the school administrators often displayed the following behaviors: School administrators are enthusiastic to listen to teachers however significant the matter is ($\overline{X}$=3,93) and school administrators make eye contact with teachers ($\overline{X}$=3,66). However, they moderately (sometimes) displayed the following behaviors: School administrators try to understand reasons underlying teachers' attitudes and behaviors ($\overline{X}$=3,09)and school administrators are enthusiastic to share their own feelings with teachers ($\overline{X}$=3,13). When emphatic listening was overall assessed, it was obvious that the school administrators' emphatic listening skills were moderate ($\overline{X}$=3,36).

In effectiveness, it was concluded that creativity ($\overline{X}$=3,03) was the least observed ability when the school administrators used the available materials to give messages, when compared to the other skills. The most and frequently displayed behavior in this factor was as follows: School administrators make teachers feel that they know what is being discussed ($\overline{X}$=3,58). When effectiveness was overall assessed, it was obvious that the school administrators' effectiveness was moderate ($\overline{X}$=3,36).

In feedback giving, the most frequently observed and almost positively displayed behaviors were as follows: School administrators watch teachers' gestures and mimics of comprehension when they give feedback ($\overline{X}$=3,39) and school administrators give examples for a good understanding when they give feedback ($\overline{X}$=3,39). The least frequent behavior was as follows: School administrators are careful to give detailed feedback ($\overline{X}$=3,18). When feedback giving was overall assessed, it was obvious that the school administrators' feedback giving skills were moderate ($\overline{X}$=3,33).

In reassurance, the followings were the frequently and positively displayed behaviors: School administrators frankly express their own personal and professional opinions when needed ($\overline{X}$=3,73) and school administrators keep their promises in communication ($\overline{X}$=3,69). When Reassurance was overall assessed, it was obvious that the school administrators' reassurance was high and positive ($\overline{X}$=3,63).

When the total scale score was examined, it was seen that the school administrators moderately had positive communication skills and "sometimes" ($\overline{X}$=3,38) displayed such behaviors.

Findings of Branch and Gender
T-test was applied to explore whether the participants' views varied according to branch and gender and the results are presented in Table 4.

Table 4. T-Test Results of Gender and Branch

Variables	N	$\overline{X}$	S	df	t	p
Female	176	108,7159	30,80926	391	-1,824	,069
Male	217	114,0461	27,07872			
Classroom	206	112,5874	29,24980	391	,668	,504
Branch	187	110,6364	28,53928			

As it is clear from Table 4, there was not a significant difference between the participants' views about school administrators' communication skills according to gender [$t_{(391)}$ = -1,824; p > 0.5] and branch [$t_{(391)}$ = 0,688; P > 0,5].

Findings of Position
Non-parametric Mann-Whitney U test was applied to the variable of position since the number of the school administrators and the teachers was not normally distributed. The results are presented in Table 5.

Table 5. Mann Whitney U Test Results of Position

Variables	N	Sıra Ortalaması	Sıra Toplamı	U	P
Administrator	37	275,96	10210,50	3664,500	,000
Teacher	356	188,79	67210,50		

As it is clear from Table 5, there was a significant difference between the school administrators' and the teachers' views about communication skills according to position [U=3664,50; p < .05]. According to the results of t-test applied for means, the school administrators ($\overline{X}$ = 3,95 /130,54) thought that they "often" displayed positive communication behaviors ($\overline{X}$ = 3,95 /130,54) and had highly positive communication skills, whereas the teachers ($\overline{X}$ =3.14 /109,69) stated that the school administrators "sometimes" displayed such behaviors and they moderately had positive communication skills.

Findings of Seniority

ANOVA was applied to explore whether the participants' views varied according to seniority and the results are presented in Table 6.

Table 6. Anova Test Results of Seniority

Categories	N	$\overline{X}$	S	Total Sum of Squares	df	Mean of Square	F	P
1-3 years	151	112,5232	28,25405	1208,945	3	402,982	,481	,696
4-6 years	130	109,3692	29,97703	326047,365	389	838,168		
7-9 years	49	111,7755	28,19225	327256,310	392			
10 years and above	63	114,2222	29,02471					

As it is clear from Table 6, there was not a significant difference between the participants' views according to seniority [$f_{(3-389)}$=0,481; p>.05]. Those who were in the experience range of 10 years and above had relatively positive views about the school administrators' communication skills, yet the difference was not found statistically significant.

Discussion

In the study, it was found that the school administrators had moderate emphatic listening skills. This finding can be evaluated as a negative finding. This result differed from the research findings presented by Şahin (2007) and Şimşek (2003). In those studies, it was concluded that the administrators had high emphatic listening skills. It is known that one of the ways to encourage people to express their sincere feelings, opinions and aspirations is listening; still listening to the other person in interaction is not enough. It is necessary to listen to the other in an effort to understand what he means (Şahin, 2007). Most people listen to the other in interaction but many think about their own prejudices, perceptions and responses rather than what is being told. However, empathy in communication requires understanding the other person's thoughts and feelings (Tuna, 2008).

Findings also reveal that school administrators often displayed the following behaviors: School administrators make eye contact with teachers and they try to be agrreeable in their own words and attitudes. For communication in educational organizations, it is vital that administrators should meet all teacher demands for dialogue without exception. In this way, both problems could be solved before they arise or get worse and educational fruitfulness increases.

Findings of *empathic listening* showed the school administrators tried to listen to the teachers quite often but they listened insincerely, inflexibly and partially responsively and they were not enthusiastic to share their own feelings with the teachers. According to Baltaş and Baltaş (1992), the most remarkable indicator of appreciation of the other person in communication process is listening time and manner. Listening constitutes almost half of mutual interaction. As a result, administrators' listening manners as well as speaking manners gain importance as it is the case for every organizational member (Şengöz, 2000).

As a result, school administrators must know how to listen to employees. Administrators must get in the habit of listening if they would like to be heard (Geçimli, 2007). Administrators who are not aware of the addressee's feelings cannot create sound communication. Thus, empathic

listening is considered as an important managemet skill and ability in school administration (Green, 2007).

According to the research findings, it was clear that the school administrators had moderate effectiveness. Effectiveness in communication means effective speaking and being conclusive and persuasive. Persuasion is the process of effectually manipulating others' disagreeable opinions, behaviors or attitudes, whereas influence can be described as an attempt to change others' attitudes and behaviors in the long term in an uncontradictory way regarding their aspirations and interests. Persuasive communication starts with a clear aim, whereas persuasion includes a hidden, long term communication strategy (Demir, 2003).

The administrators in the study often considered facts in message giving as well as information awareness in communication with teachers and applied correct data in messages. Nonetheless, the other findings of effectiveness showed that they used clichés in dialogues; they were short on material use in communication, had difficulty in giving positive messages for teacher motivation and were able to apply communication techniques at a moderate level. This case revealed the fact that the administrators were careful about awareness of the discussed matter and application of correct data in communication with teachers, but they had poor communication techniques.

In communication process, school administrators need to influence and persuade employees because most communication cases in organizations in various ways aim at influencing and changing employees' opinions, behaviors and attitudes. Avoiding using an overcomplicated, technical lexiphanicism and using clear words and visual materials could play an important role in persuasion (Pehlivanloğlu, 2006).

The study showed that the administrators gave feedback in communication process at a moderate level. In a study conducted by Gürses (2006) and Şahin (2007), it was concluded that the participant administrators had high feedback giving skills. Administrators of organizations get information about attained organizational goals and aims through feedback process. From this point of view, administrators need to improve their own feedback skills. Face to face communication is considered the best environment for feedback and it is highlighted that communication should take place face to face as much as possible (Geçimli, 2007).

According to the research findings, the school administrators had high reliability in communication. This positive result also corresponded to those reached by Şahin (2007) and Şimşek (2003). Outcome acceptance by the receiver depends to a certain extent on the receiver's perception of source reliability. Source reliability is not a constant feature of a given source, but a feature attributed to the source by the receiver (Ergin ve Birol, 2000).

According to the research findings, the participant school administrators had high reliability since they were considered as sincere individuals who could frankly express their opinions, and keep their promises, but the administrators sometimes took little notice of individual differences. However, it is known that communication functions well in organizations where individual differences are considered and appraised and thus organizational creativity and effectiveness increase (Memduhoğlu, 2008).

In the study, the findings of personal variables showed there was no significant difference between the participants' views according to seniority. However, there is something striking at this point. 71,5% of the participants reached in the study were in the experience range of 1-6 years. Thus, one of the reasons why there was no significant difference could be the fact that the experience levels of the participants were very close to one another. The highest seniority level was taken as 10 years due to compelling reasons. There is a heavy teacher circulation in the province and the region studied because of various reasons. It could be said that most of the teachers in the region are relatively dynamic in the first years of worklife but inexperienced at the same time. Although the percentage of seniority is parallel to some research findings (Akbaş, 2008; Başyigit, 2006), it significantly differs from that of the studies conducted in western cities where teacher circulation is lower (Akın, 1998;

Ateş, 2005; Gürses, 2006; Şahin, 2007; Şaşı, 2008; Şimşek, 2003; Yıldız, 1996). In 2009, the number of teachers employed in Bitlis province was 2600. 430 of them asked for appointment to the other cities and 570 new teachers were appointed (MoNE, 2009). In the conducted studies, teachers' views could vary because of different expectations and ideals connected to service time. Therefore, because seniority determines teacher expectations, it is thought that low experience range covered in the study might have had an effect on the participant teachers' views.

When the research findings were examined according to position, it was obvious that the administrators had highly positive views about their own communication skills. However, the teachers stated the administrators had moderate communication skills. This finding corresponded to the research result of a study by Şahin (2007). The difference might have been caused by the difficulty of objective self-assessment and the consideration of personal truths and competencies rather than mistakes and weaknesses.

When the total scores were considered, it was seen that the school administrators had positive moderate communication skills. This finding hardly corresponded to other research results. In a study conducted by Gürses (2006) it was concluded that the participant school administrators had high competencies in communication with teachers, and the teachers found communication skills of the administrators perfect or almost perfect. In a study conducted by Şimşek (2003) to examine the relationship between communication skills of high school administrators and school culture, it was concluded that 25% of the high school administrators had very high effective communication skills, and 75% of them had effective but improvable communication skills. As a result of a study conducted by Şahin (2007) to examine the relationship between interpersonal communication skills of primary school administrators and conflict management strategies, it was shown that the primary school administrators had high interpersonal communication skills.

As it is mentioned above, research has shown that administrators' communication skills directly affect employees' trust in administrators, their moods, productivity and motivation, organizational commitment and the overall achievement of organizations (Thomson, 2011; Yalçınkaya, 2007; Başyigit, 2006; Erbaş, 2008) and that positive communication skills of school administrators have a positive effect on administrative activities and it is difficult to attain specified organizational goals in organizations where administrators lack such skills (Dirim, 1997; Bolatkıran, 2006; Başyigit, 2006; Yalçınkaya, 2007; Akbaş, 2008).

Without communication in organizations, achievement is unlikely to happen since communication entails information share, coordination and cooperation (Dirim, 1997). Because communication is the basis for administrative activities, lack of communication skills in administrators leads to failure. Interpersonal, intragroup, intergroup or out-of-organization effective communication is the main factor of organizational achievement (Baker, 2011). Accordingly, high communication skills of school administrators are likely to contribute to better functioning in school administration processes (Covington, Erchul, Hughes and Meyers, 1995), a more peaceful working environment for teachers and other staff and increased school achievement.

Result and Recommendations

The followings are the results of the study to explore communication skills of primary school administrators as perceived by teachers and administrators. According to the participant administrators and teachers,

- Primary school administrators have moderate communication skills.

- School administrators have moderate communication skills in factors of "empathic listening", "effectiveness" and "feedback giving".

- School administrators have high reliability in communication.

- School administrators' and teachers' views about communication skills do not vary according to branch, gender and seniority.

- School administrators have more positive views about administrators' communication skills than teachers.

In the light of the research results, the following recommendations are developed:

1. There might be communication skills training programs for school administrators and they could be encouraged to participate in such activities.

2. There might be collective social activities in schools in order to develop two-way communication between school administrators and school staff.

Comparative studies on administrators' communication skills might be conducted in the cities of different regions. Similarly, correlative studies to explore the relationship between administrators' communication skills and various administration concepts and variables might be conducted.

References

Akbaş, B. (2008). *A study on the effect of organizational communication on organizational commitment* [*Örgütsel iletişimin örgütsel bağliliğa etkisi üzerine bir araştirma*] (Unpublished master's thesis), Afyon Kocatepe University, Afyon.

Akın, M. (1998). *Role and importance of communication in business conflict management* [*İşletmelerde çatişma yönetiminde iletişimin yeri ve önemi*], Erciyes University, Kayseri.

Andrews, P. H. (1989). Improving lecturing skills: Some insights from speech communication. *Teaching and Leraning at Indiana University* Series. Eric CHN: CS506560

Ateş, Ö. T. (2005). *Primary School Administrators' Communication Styles in Interactions with Teachers: A Case Study in Kırıkkale* [*İlköğretim okullarında görev yapan yöneticilerin öğretmenlerle iletişim tarzlari: Kırıkkale ili örneği*] (Unpublished master's thesis), Kırıkkale University, Kırıkkale.

Baker, K. A. (2011). http://www.au.af.mil/au/awc/awcgate/doe/benchmark/ch13.pdf (accessed on: 10.09.2011)

Baltaş, Z., & Baltaş, A. (1992). *Bady language* [*Bedenin dili*], Remzi Publication, İstanbul

Başyigit, A. (2006). *The Effect of Organizational Communication on Organizational Commitment* [*Örgütsel iletişimin örgütsel bağlilik üzerine etkisi*] (Unpublished master's thesis).,Dumlupınar University, Kütahya.

Bilgiç, A. S. (2006). *Organizational Communication and A Case Study* [*Örgütsel iletişim ve bir uygulama*], İnönü University, Malatya.

Bolatkıran, M. A. (2006). *Exploration of the Relationship between Emotional Competencies and Communication Skills of Primary School Administrators As Perceived by Teachers: A Case Study in Central Districts of Gaziantep Province* [*İlköğretim okulu müdürlerinin duygusal yeterlilikleriyle iletişim becerileri arasindaki ilişkinin öğretmen algilarina göre incelenmesi: Gaziantep ili merkez ilçeleri örneği*] (Unpublished master's thesis), Gaziantep University, Gaziantep.

Canova, S. (2011). *Effective Communication Skills* [*Etkili iletişim becerileri*]. http://www.nccogpdm.metu.edu.tr/Brosur-14.pdf (accessed on 10.09.2011)

Cansu, O. C. (2006). *The Relationship between Organizational Culture and Organizational Communication and A Business Case Study* [*Örgüt kültürü ile örgütsel iletişim ilişkisi ve bir şirket uygulamasi*], Gazi University, Ankara

Covington, C. G., Erchul, W. P., Hughes, J. N., & Meyers, J. (1995). Further explorations of request-centered relational communication within school consultation. *School Psychology Review, 24*(4), 621-632.

Demir, K. (2003). Organizational Communication Management. *Contemporary Approaches in Education* [Örgütlerde iletişim yönetimi. *yönetimde çağdaş yaklaşimlar*] (Ed: C. Elma ve K. Demir), Anı Publications, Ankara.

Dirim, M. (1997). *Role and Importance of Communication in Group Cohesion in Organizational Climate: A Case Study in Niğde Oysa Cement Plant* [*Örgüt ikliminde grup birlikteliğinin sağlanmasi için iletişimin rolü, önemi: Niğde oysa çimento fabrikasinda yapilan bir uygulama*], Niğde University, Niğde.

Efiloğlu, Ö. (2006). *Role of Communication in Information Management Process and A Study on Information Management Applications* [*Bilgi yönetimi sürecinde iletişimin rolü ve bilgi yönetimi uygulamalarina ilişkin bir araştirma*], Marmara University, İstanbul.

Erbaş, G. (2008). *A Study on the Relationship between the Quality of Communication in Administrator-Employee Relationships and Organizational Commitment* [*Yönetici ve işgören arasindaki iletişimin kalitesi ile örgütsel bağlilik ilişkisi üzerine bir araştirma*] (Unpublished master's thesis), Marmara University, İstanbul.

Ergin, A., & Birol, C. (2000). *Educational Communication* [*Eğitimde iletişim*], Anı Publications, Ankara.

Green, D. J. (2007). *The Problem of Poor Listening Skills* http://faculty.weber.edu/djgreen/ TBE_3250/Assignment.pdf (accessed on: 10.09.2011).

Gürses, Y. (2006). *A Study to Explore Educational Administrators' Effective Communication Skills* [*Eğitim örgütlerinde yöneticilerin etkili iletişim kurma becerilerinin belirlenmesine yönelik bir araştirma*] (Unpublished master's thesis), Dumlupınar University, Kütahya.

Hall, J. (1974). *Interpersonal Style and the communication Dilemma: I. Managerial Implications of the Johari Awareness Model.* Human Relations. 27(4), 381-399.

Kurt, T. (2004). *The Effect of Organizational Structure on Organizational Communication: A Case Study in the Central Organization of the Ministry of National Education* [*Örgüt yapisinin örgütsel iletişime etkisi: Milli eğitim bakanliği merkez teşkilati örneği*], Gazi University, Ankara.

Melcher A. J., & Beller, R. (1967). Toward a Theory of Organization Communication: Consideration in Channel Selection. *Academy of Management Journal, 10*(1), 39-52.

Memduhoğlu, H. B. (2008). Diversity Management *in National, Global and Organizational Context* [*Ulusal, küresel ve örgütsel bağlamda fakliliklari yönetme*], Pegem Academy Publications, Ankara.

MoNE, (2009) http://personel.meb.gov.tr/sayfa_goster.asp?ID=207 (accessed on: 12.03.2010).

Nelson, D. L., & Quick, J.C. (1995). Organizational Behavior Foundations, Realities, and Challenges. West Publishing Company, New York.

Newstrom, J. W., & Davis, K. (1997). Organizational Behavior: Human Behavior at Work. 10. Ed. USA: Mcgraw-Hill.

Nural, E. (2006). Human relationships in institutions and workplaces. *Human Relationships and Communication* [Kurumlarda, işyerlerinde insan ilişkileri. *İnsan İlişkileri ve İletişim*] (Ed:A. Solak*).* Hegem Publications, Ankara.

Oswick, C., & Keenoy, T. (1997). Managerial Discourses: Words Speak Louder than Actions. *Journal of Applied Management Studies. 6*(1), 5-13.

Payne, H. J. (2005). Reconceptualizing Social Skills İn Organizations: Exploring The Relationship Between Communication Competence, Job Performance, And Supervisory Roles. *Journal of Leadership Organizational Studies, 11*(2), 63-77

Pehlivanloğlu, Ş. (2006). *Poka-Yoke Technique for Effective Organizational Communication in Total Quality Management Process* [*Toplam kalite yönetimi sürecinde kurum içi iletişim etkinliğinin sağlanmasinda poka-yoke tekniği*], Dokuz Eylül University, İzmir.

Pondy, L. R. (1992). Reflections on organizational conflict. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 13*(3), 257-261.

Şahin, A. (2007). *The Relationship between Primary School Administrators' Interpersonal Communication Skills and Conflict Management Strategies* [*İlköğretim okulu yöneticilerinin kişiler arasi iletişim becerileri ve çatişma yönetimi stratejileri arasindaki ilişki*], Akdeniz University, Antalya.

Sayers, F., Bıngaman, C. L., Graham, R., & Wheeler, M. (1993). *Leadership Communication* [*Yöneticilikte İletişim.* Translated by Doğan Şahiner. Rota Publications, İstanbul.

Şengöz, S. (2000). *Relationships between Communication Skills and Sale Performance: A Case Study* [*İletişim becerileri ile satiş performansi arasindaki ilişkiler: Örnek bir uygulama*], Balıkesir University, Balıkesir.

Sims, R. R. (2002). Managing Organizational Behavior. Westport Connecticut: Quorum Books. http://www.questia.com/PM.qst?a=o&d=101283268 (accessed on: 10.09.2011).

Şimşek, Y. (2003). *The Relationship between School Administrators' Communication Skills and School Culture* [*Okul müdürlerinin iletişim becerileri ile okul kültürü arasindaki ilişki*], Anadolu University, Eskişehir.

Thomson, S (2011). *Importance of Communication in an Organization.* http://stephenthomson. articlesbase.com/business-articles (accessed on: 10.09.2011)

Tuna, Y. (2008). *Administrators' Emotional Intelligence Competencies in Organizational Communication Process* [*Örgütsel iletişim sürecinde yöneticilerin duygusal zekâ yeterlilikleri*], Anadolu University, Eskişehir.

Wertheim, E. G. (2011). *The Importance of Effective Communication*. http://windward.hawaii.edu /facstaff/dagrossa-p/ssci193v/articles/ (accessed on: 10.09.2011).