International Online Journal of Educational Sciences, 2016, 8 (4), 10-19

iojes
www.iojes.net

International Online Journal of Educational Sciences

ISSN: 1309-2707

Teacher perception of school principal interpersonal communication style: A qualitative study of a Turkish primary school*

Ferudun Sezgin[1] Emre Er[2]

[1, 2]*Gazi University, Gazi Faculty of Education, Ankara, Turkey*

ARTICLE INFO

Article History:
Received 08.03.2016
Received in revised form 03.08.2016
Accepted 19.08.2016
Available online 28.09.2016

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to explore considerable aspects in communication patterns of a school setting that might play important roles in principal-teacher interactions. By using a qualitative research method, the present study focused on teachers' views on communication styles of the school principal in a Turkish primary school. A semi-structured interview form prepared by researchers was applied to 14 teachers in a school from Ankara province. Content analysis is employed in the analysis of the data. Results illustrated that communication within this school perceived by interviewed teachers was inefficient. The school principal doesn't effectively use communication for developing collaboration between teachers and improving school. Findings from this study strongly point out the need of developing an interaction between the principal and teachers that can allow open two-way communication Recommendations for future research are made including the need for an investigation based on the opinions of not only teachers but also principals, parents and students. Additionally, school principals and teachers' interactions can be examined in a more detailed way by using a social network analysis approach.

© 2016 IOJES. All rights reserved

Keywords:
Primary school, organizational communication

Introduction

Many studies have recently focused on the importance of interpersonal communication in managing schools. In this regard, several investigations have shown that school principals spend a great deal of time communicating, and that a significant portion of school principals' time is spent on interpersonal communication (Ärlestig, 2007a, 2008; Bredeson, 1988; Gronn, 1983; Laud, 1998; Moller, 2000; Smith and Andrews, 1989). Principals approximately spend 70% - 80% of their time in interpersonal communication (Lunenburg, 2010). Even though the responsibilities of school principals can be identified in many different ways, communication, both directly and indirectly, is the essence of school leadership (Bredeson, 1987; DuFour, 2002; Fullan, 2002; Johns, 1997). Communication is as vital as learning in organizations (Ärlestig, 2008). In order to strengthen teachers' involvement within a school, clear communication systems are necessary (Harris, 2002). However, the quality of communication in schoolhouse should be taken into account deeply.

Principal-teacher communication in school involves the teachers' interpretation of the school principal's symbolic behaviors. A shared meaning may be difficult to create in schools because of the diversity of school principals and teachers. Furthermore, the school's hierarchy may lead to distortion in the flow of the message (Wee, 2011). Face-to-face communication is an effective method of communication in schools (Robbins, 1993). Effective communication can also be achieved in nonverbal communication, such as facial expressions, gestures and postures (Williams, 2002). Williams (2002) found that eye contact, dress and appearance, voice,

* An earlier versin of this study presented in VII. National Educational Administration Congress.

[2] Corresponding author's address: Gazi University Gazi Faculty of Educaton Bosna Block No:240 Teknikokullar Ankara
Telephone: +903122029111
e-mail: emreer@gazi.edu.tr

DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.15345/iojes.2016.04.002

© 2016 International Online Journal of Educational Sciences (IOJES) is a publication of Educational Researches and Publications Association (ERPA)

humor and being natural were important behaviors in terms of developing interpersonal communication skills.

One of the factors determining the quality of communication in schools is the pressure school principals face in having to assume various roles simultaneously (Gantner, Newsom and Dunlap, 2000). The fact that school principals who must assume a large number of roles during a business day remain unfamiliar with communication patterns inside and outside the school indicates that those principals may encounter difficulty in navigating the management process and functions directly related to communication, or may fail altogether (Bursalıoğlu, 2010).

School principals who often initiate and direct communication with teachers (Açıkalın, 1995; Celep, 1992) encourage them to be successful in their profession by listening to them consciously (Reitzug, 1994). Anderson (2006) asserted that communication helps shape the culture of the school. In other words, school principals have the power to transform the school culture in a more collaborative and supportive way. There are some researches shows us that school principal leadership has a great capacity to improve school culture (Leithwood, 1994; Marks and Prinity, 2003). Furthermore, Halawah (2005) emphasizes the fact that a more positive school climate is likely to coincide with a clear articulation of communication methods between principals and teachers. There are also empirical data reporting that principals in successful schools use multidimensional communication and that they communicate more often about issues related to academic and pedagogical tasks (Ärlestig, 2008a). It is therefore important that school principals be regarded as leaders with sufficient communication skills in order to create effective interpersonal communication networks in a school community. In this regard, as stated by Schein (1991), a leader of any organization with sufficient communication skills is more likely to be competent in leading a successful implementation of new practices in the organization.

Communication is both a means and a way to describe the school vision for principals. Communication may also be a process of understanding and conducting leadership within the school (Ärlestig, 2008). On an ordinary day, school principals and teachers are busy with a number of meetings and interactions. Kremer-Hayon and Wubbles (2005) indicate that teachers' perceptions of both actual and desired school principal behavior are related to teachers' satisfaction with the school environment. Communication provides information to teachers, and teachers' satisfaction is closely related to the quality of principal-teacher communication (Price, 2012). This also means that the quality of communication and the quality of relationships are associated with each other. Goleman (2000) draws attention to the fact that leaders must support relevant conversations in organizations. The features that identify a conversation as a constructive dialogue and that separate it from an ordinary conversation can be considered as facilitating the sharing of common goals in the organization, offering reminders of the history of the organization, helping make sense of events experienced in the organization, enabling the mutual transfer of ideas and encouraging the act of listening to opponents respectfully (Lambert, 2002).

Although communication is at the heart of school life, little has been known about the nature of teacher-principal communication. Communication networks in schools and the communication forms that school principals use have been analyzed in a number of studies, and the principal is considered an important factor in the establishment of collegial relationships and in school improvement (Bakkenes, Brabander and Imants, 1999; Barth, 1990). The relationships between primary school principals' communication forms and teachers' motivation levels (Özgan and Aslan, 2008) and their job satisfaction have been investigated in several studies (Özgan and Aslan, 2008; Sias, 2005; Washington, 2007; Whaley and Hegstrom, 1992). These studies also revealed that healthy teacher-principal communication is positively correlated with teachers' job satisfaction. Therefore, communication is accepted as one of the most crucial components of a school principalship.

The variables of teacher and principal professional seniority, education level, gender and age have also been examined so as to show how such variations affect the perceptions of teachers towards primary school principals (Aydoğan and Kaşkaya, 2010; Çınar, 2010; Köşterelioğlu and Argon, 2010; Sueltenfuss, 2001). In addition, the relationship between school principals' communication skills and the school culture has been examined in other studies (Ada, Çelik, Küçükali ve Manafzadehtabriz, 2015; Fidan ve Küçükali, 2014; Şimşek,

2003). These studies aimed to determine the verbal communication forms used by school principals with teachers in a qualitative approach according to the teachers' and principals' perceptions.

This study provides extra information about school principal-teacher interaction by deeply analyzing communication patterns in a primary school. The number of studies focusing on the characteristics of a school principal's communication is quite limited. Moreover, examining the communication patterns in a primary school may be useful for understanding both the informal role communication plays in school and the school community's communication network. Research findings may make a significant contribution to the understanding of organizational communication within primary schools.

Method

This research uses a qualitative interview design to examine how primary school teachers perceive school principal's form of communication. This approach allows selected teachers to define their own experiences clearly. Therefore, this study focused on the particularistic aspects of the principal's communication. The research was guided by two main questions: (1) How do primary school teachers perceive their school principal's form of communication on work based issues? and (2) How do primary school teachers perceive their school principal's communication on personal issues? This study used a qualitative semi-structured interview as the method of data collection. According to Patton (2002), interviews are necessary when we cannot observe feelings, thoughts, and intentions, and when we cannot observe how people make sense of the world around them.

Procedure and Participants

Data were collected in September 2013 via semi-structured interviews with 14 teachers in a Turkish primary school determined by a typical case sampling. The school was selected as an ordinary Turkish primary school settled in the urban setting. Moreover, this study used a purposeful sampling of 14 teachers stratified by their gender, age, teaching experience, and their branches. Purposeful sampling method and maximum variation method were used to gain greater insights in to the phenomenon. According to Patton (2002), a maximum variation method purposefully picks a wide range of variation along dimensions of interest among participants. Table 1 describes sample characteristics of school.

Table 1. Sample characteristics of school

	N		Min.	Max.
Age	14		29	57
	N	%		
Years of experience at current school				
1-3 years	3	21.4		
4-10 years	7	50.0		
>10 years	4	28.6		
Years of experience as a teacher				
1-3 years	3	21.4		
4-10 years	5	35.7		
>10 years	6	42.9		
Years of experience with current school principal				
1-3 years	2	14.3		
4-10 years	8	57.1		
>10 years	4	28.6		
Gender				
Male	8	57.1		
Female	6	42.9		

A brief description of the school. This is a state primary school located in Ankara, Turkey. It is a primary school containing 1-8 grades students. At the time of data collection in 2013, the roll was about 700 students with 30 teachers. The success of the school could be seen as average in terms of students' test scores acquired from the national level determination examination. Moreover we can describe this school as a typical primary school in Turkish educational system.

The Ministry of National Education (MoNE) is responsible for development of the national educational program on all educational levels and simultaneously serves as controlling body of all educational establishments. Turkish educational system is highly centralized. Therefore school autonomy is quite limited. As a consequence relationships between school principal and teachers can be seen as an ideological control tool which is held by school principal. We try to describe teachers' point of views on communication patterns in school in order to understand nature of the relationships in a highly centralized education system.

Data Analysis

Prior to the interview, all participants were informed about the purpose of the study and provided a permission form. Each participant was interviewed individually for about an hour during which each responded to five research questions. Each of these questions was formed in open-ended style and probes were added when necessary so that teachers' perceptions can be examined in more detailed way. Participants also completed a short questionnaire that contained five questions focusing on gender, age, level of academic degree, seniority, and teaching branches. The interviews of the participants were conducted in a one-on-one format. This setting allowed teachers to be more comfortable and secure in their surroundings. After getting permissions from participants, the interviews were recorded to gain accurate findings.

After transcribing the participants' interviews, the data were analyzed using the interpretational analysis method. This method allowed us to determine themes and codes within the interviews clearly. In order to ensure their confidentiality, each participant was given a code name such as T1, T2, T3, etc. These code names were in no way connected to the participant's real properties. Furthermore, original views of participants were reflected to readers via direct quotations. Lincoln and Guba (1985) argued that credibility and transferability were the key principles in ensuring the accuracy of a qualitative study. In this study, strategies employed to adhere these principles include the collection of rich data, member checking, prolonged engagement, purposeful sampling, and peer debriefing. These strategies provided that the data were as valid and credible as possible.

Results

Four major themes concerning teachers' perceptions of school principal's communication emerged from the data analysis. Themes identified in that analysis are presented in tables respectively. Table 1 illustrates the content analysis of communication style of the school principal on instructional issues.

Table 2. Content analysis about principal communication style on instructional issues

Theme	Codes
School principal communication style on instructional issues	Sermonizing (*n* = *6*)
	Communication overload (*n* = 4)
	Over familiar (*n* = *4*)
	Inappropriate communication modes (*n* = *2*)

According to Table 2, majority of the participants (*n* = 6) expressed that the principal sermonizes to them. Teachers thought school principal has a tendency to turn every chance to speak into a lecture on rules and prohibitions in school. Moreover, four participants thought school principal talks a lot more than they want or need. It was clear from Table 2 that some teachers (*n* = 4) stated that school principal becomes too familiar in communicating with them. As can be seen from Table 2, inappropriate communication mode (*n* = 2) is another main statement that asserted by teachers about their principal's way on communicating with them. Here, we presented two teachers' opinions;

"I think the principal's communication style is little bit problematic. There is a negative atmosphere in the school because of insufficient teacher-principal communication."

(T4).

"… When we talk about a serious problem, the principal often tries to make a joke for reducing tension. However, we cannot solve our problems by ignoring them. Our principal tries to be a 'close friend' to us, but I think our school will be more successful if he would have more leadership skills." (T1). Table 3 illustrates the content analysis of communication style of the school principal through decision making process.

Table 3. Content analysis about principal communication style in decision making process

Theme	Codes
Principal's communication style in decision-making process	Patronizing (*n = 7*) Getting teachers opinions only through meetings (*n = 4*) Ignoring teachers' opinions (*n = 3*)

As can be seen from Table 3, the most of the participants (*n* = 7) thought principal of their school patronized to them. Furthermore teachers stated that, school principal takes their ideas via meetings (*n* = 4), but he ignores teachers ideas (*n* = 3) in school practices. For example, teachers stated:

"Our principal asks for our ideas in many different ways to make a decision on an issue. I'm happy to represent my ideas about any subject, but it's clear that our ideas do not make any significant influence over our school practices." (T11).

"…one of the most important problems on decision making process in our school is the silence of teachers on meetings. But I couldn't find this situation strange because of school principal's egocentric behaviors. Instead of regarding teachers' views on problems, he prefers doing everything in his own way." (T4).

Table 4. Content analysis about principal communication style in disagreements

Theme	Codes
Principal's communication style in disagreements	Aggressive (*n = 8*) Formal discourse (*n = 7*) Authoritarian (*n = 3*) Imposing his own ideas (*n = 3*)

Table 4 demonstrated that school principals become more aggressive (*n* = 8) and school principal's discourse getting more formal (*n* = 7) in case of disagreements between principal and teachers. Additionally it can be said that teachers found their principal an authoritarian manager (*n* = 3) and teachers complained about school principal imposing his own ideas (*n* = 3) during disagreements. Here, we presented two teachers' opinions;

"I think there is no one size fits all formula for every problem in this century. We must discuss different perspectives respectfully in the schoolhouse. If we can't share our own ideas then how can we expect it from our pupils? Our principal dominates every meeting and doesn't provide enough time for teachers with different ideas and doesn't encourage inexperienced teachers to participate actively in meetings." (T8).

"…I think the main problem in communication process in the schoolhouse is that school principal prefers unsuitable communication modes. A family metaphor is favorable for all of us in this school, but it might better to makes use of more formal communication styles in the schoolhouse." (T7). Table 5 illustrates content analysis of the school principal's listening skills.

Table 5. Content analysis about principal listening skills

Theme	Codes
Principal's listening skills	Insufficient feedback (*n = 9*) Not making eye contact (*n = 6*) Tendency to listen with gestures and mimics (*n = 4*)

As can be seen from Table 5, majority of the participants (*n* = 9) complained about their principal's insufficient feedback. Moreover teachers claimed that their principal usually doesn't make eye-contact (*n* = 6) during a conversation. Teachers also stated that their principal usually tries to express gestures (*n* = 4) while listening them. Teachers said:

"… Actually he listens to me but he doesn't respond my questions seriously. He asks a question and doesn't wait until response. That is to say, the quality of principal-teacher communication is quite limited." (T4).

"… Just like everyone, our school principal has some unique facial expressions during a conversation. He usually avoids making eye contact and tries to focus on different issues simultaneously. At the end of the conversation, he seems confused of what I try to talk about." (T6).

Discussion and Conclusion

This study aims to understand the nature of principal-teacher communication; teacher perceptions of a better communication process with their principal generally indicate the importance of supportive communication patterns in a school organizational setting. As a qualitative study, this research was conducted in a Turkish primary school characterized as an ordinary urban school.

There are several limitations to our work. First, our work suggests that a communication pattern in the school can be revealed by teachers' perceptions. In this regard, there are only teachers in the study group of this research endeavor. Another limitation concerns the ability to generalize the findings. Although we tried to use maximal variation sampling methods to reach different teachers' points of view, there is only one school in our study.

This study produced several important findings in terms of school principal communication with teachers in both formal job requirements and informal relationships. The study revealed that teachers perceived the school's actual communication as being generally inefficient. In other words, the school principal didn't adequately use the communication process to develop teacher collaboration and improve school activities.

This qualitative study suggested that teachers tend to have a negative attitude towards their school principal's communication style. The majority of teachers interviewed described the school principal's communication style as disturbing and aggressive. Some teachers described their principal's communication style as authoritative and aggressive, while some complained about the principal's limited communication. In parallel to this, Yavuz (2010) stated that school principals have the necessary listening skills, but they don't listen to teachers equally. Also there are some evidence from other studies teachers stated that principals' communication skills are strong but need to be developed; there is a meaningful difference between teachers' and school administrators' perceptions on school administrators' communication skills (Ada, Çelik, Küçükali, & Manafzadehtabriz, 2015).

Hall and Danby (2005) reported that school principal often determine the topics to be communicated and initiate changes of topic in meetings. Similarly, interviewed teachers in this study described the school principal as egocentric and annoying in terms of his attitude during meetings. The study also showed how teachers felt about the school principal's verbal and nonverbal communication. The study's findings showed that the school principal should be aware of the power of words. It can be said that "what you say is as important as how you say it." Because the principal serves a managerial function, communication should be clear while fostering positive interpersonal relationships in the school (Thakathi and Lemmer, 2002). Thus, the school principal's discourse is much more powerful than many other aspects of school life.

The results revealed that teachers commented on the school principal's communication style with respect to instructional issues. Approximately half of interviewed teachers get annoyed when the school principal tried to sermonize to them. Additionally, some teachers stated that there was a communication overload in the school. There are many reasons why communication overload develops in modern organizations, such as too many communication channels, including too many messages at the same time. However, the school principal's communication style can play an important role in transferring crucial issues and avoiding communication overload.

The results demonstrated that half of the participant teachers perceived their school principal's communication style in the decision-making process to be patronizing, and that the principal ignored them. In addition, the school principal rarely took into consideration the teachers' opinions. According to the results, the school principal asked for teachers' opinions only during formal meetings. A school is an organization in which informal communication between people is crucial for attaining organizational goals. In this regard, the school principal should be able to use both formal and informal communication patterns to create a positive school environment and boost teacher job satisfaction. These findings are in line with the notion stated by

Price (2012), reporting that teacher job satisfaction is related to the quality of communication and interaction between the school principal and the teachers.

One of the most interesting results from the present study is that the majority of teachers perceived the school principal's communication style in disagreements as aggressive. As the relevant literature indicates, a school principal's daily working elapsed time is spent in interpersonal communication (Ärlestig, 2007b, 2008; Bredeson, 1988; Smith and Andrews, 1989); this result showed that the school principal's aggressive behavior may prevent teachers from explaining their opinions and participating in school decision making processes. In another study, teachers' perceptions of actual and desired principals' communication styles revealed that teachers tend to classify their principals' communication styles as authoritative and aggressive (Kremer-Hayon and Wubbles, 2005). Consequently, a school principal's aggressive and authoritarian communication style might produce a closed school climate in which all participates cannot share in and support the school vision.

It should be noted that teachers had not only negative opinions about the principal's communication; they expressed several positive opinions as well. Still, according to the results, the majority of respondents felt that the principal maintained insufficient listening skills, and teachers indicated that their school principal didn't make eye contact during conversation. This finding corroborates Williams's (2002) finding, which showed that effective communication extends to forms of nonverbal communication such as eye contact, facial expressions, gestures and postures. Many scholars have reported on the importance of face-to-face communication in schools (Arlestig, 2008; Fullan, 2002; Robbin, 1993). On the other hand, some teachers reported that the principal was good at listening to them by using nonverbal expressions such as gestures and mimics. This difference in teachers' perceptions of the school principal's communication may be attributed to the multidimensional characteristics of personal communication and teacher's individual differences. The school in this study has unique organizational and managerial features which could be different in another school setting. As a qualitative investigation, this case study and its results should be assessed with respect to its own reality and limitations in terms of generalizing.

Overall, the findings of this study show a thematic consistency among the statements given by teachers. Ärlestig (2007a) reported that communication concerned everyday activities and information in the school. Likewise, participant teachers perceived communication as a daily requirement instead of a tool for developing the school. The findings from this study strongly point out the need to develop an interaction between principal and teachers that can allow for open two-way communication. It might also be suggested that the school principal needs an opportunity to develop his interpersonal communication skills for establishing clear, meaningful and two-way communication with teachers. Development of such skills may also include building open communication between the school principal and school stakeholders.

It's clear from this research that teachers' expectations of good interpersonal communication with the school principal may be varied. The findings also have some implications for future studies that may be conducted to examine both school principals' and teachers' perceptions of interpersonal communication. In future research, school principals' communication styles may be investigated based on the opinions of students and principals as well as teachers.

References

Açıkalın, A. (1995). *Toplumsal kurumsal ve teknik yönleriyle okul yöneticiliği* Ankara: Pegem.

Ada, Ş., Çelik, Z., Küçükali, R., & Manafzadehtabriz, S. (2015). Okul yöneticilerinin iletişim becerilerine ilişkin yönetici ve öğretmenlerin algılama düzeyleri (Erzurum İli Örneği). *Atatürk Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi, 19*(1), 101-114.

Anderson, W. (2006). *Communicating: School leadership: Handbook for excellence in student learning.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin.

Ärlestig, H. (2007a). Multidimensional organizational communication as a vehicle for successful schools? *Journal for School Public Relations,* 28(2), 137- 163.

Ärlestig, H. (2007b). Principal's communication inside schools: A contribution to school improvement. *The Educational Forum, 71*(3), 262-273.

Ärlestig, H. (2008a). *Communication between principals and teachers in successful schools*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Umea University. Sweden.

Ärlestig, H. (2008b). Structural prerequisites for principals' and teachers' communication about teaching and learning issues. *Improving Schools, 11*(3), 191-205.

Aslanargun, E., & Bozkurt, S. (2012). Okul müdürlerinin okul yönetiminde karşılaştığı sorunlar. *Gaziantep Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi, 11*(2), 349-368.

Aydoğan, İ. & Kaşkaya, A. (2010). İlköğretim okulu yöneticilerinin iletişim becerilerinin yönetici ve öğretmen görüşlerine göre incelenmesi. *Gazi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi, 30*(1), 1-16.

Bakkenes, I., Brabander, C., & Imants, J. (1999). Teacher isolation and communication network analysis in primary schools. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 35*(2), 166-202. doi: 10.1177/00131619921968518.

Barth, R. S. (1991). *Improving school from within*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Bredeson, P. V. (1988). Communicating as a measure of leadership in schools: a portrait of school principals, *The High School Journal, 71*(4), 174-186.

Bredeson, P. V. (1987). Principally speaking: an analysis of the interpersonal communications of school principals. *Journal of Educational Administration, 25*(1), 55-71. doi: 10.1108/eb009925

Bursalıoğlu, Z. (2010). *Okul yönetiminde yeni yapı ve davranış.* Ankara: Pegem.

Celep, C. (1992). İlkokullarda yönetici-öğretmen iletişimi. *Hacettepe Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi,* 8, 301-306.

Cemaloğlu, N. (2002). Öğretmen performansının artırılmasında okul müdürünün rolü. *Milli Eğitim,* (153-154).

Çetinkanat, C., & Sağnak, M. (2010). İlkokul öğretmenlerinin iletişim stilleri. *Milli Eğitim,* (185), 162-174.

Çınar, O. (2010). Okul müdürlerinin iletişim sürecinde etkililiği. *Dumlupınar Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi, 26*(1), 274-283.

DuFour, R. (2002). The learning-centered principal. *Educational Leadership, 59*(8), 12-15.

Eriksen, E. O. (2001). Leadership in a communicative perspective. *Acta Sociologica, 44*(1), 21-35.

Fidan, M., & Küçükali, R. (2014). İlköğretim kurumlarında yöneticilerin iletişim becerileri ve örgütsel değerler. *Journal of Educational Sciences Research, 4*(1), 317-334.

Fullan, M. (2002). The change leader. *Educational Leadership, 59*(8), 16-21.

Gantner, M., Newsom, J., & Dunlap, K. (2000, April). *Reconceptualizating the role of the principal: Giving voice to the silence.* Retrieved on 20th September 2015, from http://www.eric.ed.gov/PDFS/ED450484.pdf

Glasser, W. (1999). *Okulda kaliteli eğitim* (U. Kaplan Çev.). İstanbul: Beyza.

Goleman, D. (2000). *Working with emotional intelligence*. New York: Bantam.

Gronn, P. C. (1983). Talk as work: the accomplishment of school administration, *Administrative Science Quarterly, 28*(1), 1-21.

Halawah, I. (2005). The relationship between effective communication of high school principal and school climate. *Education, 126*(2), 334-345.

Hall, G., & Danby, S. (2005). *Principal talk: The activity of a principal in school meeting talk.* Paper presented in Australian Association for Research in Education Conference, Paramatta, November. Retrieved on December 20th 2015, from http://www.aare.edu.au/index.php.

Harris, A. (2002). *School improvement: What is in it for schools?* London: Routledge Falmer.

Johns, C. (1997). *Communication competencies necessary for educational leadership as perceived by public school principals*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Houston University.

Karaköse, T. (2008). Okul müdürlerini itibarlı kılan değerlerin belirlenmesine yönelik nitel bir çalışma. *Değerler Eğitimi Dergisi, 6*(16), 113-129.

Köşterelioğlu, M. A., & Argon, T. (2010). Okul yöneticilerinin iletişim sürecindeki etkililiğine ilişkin öğretmen algilari. *Kırşehir Eğtiim Fakültesi Dergisi, 11*(1), 1-17.

Kremer-Hayon, L. & Wubbles, T. (2005). Principals' interpersonal behavior and teachers' satisfaction. In T. Wubbles and J. Levy (Eds.), *Do you know what you look like: Interpersonal relationships in education* (pp. 101-109). London: Falmer.

Lambert, L., Walker, D., Zimmerman, D., Cooper, J., Lambert, M., Gardner, M., & Szabo, M. (2002). *The constructivist leader*. New York: Teacher College.

Laud, L. (1998). Changing the way we communicate. *Educational Leadership, 55*(7), 23-25.

Leithwood, K. (1994). Leadership for school restructuring. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 30*(4), 498-518.

Lincoln, Y. S., & Guba, E. G. (1985). *Naturalistic inquiry*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Lunenburg, F. C. (2010). The principal and the school: What do principals do? *National Forum of Educational Administration and Supervision Journal*, *27*(4), 1-13.

Marks, H. M., & Printy, S. M. (2003). Principal leadership and school performance: An integration of transformational and instructional leadership. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 39*(3), 370-397. doi:10.1177/0013161X03253412.

Miller, J., & Glassner, B. (1997). The inside and the outside: Finding realities in interviews. In D. Silverman (Ed.), *Qualitative research: Theory method and practice* (pp. 99-112). London: Sage.

Moller, J. (2000). School principals in transition. In: Day C (Ed.), *The life and work of teachers: International perspectives in changing times.* New York: Falmer.

Özdemir, S., & Cemaloğlu, N. (2000). Eğitimde örgütsel yenileşme ve karara katılma. *Milli Eğitim, 146*.

Özgan, H., & Aslan, N. (2008). İlköğretim okul müdürlerinin sözlü iletişim biçiminin öğretmenlerin motivasyonuna etkisinin incelenmesi. *Gaziantep Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi, 7*(1), 190-206.

Patton, M. Q. (2002). *Qualitative evaluation and research methods*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Price, H. E. (2012). Principal-teacher interactions: How affective relationships shape principal teacher attitudes. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 48*(1), 39-85. doi: 10.1177/0013161X11417126.

Reitzug, U. C. (1994). A case study of empowering principle behavior. *American Educational Research Journal, 31*(2), 283-307. doi: 10.3102/00028312031002283.

Robbins, S. P. (1993). *Organizational behavior*. Prentice Hall.

Sandelowski, M. (1995). Focus on qualitative methods: sample sizes in qualitative research. *Research in Nursing & Health, 18*(2), 179–183.

Schein, E. (1991). *Organizational culture and leadership.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Skrapits, V. A. (1986). *School leadership, interpersonal communication, teacher satisfaction and student achievement.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Fordham University.

Sias, P. (2005). Workplace relationship quality and employee information experiences. *Communication Studies, 56*(4), 375-395. doi: 10.1080/10510970500319450

Sueltenfuss, P. E. (2001). *Principal and teacher perceptions of communication skills of the principal.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Northern Colorado University. USA.

Smith, W. F., & Andrews, R. L. (1989). *Instructional leadership: how principals make a difference*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, USA.

Şimşek, Y. (2003). *The relationship between the school principals' communication skills and the school culture.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Anadolu University.

Şimşek, Y., & Altınkurt, Y. (2009). Endüstri meslek liselerinde görev yapan öğretmenlerin okul müdürlerinin iletişim becerilerine ilişkin görüşleri. *Akademik Bakış*, *17*, 1-16.

Thakathi, T., & Lemmer, E. M. (2002). Communication strategies of women in educational management. *South African Journal of Education*, *22*(3), 193-197.

Tüzün, İ. K., & Çağlar, İ. (2008). Örgütsel özdeşleşme kavramı ve iletişim etkinliği ilişkisi. *Journal of Yaşar University, 3*(9), 1011-1027.

Uyar, Ş. (2007). *Teachers and administrators' opinions in relation to teachers' participation in school administration*. Unpublished master thesis, Ankara University. Turkey.

Washington, J. L. (2007). *Teachers' perception of the principal's communication style and its effect on teacher morale and job satisfaction*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Texas Southern University.USA (UMI: 3317520).

Wee, E. (2011). *Principals' communication style and parents' involvement in school.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Southampton. USA (UMI: 3195501).

Whaley, K. W., & Hegstrom, T. G. (1992). Perception of school principal communication effectiveness and teacher satisfaction on the job. *Journal of Research and Development in Education, 25*(4), 224-231.

Williams, J. (2002). *Professional leadership in schools: Effective middle management and subject leadership.* London: Kogan page.

Woods, J. W. (2005). *Listening skills: an exploratory analysis of school administrators' self- perception versus teachers' perceptions.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Texas. USA (UMI: 3195501).

Yavuz, M. (2010). An analysis of school principals' listening skills according to teacher feedback. *Hacettepe Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi, 38*, 292-306.

Yıldırım, N. (2011). Positive and negative contributions of management profession to school managers. *Education and Science, 36*(161), 230-245.

Yıldırım, A., & Şimşek, H. (2005). *Qualitative research method in social sciences.* Ankara: Seçkin.

Yılmaz, E. (2006.) *To investigate the effect of the school managers' ethical leadership levels on the organizational trust level and to test whether the organizational trust level in schools differentiate with respect to some variables or not*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Selçuk University. Konya, Turkey.