

The Correlation Between School Managers' Communication Skills and School Culture

Ali Sabancıⁱ

Akdeniz University, Turkey

Ahmet Şahinⁱⁱ

Ministry of National Education, Turkey

Melek Alev Sönmezⁱⁱⁱ

Ministry of National Education, Turkey

Ozan Yılmaz^{iv}

Ministry of National Education, Turkey

Abstract

The purpose of this study was to explore the correlation between school administrators' communication skills and school culture. This research was conducted as a survey using a descriptive method in order to ascertain the views of school managers and teachers about the correlation between school managers' communication skills and school culture in Turkey. The data were collected from teachers and managers working in Kindergartens, Primary Schools (1-8th grades), and High Schools in the province of Antalya, Turkey via the "Interpersonal Communication Skills Questionnaire" and "Organizational Culture Questionnaire" designed with five-point Likert scales, ranging from strongly disagree to strongly agree. A total of 1037 questionnaires were included in the analysis. Pearson correlations coefficient and Hierarchical regression analyses were conducted to examine the extent to which communication skills of school managers predict school culture. Consequently, interpersonal communication skills of school managers and organizational culture were found to be correlated moderately.

Key words: School culture, Interpersonal communication, Managers' skills, Culture change.

ⁱ **Ali Sabancı** Management, Supervision, Economy and Planning Program, Department of Educational Sciences, Faculty of Education, Akdeniz University, Antalya, Turkey.

Correspondence: alisabanci@akdeniz.edu.tr

ⁱⁱ **Ahmet Şahin** Ministry of National Education, Antalya, Turkey.

ⁱⁱⁱ **Melek Alev Sönmez** Ministry of National Education, Antalya, Turkey.

^{iv} **Ozan Yılmaz** Ministry of National Education, Antalya, Turkey.

Introduction

The purpose of this study was to find out the correlation between school administrators' communication skills and school culture. As Marzano, Waters and McNulty, (2005, p.65) pointed out it seems logical that the responsibility of relationships might be related to communication, which might be related to culture and so on. Mutual relationships and multi-dimensional connections among the concepts and processes in any organization are important considerations of research. In this sense, below first the arguments and related literature about organizational/school culture and organizational communication were presented and later on, the mutual relationship of culture and communication were discussed.

Organizational/School Culture

As Deal and Peterson (1990, p.7) stated well it is clearly time to reconsider and rethink the importance of school culture in today's educational environment. They stated that school cultures are complex webs of traditions and rituals built up over time as teachers, students, parents and administrators work together and deal with crises and accomplishments.

There are several features common to the definitions of organizational culture in the literature. First, organizational culture must be shared by a collective. Organizational members who share cultural elements are drawn together by their meaningful and shared interpretation. Second, organizational culture is a multilevel construct comprising many elements-primarily artifacts, values, and assumptions. As a set, these elements guide our organizational behavior, help us make sense of the organizational world in which we operate, and create a mechanism for identifying with others at work. At the core are the assumptions, beliefs, and values regarding work or non-work interests that manifest in individuals' and groups' behaviour that in turn affect or are affected by organizational systems, procedures and norms and the underlying philosophy, strategy and so on. Most authors will probably agree on the following characteristics of the organizational/corporate culture construct: it is 1) holistic, 2) historically determined, 3) related to anthropological concepts, 4) socially constructed, 5) soft, and 6) difficult to change, 7) terms such as 'myth', 'ritual', 'symbols' 'heroes' and similar anthropological terms are commonly used to characterize culture, 8) culture most commonly refers to ways of thinking, values and ideas of things rather than the concrete, objective and more visible part of an organization (Alvesson, & Sveningsson, 2008 p.36; Alvesson, 2011, p.14; Hellriegel & Slocum, 2011, p.479; Hofstede, Bram, Daval, & Geert, 1990, p.2; Hofstede, Neuijen, Ohayv & Sanders, 1990; Hofstede, Hofstede & Minkov, 2010, p.344; Keyton, 2005, p.22; Schermerhorn, Hunt, & Osborn, 2002, p.43; Schein, 2010, p.18, Sinha, 2008, p.299).

Schein (2010, p.18) proposed three levels of culture. They were 1) Artifacts (visible and feelable structures and processes, observed behaviour, difficult to decipher). 2) Espoused beliefs and values (ideals, goals, values, aspirations, ideologies, rationalizations). 3.) Basic underlying assumptions (unconscious, taken - for - granted beliefs and values). According to Keyton (2005, p.23) artifacts are visible or tangible-anything that one can see, hear, or feel in the organizational experience, and often the first things we notice about an organization when we enter it. Norms, standards, and customs are artifacts just like the more physical attributes of organizational life. Values are strategies, goals, principles, or qualities that are considered ideal, worthwhile, or desirable, and, as a result, create guidelines for organizational behaviour. Assumptions are beliefs that are taken for granted. An organizational culture emerges when members share knowledge and assumptions as they discover or develop ways of coping with issues of external adaptation and internal integration (Hellriegel & Slocum, 2011, p.482). The level of analysis in cultural assessments is therefore always that of collective groups. Attempts to measure culture also focus on deep elements of analysis, such as the shared meanings, assumptions and values (Sparrow, 2001, p.88).

Culture is ultimately created, embedded, evolved, and ultimately manipulated by leaders. If elements of a given culture become dysfunctional leaders have to surmount their own culture and speed up the normal evolution processes with forced managed culture change programs. These dynamic processes of culture creation and management are the essence of leadership and make you

realize that leadership and culture are two sides of the same coin (Schein, 2010, p.4). Although leaders are aware of their organization's culture(s), they are often unsure about how to influence it (Hellriegel, & Slocum, 2011, p.478). Good managers are able to reinforce and support an existing strong culture; good managers are also able to help build resilient cultures in situations where they are absent (Schermerhorn, et al., 2002, p.52). Principals know from experience that piecemeal reforms, reforms which ignore the inner realities of schools, will have limited effect. They understand by instinct that to build a successful school one must work simultaneously on staff needs and skills, the organization's goals and roles, and the dynamics of political power and conflict (Deal & Peterson, 1990, p.7). Evidence suggests that the typical school culture and its organizational structures may be responsible, in part, for stifling teacher development (Leithwood, 1990, p.82). Deal and Peterson (1990, p.20), in order to identify the cultural dimensions of their job and do concrete things, suggested 1) to affirm values through dress, behavior, attention, routines (the principal as symbol), 2) to shape and be shaped by the school's heroes, rituals, ceremonies, symbols (the principal as potter), 3) to use language to reinforce values and sustain the school's best image of itself (the principal as poet), 4) improvise in the school's inevitable dramas (the principal as actor), 5) oversee transitions and change in the life of the school (the principal as healer).

There are various opinions about how culture can be studied. Some writers stated that culture can be studied from the perspective of the functions it performs and how it is structured; some writers proposed three levels of cultural analysis: observable culture, (includes the unique stories, ceremonies, and corporate rituals) shared values (implies that the group is a whole) and common assumptions (truths); some writers spoke of subcultures and countercultures. Subcultures are unique patterns of values and philosophies within a group that are consistent with the dominant culture of the larger organization or social system. Countercultures are the patterns of values and philosophies that outwardly reject those of the larger organization or social system. In another conceptualization culture was analysed as productive and counterproductive cultures. Productive cultures focus on feedback, continued cultural change and learning, flexibility, reward risk-taking, encouraging assignments, strengthening of trust and cooperation. Counterproductive cultures on the other hand, are bureaucratic and resistant to accept responsibility, fear getting into trouble by taking initiatives, lack appropriate organizational rewards, develop a victim mentality, lack genuine and enthusiastic commitment, lack persistent champions for persistent change, fear taking initiatives that are too risky (Argyris, 2010, pp.119-120; Schabracq, 2007, p.7; Schein, 2010, p.4; Schermerhorn, et al., 2002, pp.45-47).

Maslowski (2001, p.131) discussed that schools' cultural traits were human relations, open systems, rational goal and internal process orientations. To Deal and Peterson (1990, p.7) the concept of culture is meant to describe the character of a school as it reflects deep patterns of values, beliefs and traditions that have been formed over the course of its history. In this sense, each school must identify its core beliefs, develop a shared vision, measure the congruence between the current reality and the vision, determine the changes that will close any gaps, support teachers during the change process, and foster a culture of collective autonomy and accountability (Zmuda, Kuklis, & Kline, 2004, p.179).

The traditional school culture rewards competition, autonomy and individualism within a faculty, so the journey toward achievement and recognition is sometimes frustrating for both leaders and teachers. This environment is an inevitable result of the competitive and individualistic nature of teaching (Combs, Miser & Whitaker, 1999, p.75; Eryaman, 2007). Research tells us that some kinds of school cultures support students' learning much more strongly than others. This applies not only to whole school cultures but also to cultures within schools (Fleming & Kleinhenz, 2007, P.5). Although a culture is a natural by-product of people working in close proximity, it can be a positive or negative influence on a school's effectiveness. An effective leader builds a culture that positively influences teachers, who, in turn, positively influence students (Marzano, Waters, & McNulty, 2005, p.47). To the extent that all managers share relatively consistent values, then performance follows (Sparrow, 2001, p.95).

Cultures almost always endorse the values and beliefs of some subgroups while ignoring the values and beliefs of other subgroups. The devalued subgroups thus gain incentive to protest or oppose. As

cultures clarify some beliefs and rituals, they also create ambiguity about the beliefs and rituals that they ignore (Baumard & Starbuck, 2001, p.522). Likewise, the individual who does not agree with the group behavioral norms or with the values found within the corporate culture will be in conflict with the work group or with the entire organization (Montana & Charnov, 2000, p.385). Combs et al. (1999, pp.67,92) stated also that traditionally, school cultures do not value and address people's needs. Most school cultures do not even expect or encourage strong feelings and emotions-or even passion. The culture of schools often fosters isolation and individualism, not cooperation and collaboration. Dimmock and O'Donoghue (2005, p.101) discussed that in order to provide a firm foundation on which to build a healthy school culture in the pursuit of effective teaching and learning the 'appropriate foundations' included the establishment an institutionalization of school practices built on social justice, an 'inclusive' curriculum and equity for all members of the school community. Gelsthorpe and West-Burnham (2003, p.183) assumed the new school culture to be built on mutual trust and common purpose. They added that the foundations include passion, emotion, hope, alliances, tapping of expertise within and beyond the school, responsive leadership and celebration.

Pheysey (1993, pp.17-19) referring to the other writers such as Harrison (1972) describes four types of organizational culture. They are role culture, achievement culture, power culture and support culture. A role culture is one which emphasises conformity to expectations. The word 'role', refers to the way in which the occupant of each position in the firm is expected to act. There are usually job descriptions, rules and procedures to govern behaviour, and principles for fixing remuneration. The Role orientation assumes that people work most effectively and efficiently when they have relatively simple, clearly defined, circumscribed and measurable tasks. Clarity and precision of roles and procedures are striven for in order to fit the parts of the organization together like a machine. In an achievement culture people are interested in the work itself, and have a personal stake in seeing that it is done. The achievement-oriented organization makes high demands on its people's energy and time, assuming that people actually enjoy working at tasks which are intrinsically satisfying. In a power culture certain persons are dominant and others subservient. There is 'a relatively bounded and stable occurrence of social order based on habits of deference to authority'. In the power organization at its best, leadership is based on strength, justice and paternalistic benevolence. The support-oriented organization offers its members satisfactions which come from relationships; mutuality, belonging, and connection. The assumption is that people will contribute out of a sense of commitment to a group or organization of which they feel themselves truly to be members, and in which they believe they have a personal stake. This study was also based on the types of organizational culture explained by Pheysey (1993).

Organizational Communication

Communication is one of the most important interpersonal processes in organizations. The often posed philosophical question "Is there a noise in the forest if a tree crashes to the ground but no one is there to hear it?" demonstrates some of the important aspects of interpersonal communication (Luthans, 2011, p.254). The primary role of communicative action is to foster mutual understanding, whereas that of strategic activity is to pursue and attain goals. Both are required to maintain individual lives, families, communities, organisations, and societies, and are dialogically related (Milley, 2008, p.61). Effective communication allows employees, groups and organizations to achieve their goals and perform at a high level (George & Jones, 2012, p.428). Interpersonal communication is fundamental to obtaining employment, succeeding on the job, and being an effective colleague, subordinate, or manager (Harris & Nelson, 2008). Interpersonal communication involves the exchange of a message across a communication channel from one person to another (Aamodt, 2010, p.414). In interpersonal communication, the major emphasis is on transferring information from one person to another. Communication is looked on as a basic method of effecting behavioural change and it incorporates the psychological processes (perception, learning, and motivation) on the one hand and language on the other (Luthans, 2011, p.253). Communication among individuals and groups is vital in all organizations. Communication is probably the most visible of all group activities and it is critical to effective group functioning (Stroh, Northcraft & Neale, 2002, p.174). Without communication, an organization would be merely a collection of individual workers doing separate tasks. Organizational action would lack coordination and would be oriented toward individual rather

than organizational goals (Griffin & Moorhead, 2013, p.295). Communication fosters motivation by clarifying for employees what is to be done, how well they are doing, what can be done to improve performance if it's subpar (Robbins, 2002, p.114). Communication creates the foundation for successful actions; it opens pathways to a more collaborative workplace. Collaboration requires effective communication. It is the way we share information, ideas, goals, directions, expectations, feelings, and emotions in the context of coordinated action. Successful organizations value and promote effective communication both at the interpersonal level and across organizational boundaries (Schermerhorn, Hunt, Osborn, & Uhl-Bien, 2010, p. 256).

Organizational communication has several functions and dysfunctions. Keyton (2005) asserted that some organizational communication functions for socializing new members or negotiating one's position in the organization. Some organizational communication is a mediator for management in order to structure or control the organization. Some organizational communication is devoted to negotiating and coordinating work activities. Finally, some organizational communication functions for positioning the organization within the marketplace and society. Robbins (2002, p.114) claimed that communication serves four major functions within a group or organization: control, motivation, emotional expression, and information. Champoux (2011, p.338) stated that the functions include letting people share information and helping managers integrate or coordinate different parts of the organization. Champoux (2011, p.338) listed the dysfunctions as selective perception, semantic problems and information overload. (Schermerhorn et al., 2010, p. 256) used glue to explain the tie between communication and organization. They stated that communication is the glue that holds organizations together. Similarly, Griffin and Moorhead (2013, p.295) to explain the function of communication in an organization used the human nervous system as a metaphor well. They stated that the primary purpose is to achieve coordinated action. Just as the human nervous system responds to stimuli and coordinates responses by sending messages to the various parts of the body, communication coordinates the actions of the parts of an organization.

Communication is one of the management functions and it is one of the most crucial aspects of effective leadership, planning control, coordinating, training, conflict management, decision making and all other management functions (Wexley & Yukl, 1984, p.74; Miller, 2000, p.25; Shochley-Zalabak, 2006, p.244). Organizations are always looking for employees with excellent communication skills and listening is probably the most important communication skill that a supervisor should master (Aamodt, 2010, p.425-8). When organizations experience problems such as unmotivated employees or excessively high turnover, poor communication is often partially to blame (George & Jones, 2012, p.403). Research indicates that it is essential that managers not only communicate well but that their success is, in large measure, determined by their communication skills (Stroh, et al., 2002, p.175). Interpersonal communication is the primary means of managerial communication; on a typical day, over three-fourths of a manager's communications occur in face-to-face interactions. The day-to-day activities of managers are closely tied to effective interpersonal communications. Managers provide information (which must be understood), they give commands and instructions (which must be obeyed and learned) and they make efforts to influence and persuade (which must be accepted and acted on) (Gibson, Ivancevich, Donnelly, Konopaske, 2011, p.446). Effective managers and leaders are skilled at human relations, develop others, make decisions, provide role models, use humor, understand language, use positive nonverbal behavior, develop networks and encourage upward and downward communication, listen effectively, develop strong symbolic messages, and apply power effectively. This is a prodigious set of expectations for any manager (Harris & Nelson, 2008). Characteristics and qualities of the principals identified showed a common and consistent set of personal traits, behaviours, values and beliefs, such as honesty and openness, highly developed communication skills, flexibility, commitment, passion, empathy with others, a sense of 'innate goodness', support of equity and social justice, a belief that all children are important and can succeed, being other-centred, high expectations and a belief that schools can make a difference (Gurr, Drysdale, & Mulford, 2006, p.371).

Luthans (2011, p.247) asserted that "Real Managers" in their day-to-day behaviors, devoted about a third of their activities to exchanging and processing routine information. Research has

repeatedly shown that groups and organizations spend enormous amounts of time communicating. The centrality of communication to the overall job of the administrator is evident when we consider how much time administrators spend communicating in organizations (Lunenburg & Ornstein, 2012, p.158; Schermerhorn, 1996, p.209; Wexley & Yukl, 1984, p.74). Research findings proved that managers spend most of their time for organizational communication. In some occupations, more than half of all time on the job is spent communicating (Lunenburg & Ornstein, 1991; Stroh, et al., 2002, p.175, Schermerhorn, 1996; Wexley & Yukl, 1984). Baird, Post and Mahon, (1990 p.352) stated that top level managers spent 87 % of their work day for communication (62 percent for listening and speaking, 8 percent for telephone, 13 percent for writing and 12 percent for reading). Lunenburg & Ornstein (1991, p.185) reported that the results of two separate studies of executives also indicated that administrators spend 80 percent of their time in interpersonal communication.' Similar findings, ranging from 70 to 80 percent, have been reported for elementary and high school principals. School administrators, therefore, need a clear understanding of the process of communication (Lunenburg & Ornstein, 2012, p.158).

Literature review showed that studies in interpersonal communication skills concentrated mainly on the dimensions of empathy, comprehension, active listening, feedback, effectiveness (openness, clarity, transparency, brevity, kindness, concreteness, consideration), persuasion, trusting and being an effective sender (effective body language, effectiveness in verbal and non-verbal communication) (Cohen, Fink, Gadon, Willits & Josefowitz, 2001, p.240; Daft, 2002, p.589; Devito, 2001; Dubrin, 1997; Gordon, 1998, p.191; Hartley & Bruckmann, 2002, p.247-248; Ivancevich & Matteson, 1996, p.503; Lunenburg & Ornstein, 1991, pp.189-209; Murphy, Hildeprant & Thomas, 1997; p.31 Robbins, 2000, pp.129; 150-151; Schermerhorn, 2001; Sims, 2002; Steers, 1981, p.214; Timm, Peterson & Stevens, 1990, p.246).

The correlation between organizational communication and culture

Connections between organizational culture and communication are well established in communication studies. It can be assumed that as more communicative studies of organizational culture have been completed, the contribution of communication scholars has become clearer. Eisenberg and Riley (2001) pointed to five of these. First, a communication perspective has highlighted the symbolic nature of day to day conversations and routine practices. Communication research emphasizes that culture is present in all acts of communication behaviour. Second, a communication perspective emphasizes both action and interpretation; not just what is done, but how is done is interpreted by others. Third, a communication perspective acknowledges the role of societal patterns and norms in facilitating or constraining individuals within an organizational culture. That is, organizational culture exists within a larger societal culture. Fourth, a communication perspective honours a wide range of researcher-organization relationships from intimate to more distant. Fifth, a communication perspective on organizational culture legitimizes all motives for its study. In other words, motives for studies can be found in the practical concerns of management or employees, or in the desire to inform and empower multiple organizational stakeholders. According to Keyton (2014, pp.118-135) the most frequent perspective for studying communication and organizational culture is the interpretive perspective, which examines organizing as emerging from patterns of meaning-making and culturing from patterns of expectations implicated by that meaning-making. Studying organizational culture in this way embeds the communication of the organization within the context that both informs and reveals an organization's historical, social, and economic background and foreground. Alvesson (2011, p.14) asserted that culture is closely related to communication and language use. Culture is not primarily inside people's heads, but somewhere between the heads of a group of people where symbols and meanings are publicly expressed, for example, in work group interactions, in board meetings, and in material objects. Since communication is observable, it provides a window for understanding the deeper levels of institutional culture and for determining how basic assumptions and beliefs shape behaviour (Kowalski, (2000. p.9).

The purpose of this study was to explore the correlation between school managers' communication skills and school culture. As a result the following question was addressed: Is there correlation between school managers' communication skills and school culture?

Method

This research was conducted as a survey using a descriptive method in order to ascertain the views of school managers and teachers about the correlation between school managers' communication skills and school culture in Turkey.

Population and Sample

In this research, the data were collected from Kindergartens, Primary Schools (1-8 grades), Anatolian High Schools, and Vocational and Technical High Schools in the province of Antalya, Turkey. So, the population of the research consisted of 11690 teachers and managers working in these schools. The sample size to represent the universe of 11690 teachers and managers with 5% margin of error and 95% confidence level is at least 372 persons (Krejcie & Morgan, 1970, s.608; Büyüköztürk, Çakmak, Akgün, Karadeniz & Demirel, 2010, p.94). Out of 1600 questionnaires sent to managers and teachers, a total of 1441 questionnaires were responded. After the invalid questionnaires were eliminated, 1037 questionnaires were included in the analysis. Respondents' profiles were presented in Table 1.

Table 1. Respondents' profiles

		Kindergarten		Primary School		Anatolian High School		Vocational and Technical High School		Total (N=1037)	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Position	Teacher	50	64.1	342	63.6	165	78.2	140	66.7	697	67.2
	Manager	28	35.9	196	36.4	46	21.8	70	33.3	340	32.8
Gender	Female	70	89.7	261	48.5	98	46.4	81	38.6	510	49.2
	Male	8	10.3	277	51.5	113	53.6	129	61.4	527	50.8
Education Background	Pre-licence	9	11.5	96	17.8	2	0.9	3	1.4	110	10.6
	Undergraduate	66	84.6	417	77.5	182	86.3	183	87.1	848	81.8
	Graduate	3	3.8	25	4.6	27	12.8	24	11.4	79	7.6
Seniority In the position	1-5 years	36	46.2	48	8.9	27	12.8	40	19.0	151	14.6
	6-10 years	19	24.4	103	19.1	27	12.8	26	12.4	175	16.9
	11-15 years	13	16.7	126	23.4	56	26.5	70	33.3	265	25.6
	16-20 years	4	5.1	90	16.7	55	26.1	42	20	191	18.4
	21years and more	6	7.7	171	31.8	46	21.8	32	15.2	255	24.6

As indicated in Table 1, out of 1037 participants, 697 (67.2%) were teachers and 340 (32.8%) were school managers. The proportion of female to male employees was similar across the schools with more male representation (61.4%) at vocational high schools and small representation (10.3%) at kindergartens. A total of 527 (50.8%) were male while 510 (49.2%) were female participants. The participants' educational backgrounds varied considerably. About 7.6% of the participants had graduate (master's and doctoral) degrees, 81.8% had under graduate (bachelor's) degrees, and 10.6% had pre-licence degrees (two years of higher education). 25.6% of the participants had 11-15 years seniority, 24.6% had 21 years and above seniority, 16.9% had 6-10 years seniority, and 14.6% had 1-5 years seniority.

Instruments

Interpersonal Communication Skills of School Managers: In this research the data was collected by Interpersonal Communication Skills Questionnaire which consisted of 33 items. The questionnaire was, first, developed by Şahin (2007) to measure primary school managers' communication skills: emphatic listening (Cronbach's Alpha=.95), effectiveness (Cronbach's Alpha=.92), feedback (Cronbach's Alpha=.93) and trusting (Cronbach's Alpha=.79). The

questionnaire was adopted for this study to gather data from teachers and managers. The questionnaire designed as a five-point Likert scale ranging from strongly disagree (coded as 1) to strongly agree (coded as 5) was used.

To provide validity of the questionnaire, principal components factor analysis was conducted with the data of 229 questionnaires. Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy was .977 and Bartlett's Test of Sphericity was .00. As a result of the analysis, we had a single factor and a 33 item the questionnaire. All the items had factor loadings greater than .72 and explained 65,27% of the total variance. To provide reliability, within-items reliability test was done using Cronbach reliability correlation analysis. The alpha coefficient of reliability was .98.

Organizational Culture: To gather data about organizational cultures of schools, the "Organizational Culture Questionnaire" which was, first, developed by İpek (1999) was used. It consisted of 37 items designed with five-point Likert scales, ranging from strongly disagree (coded as 1) to strongly agree (coded as 5). The original questionnaire consisted of four dimensions; role culture (explained %30 of the total variance and Cronbach's Alpha=.69), success culture (explained %35 of the total variance and Cronbach's Alpha=.78), power culture (explained %31 of the total variance and Cronbach's Alpha=.60) and support culture (explained %53 of the total variance and Cronbach's Alpha=.90).

In this study, principal components factor analysis was conducted for the data gathered from 359 questionnaires. Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy was .909 Bartlett's Test of Sphericity was .00. As a result of the analysis, the questionnaire consisted of 20-items in four dimensions. These are role culture (5 items), success culture (5 items), power culture (3 items) and support culture (7 items). All of the items dispersed in four dimension had greater than .56 factor loadings. Four dimension explained 63.25% of the total variance. In order to test reliability, "within-items reliability test" was conducted using Cronbach reliability correlation analysis. The alpha coefficient of reliability was found .85 for the whole scale. The alpha coefficient of reliability was .69 for the factor of role culture .84 for the factor of success culture .65 for the factor of power culture and .91 for the factor of support culture.

Data analysis

In the analyses of the study, Pearson correlations coefficient and Hierarchical regression was conducted to examine the extent to which communication skills of school managers predict school culture. The predictors were entered step by step (first empathic sensitivity, then reflective listening, and last creating positive communication). In order to validate the model, the Durbin Watson coefficient was calculated and the results showed that there were no autocorrelations among any factors (D-W coefficient=1.04). The multicollinearity problem was eliminated because correlation coefficients were lower than .68, and VIF values were acceptable (Akgül & Cevik, 2003; Bryman & Cramer, 2001; Büyüköztürk, 2001; Hair, Anderson, Tahtam & Black, 1998; Leech, Barrett & George, 2005; Muijs, 2004).

Findings

In this section the findings about correlations between school managers' communication skills and school culture were presented.

Table 2. Correlations among the interpersonal communication skills of school managers and school culture

	N=1284	Power culture	Role culture	Success culture	Support culture
Empathic sensitivity	Pearson Correlation	.334**	-.087**	.570**	.532**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.002	.000	.000
Reflective listening	Pearson Correlation	.344**	-.088**	.571**	.518**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.002	.000	.000
Creating positive communication	Pearson Correlation	.308**	-.164**	.490**	.481**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.000

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

Table 2 shows the correlations among the variables of organizational culture and interpersonal communication skills of school managers. All Correlations between organizational culture (role culture, power culture, success culture, and support culture) and interpersonal communication skills (empathic sensitivity, reflective listening, and creating positive communication) were statistically significant. Positive correlations were found between organizational culture and interpersonal communication skills except role culture.

There were low positive linear correlation ($r=.31$) between power culture and communication skills; very low negative linear correlation ($r=-.20$) between role culture and communication skills; moderate positive linear correlation ($r=.62$) between support culture and communication skills and finally there were moderate positive linear correlation ($r=.67$) between success culture and communication skills.

Table 3. Hierarchical regression analyses regarding the effects of communication skills on power culture

	Variable	B	Std. Error	β	T	p	R zero-order	r partial
Model 1	Constant	2.384	.108		22.148	.000		
	Empathic sensitivity	.343	.027	.334	12.703	.000	.334	.334
	$\Delta R^2=.112$	p=.000						
	$F_{(1-1282)}=161.355$	p=.000		R=.334	$R^2=.112$			
Model 2	Constant	2.274	.110		20.684	.000		
	Empathic sensitivity	.156	.051	.152	3.051	.002	.334	.085
	Reflective listening	.213	.050	.214	4.297	.000	.344	.119
	$\Delta R^2=.013$	p=.000						
	$F_{(2-1281)}=91.007$	p=.000		R=.353	$R^2=.124$			
Model 3	Constant	2.140	.127		16.821	.000		
	Empathic sensitivity	.103	.057	.101	1.812	.070	.334	.051
	Reflective listening	.192	.051	.193	3.801	.000	.344	.106
	Creating positive communication	.100	.048	.089	2.082	.038	.308	.058
	$\Delta R^2=.003$	p=.038						
	$F_{(3-1280)}=62.275$	p=.000		R=.357	$R^2=.127$			

Table 3 shows the hierarchical regression for the prediction of power culture. In the first step, empathic sensitivity variable was entered into the equation. This produced a statistically significant increase in R^2 ($\Delta R^2=.112$; $p<.01$). In the second step, reflective listening variable was entered into the equation. In step 2 (model 2) empathic sensitivity and reflective listening variables together produces a statistically significant increase in R^2 ($\Delta R^2=.013$; $p<.01$). In the last step (model 3) creating positive

communication variable was entered into the equation. This resulted in a small, but statistically significant increase in R^2 ($\Delta R^2=.003$; $p<.05$). The final model shows that empathic sensitivity, reflective listening, and creating positive communication variables together predict power culture significantly ($R=.357$; $R^2=.127$; $F_{(3-1280)}=62.275$; $p<.01$). 12.7% of the variance in power culture was accounted for by the three predictors used in Model 3.

Regarding the predictor variables, a statistically significant effect of reflective listening on power culture can be seen ($\beta=.193$; $p<.01$). There was also a statistically significant positive effect of creating positive communication on power culture ($\beta=.089$; $p<.05$). However, empathic sensitivity does not have a significant effect on power culture ($\beta=.101$; $p>.05$). Consequently, the final model shows statistically significant positive effects for reflective listening and creating positive communication variables on power culture.

Table 4. Hierarchical regression analyses results regarding the effects of communication skills on role culture

	Variable	B	Std. Error	β	t	p	r zero-order	r partial
Model 1	Constant	3.445	.121		28.534	.000		
	Empathic sensitivity	-.094	.030	-.087	-3.116	.002	-.087	-.087
	$\Delta R^2=.008$							
	$p=.002$ $F(1-1282)=9.709$ $p=.002$			$R=.087$				$R^2=.008$
Model 2	Constant	3.473	.124		27.967	.000		
	Empathic sensitivity	-.048	.058	-.044	-.831	.406	-.087	-.023
	Reflective listening	-.053	.056	-.050	-.943	.346	-.088	-.026
	$\Delta R^2=.001$							
$p=.346$ $F(2-1281)=5.299$ $p=.005$			$R=.091$				$R^2=.008$	
Model 3	Constant	3.869	.142		27.200	.000		
	Empathic sensitivity	.108	.064	.099	1.699	.090	-.087	.047
	Reflective listening	.009	.056	.009	.164	.870	-.088	.005
	Creating positive communication	-.296	.054	-.248	-5.519	.000	-.164	-.152
	$\Delta R^2=.023$							
$p=.000$ $F_{(3-1280)}=13.768$ $p=.000$			$R=.177$				$R^2=.031$	

Table 4 shows the hierarchical regression for the prediction of role culture. In the first step, empathic sensitivity variable was entered into the equation. This produced a statistically significant increase in R^2 ($\Delta R^2=.002$; $p<.01$). In the second step, reflective listening variable was entered into the equation. In step 2 (model 2) empathic sensitivity and reflective listening variables together do not produce a statistically significant increase in R^2 ($\Delta R^2=.001$; $p>.05$). In the last step (model 3) creating positive communication variable was entered into the equation. This resulted in a statistically significant increase in R^2 ($\Delta R^2=.023$; $p<.01$). The final model shows that empathic sensitivity, reflective listening, and creating positive communication variables together predict role culture significantly ($R=.177$; $R^2=.031$; $F_{(3-1280)}=13.768$; $p<.01$). 3.1% of the variance in role culture was accounted for by the three predictors used in Model 3. Regarding the predictor variables, only a statistically negative significant effect of creating positive communication on role culture can be seen ($\beta=-.248$; $p<.01$). Empathic sensitivity ($\beta=.099$; $p>.05$) and reflective listening ($\beta=.009$; $p>.05$) do not have significant effects on power culture.

Table 5. Hierarchical regression analyses results regarding the effects of communication skills on success culture

Variable		B	Std. Error	β	t	p	r zero-order	r partial
Model 1	Constant	.970	.108		8.944	.000		
	Empathic sensitivity	.676	.027	.570	24.836	.000	.570	.570
	$\Delta R^2=.325$	p=.000						
	F(1-1282)=616.608	p=.000	R=.570	R ² =.325				
Model 2	Constant	.786	.109		7.186	.000		
	Empathic sensitivity	.362	.051	.306	7.130	.000	.570	.195
	Reflective listening	.357	.049	.310	7.233	.000	.571	.198
	$\Delta R^2=.026$	p=.000						
	F(2-1281)=346.900	p=.000	R=.593	R ² =.351				
Model 3	Constant	.670	.127		5.294	.000		
	Empathic sensitivity	.317	.057	.267	5.591	.000	.570	.154
	Reflective listening	.339	.050	.295	6.734	.000	.571	.185
	Creating positive communication	.086	.048	.066	1.806	.071	.490	.050
	$\Delta R^2=.002$	p=.071						
	F(3-1280)=232.762	p=.000	R=.594	R ² =.353				

Table 5 shows the hierarchical regression for the prediction of success culture. In the first step, empathic sensitivity variable was entered into the equation. This produced a statistically significant increase in R^2 ($\Delta R^2=.325$; $p<.01$). In the second step, reflective listening variable was entered into the equation. In step 2 (model 2) empathic sensitivity and reflective listening variables together produce a statistically significant increase in R^2 ($\Delta R^2=.026$ $p<.01$). In the last step (model 3) creating positive communication variable was entered into the equation. This did not result in a statistically significant increase in R^2 ($\Delta R^2=.002$; $p>.05$). However, the model shows that empathic sensitivity, reflective listening, and creating positive communication variables together predict success culture significantly ($R=.594$; $R^2=.353$; $F_{(3-1280)}=232.762$; $p<.01$). 35.3% of the variance in success culture was accounted for by the three predictors used in Model 3. Regarding the predictor variables, a statistically significant effect of empathic sensitivity on success culture can be seen ($\beta=.267$; $p<.01$). There was also a statistically significant positive effect of reflective listening on success culture ($\beta=.295$; $p<.01$). However, creating positive communication does not have a significant effect on success culture ($\beta=.066$; $p>.05$).

Table 6. Hierarchical regression analyses results regarding the effects of communication skills on support culture

Variable		B	Std. Error	β	T	p	r zero-order	r partial
Model 1	Constant	1.572	.104		15.059	.000		
	Empathic sensitivity	.589	.026	.532	22.508	.000	.532	.532
	$\Delta R^2=.283$	p=.000						
	F(1-1282)=506.630	p=.000	R=.532	R ² =.283				
Model 2	Constant	1.441	.106		13.571	.000		
	Empathic sensitivity	.368	.049	.332	7.453	.000	.532	.204
	Reflective listening	.252	.048	.235	5.259	.000	.518	.145
	$\Delta R^2=.015$	p=.000						
	F(2-1281)=272.409	p=.000	R=.546	R ² =.298				
Model 3	Constant	1.225	.123		10.000	.000		
	Empathic sensitivity	.283	.055	.256	5.156	.000	.532	.143
	Reflective listening	.218	.049	.203	4.481	.000	.518	.124
	Creating positive communication	.161	.046	.133	3.490	.000	.481	.097
	$\Delta R^2=.007$	p=.000						
	F(3-1280)=187.250	p=.000	R=.552	R ² =.305				

Table 6 shows the hierarchical regression for the prediction of support culture. In the first step, empathic sensitivity variable was entered into the equation. This produced a statistically significant increase in R² ($\Delta R^2=.283$; $p<.01$). In the second step, reflective listening variable was entered into the equation. In step 2 (model 2) empathic sensitivity and reflective listening variables together produce a statistically significant increase in R² ($\Delta R^2=.015$; $p<.01$). In the last step (model 3) creating positive communication variable was entered into the equation. This resulted in a statistically significant increase in R² ($\Delta R^2=.007$; $p<.01$). The model shows that empathic sensitivity, reflective listening, and creating positive communication variables together predict support culture significantly ($R=.552$; $R^2=.305$; $F_{(3-1280)}=187.250$; $p<.01$). 30.5% of the variance in support culture was accounted for by the three predictors used in Model 3. Regarding the predictor variables, empathic sensitivity ($\beta=.256$; $p<.01$), reflective listening ($\beta=.203$; $p<.01$), and creating positive communication ($\beta=.133$; $p<.01$) have positive significant effects on support culture. Shortly, results of the t test indicate that all of the interpersonal communication skills variables significantly contribute to predicting support culture.

Discussion and Conclusions

The purpose of this study was to find out the correlation between school managers' communication skills and school culture. The issue of communication has not been much studied in the climate literature but in the world of organizational culture it has played an important role (Schneider & Barbera 2014, p.22). Keyton stresses that organization discourse and organizational culture are mutually constitutive. Organizational culture transmission occurs at many levels, as organizational members communicate within and across task, hierarchical, and functional relationships and networks (Keyton, 2014, pp.123-124).

Our research findings conclude that interpersonal communication skills of school managers and organizational culture were correlated moderately. This finding is consistent with the findings of the research conducted by Lal in (2012). He also found moderate correlation between interpersonal communication skills school principals and school culture. Further analyses of our study show that first, empathic sensitivity, reflective listening, and creating positive communication variables together predict power culture significantly. 12.7% of the variance in power culture was accounted for by the

three predictors. The final model shows statistically significant positive effects for reflective listening and creating positive communication variables on power culture. Secondly, the final analyses show that empathic sensitivity, reflective listening and creating positive communication variables together predict role culture significantly. 3.1% of the variance in role culture was accounted for by the three predictors. Regarding the predictor variables, only a statistically negative significant effect of creating positive communication on role culture can be seen. Third, the model shows that empathic sensitivity, reflective listening, and creating positive communication variables together predict success culture significantly. 35.3% of the variance in success culture was accounted for by the three predictors. Regarding the predictor variables, a statistically significant effect of empathic sensitivity and reflective listening on success can be seen. Fourth, the model shows that empathic sensitivity, reflective listening, and creating positive communication variables together predict support culture significantly. 30.5% of the variance in support culture was accounted for by the three predictors. Regarding the predictor variables, empathic sensitivity, reflective listening, and creating positive communication have positive significant effects on support culture. Last of all, all correlations between organizational culture and interpersonal communication skills were statistically significant. There were low positive linear correlation between power culture and communication skills; very low negative linear correlation between role culture and communication skills; moderate positive linear correlation between success culture and communication skills and finally there were moderate positive linear correlation between support culture and communication skills.

These findings are consistent in general with what Latané (1996, p.13.) asserted. Latané wrote that there is a tendency for people to be more influenced by nearby, rather than faraway people, which gives rise to local patterns of consensus in attitudes, values, practices, identities, and meanings that can be interpreted as subcultures. Brown and Starkey (1994, p.824) also found that the organizations' culture may be one of the factors which determine the nature, extent and form of its information/communication dimensions and its associated problems. The cultural traits are all inter related in a seamless web of cognitive effect, which influences and shapes the information and communication structures and processes evident in the organization. Jiang (2000, p.332) concluded that the referents of language are the entities, events, states, processes, characteristics, and relations that exist in the culture, whether these are referred to by single words or by phrases. Between language and culture there is always an interactive influence: the two cannot exist without each other. Consequently, the findings lead us to think that there is a significant moderate relationship between the type of communication and cultural characteristics of an organization which should be searched deeper using qualitative methods. In this sense, the findings imply first that empathic sensitivity is likely to contribute to success and support cultures. Secondly, role culture seems to occur in the absence of reflective listening and empathic sensitivity, third power culture seems to have a negative relationship with empathic sensitivity and finally success culture seems again to have a negative relationship with creating positive communication. In this sense, principals should seek to build a better rapport with teachers and staff members by developing and implementing such as developing cooperative relationships among teachers, actively listening to teachers, treating teachers and staff members with respect and dignity, supporting progressive decisions made by teachers, and growing staff members through professional development (McKinney, Labat & Labat, 2015, p.164). Finally as Kowalski (2005, p.112) proposed well more research is needed to understand school culture, school managers' communication skills and the mutual relationship between them.

References

- Aamodt, M. G. (2010). *Industrial/Organizational psychology*. (6th ed.). United States: Wadsworth Cengage Learning.
- Akgül, A. & Çevik, O. (2003). *İstatistiksel analiz teknikleri: SPSS'te işletme uygulamaları*. Ankara: Emek Ofset.
- Alvesson, M., & Sveningsson, S. (2008). *Changing organizational culture: Cultural change work in progress*. Routledge.

- Alvesson, M. (2011). Organizational culture: Meaning, discourse, and identity. In N.M Ashkanasy, C.P.M. Wilderom, and M.F. Peterson, (Eds.). *The handbook of organizational culture and climate* (2nd ed.). (11-28). Los Angeles: Sage.
- Argyris, C. (2010). *Organizational traps: Leadership, culture, organizational design*. USA: Oxford University Press Inc.
- Aydın, M. (2000). *Eğitim yönetimi*. Ankara: Hatiboğlu Yayıncılık.
- Baird, L. S., Post J. E. & Mahon J. F. (1990). *Management functions and responsibilities*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Baumard, P. & Starbuck, W. H, (2001). Where are organizational cultures going? In C.A. Cooper, S. Cartwright, & P.C. Earley, (Eds.). *The international handbook of organizational culture and climate* (pp.522-531). England: John Wiley & Sons.
- Brown, A. D., & Starkey, K. (1994). The effect of organizational culture on communication and information. *Journal of Management studies*, 31(6), 807-828.
- Büyüköztürk S. (2001). *Deneysel desenler: Öntest-sontest kontrol grubu desen ve veri analizi*. (1.Baskı). Ankara: PegemA Yayıncılık.
- Büyüköztürk, Ş., Çakmak, E.K., Akgün, Ö.E., Karadeniz, Ş. & Demirel, F. (2010). *Bilimsel araştırma yöntemleri*. Ankara: Pegem Akademi.
- Bryman A. & Cramer D. (2001). *Quantitative data analysis with SPSS release 10 for Windows: A Guide for Social Scientists*. London: Routledge.
- Champoux, J. E. (2011). *Organizational behavior: integrating individuals, groups, and organizations* (4th ed.). New York: Routledge.
- Cohen, A.R., Fink, S.L., Gado, H., Willits, R.D. & Josefowitz N. (2001). *Effective behavior in organizations, cases, concepts, and student experiences* (7th ed.). Boston: McGraw-Hill.
- Combs, A. W., Miser, A. B., & Whitaker, K. S. (1999). *On becoming a school leader: A person-centered challenge*. Alexandria: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Daft, R.L. (2002). *Management* (6th ed.). USA: Thomson South Western.
- Deal, T., & Peterson, K. (1990). *The principal's role in shaping school culture*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education.
- Dimmock, C. A., & O'Donoghue, T. A. (2005). *Innovative school principals and restructuring: Life history portraits of successful managers of change*. Canada: Routledge.
- Devito, J.A. (2001). *The Interpersonal communication book* (9th ed.). New York: Longman.
- Dubrin, A.J. (1997). *Human relations: Interpersonal, job-oriented skills* (6th ed.). Upper Saddle River, New Jersey: Prentice Hall.
- Eisenberg, E., P. Riley. (2001). *Organizational culture*. In F. Jablin and L. Putnam, (Eds.). *New Handbook of Organizational Communication*. Thousand Oaks, CA.: Sage.
- Eren, E. (2003). *Yönetim ve organizasyonlar: Çağdaş ve küresel yaklaşımlar*. (6th ed.). İstanbul: Beta Basım.
- Eryaman, M. Y. (2007). From reflective practice to practical wisdom: Toward a post-foundational teacher education. *International Journal of Progressive Education*, 3(1), 87-107.
- Fleming, J., & Kleinhenz, E. (2007). *Towards a moving school: Developing a professional learning and performance culture* (No. 1). Aust. Council for Ed Research.
- Gelsthorpe, T., & West-Burnham, J. (2003). *Educational leadership and the community: strategies for school improvement through community engagement*. Edinburgh: Pearson Education Ltd.

- George, J.M. & Jones, G.R. (1996). *Understanding and managing organizational behavior*. New York: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company.
- George, J.M. & Jones, G. (2012). *Understanding and managing organizational behavior* (6th ed.). United States: Prentice Hall.
- Gibson J. L., Ivancevich J.M., Donnelly Jr., J.H., & Robert Konopaske, R. (2011). *Organizations: Behavior, structure processes* (14th ed.). USA: McGraw-Hill, Irwin.
- Gordon, J.R. (1998). *Organizational behavior: A diagnostic approach* (6th ed.). Upper Saddle River, New Jersey: Prentice Hall.
- Griffin, R.W & Moorhead, G. (2013). *Organizational behavior: Managing People and organizations* (11th ed.). Canada: South-Western, Cengage Learning.
- Gurr, D., Drysdale, L., & Mulford, B. (2006). Models of successful principal leadership. *School leadership and management*, 26(4), 371-395.
- Gürgen, H. (1997). *Örgütlerde iletişim kalitesi*. İstanbul: Der Yayınları.
- Hair J.F., Anderson R.E., Tahtam R.L. & Black W.C. (1998). *Multivariate data analysis* (5th ed.). New Jersey: Pearson Education.
- Harris, T. E., & Nelson, M. D. (2008). *Applied organizational communication: Theory and practice in a global environment*. Taylor & Francis.
- Harrison, R. (1972) Understanding your organization's character. *Harvard Business Review*, 50 (23), 119-28.
- Hartley, P. & Bruckmann, C.G. (2002). *Business communication*. London: Routledge.
- Hellriegel, D. & Slocum, J. W. (2011). *Organizational behavior* (13th ed.). USA: South-Western Cengage Learning.
- Hofstede, G., Neuijen, B., Ohayv, D. D., & Sanders, G. (1990). Measuring organizational cultures: A qualitative and quantitative study across twenty cases. *Administrative science quarterly*, 286-316.
- Hofstede, G., Bram, N., Daval, O. D. & Geert, S. (1990) Measuring organizational cultures: a qualitative and quantitative study across twenty cases. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 35, 286-316.
- Hofstede, G., Hofstede, G. J. & Minkov, M. (2010). *Cultures and organizations: Software of the mind, intercultural cooperation and its importance for survival*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Ivancevich, J.M. & Matteson, M.T. (1996). *Organizational behavior and management* (4th ed.). Boston, Massachusetts: Irwin McGraw-Hill.
- İpek, C. (1999). *Resmi liseler ile özel liselerde örgütsel kültür ve öğretmen- öğrenci ilişkisi*. Ankara Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Eğitim Yönetimi ve Planlaması Anabilim Dalı, Doktora Tezi, Ankara.
- Jiang, W. (2000). The relationship between culture and language. *ELT journal*, 54(4), 328-334.
- Keyton, J. (2005) *Communication and organizational culture: a key to understanding work experiences*. Sage Publications, Inc.
- Keyton, J. (2014). Communication, organizational culture, and organizational climate. In B. Schneider and M.B. Karen (Eds.). *The Oxford Handbook of Organizational Climate and Culture* (118-135). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Kowalski, T. J., (2000). Cultural change paradigms and administrator communication. *Contemporary Education*, 71(2). 5-10.
- Kowalski, T.J. (2005) Evolution of the school superintendent as communicator. *Communication Education*, 54(2), 101-117.

- Krejcie, R.V. & Morgan, D.W. (1970). Determining sample size for research activities. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 30, 607-610.
- Lal, İ. (2012). *İlköğretim okulu müdürlerinin iletişim becerileri ile okul kültürü arasındaki ilişkiler* (Yayımlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi). Kırşehir: Ahi Evran Üniversitesi.
- Latané, B. (1996). Dynamic social impact: The creation of culture by communication. *Journal of Communication*, 46(4), 13-25.
- Leithwood, K. A. (1990) The Principal's role in teacher development. In B. Joyce (Ed.). *School culture through staff development* (71-90). USA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Leech, N. L., Barrett, K.C. & George, A. M. (2005). *SPSS for intermediate statistics: use and interpretation* (2nd ed.). London: Lawrence Erlbaum associates, Publishers.
- Lunenburg, F.C. & Ornstein, A.C. (1991). *Educational administration: Concepts and practices*. California: Wadsworth Publishing Company.
- Lunenburg, F.C. & Ornstein, A.C. (2012). *Educational administration: Concepts and practices*. USA: Wadsworth Publishing Company.
- Luthans, F. (2011). *Organizational behavior: an evidence-based approach* (12th ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill/Irwin.
- McKinney, C. L. Labat, M. B. Jr., Labat, C. A. (2015). Traits possessed by principals who transform school culture in national blue ribbon schools. *Academy of Educational Leadership Journal*. 19(1), 152-166.
- Marzano, R. J., Waters, T., & McNulty, B. A. (2005). *School leadership that works: From research to results*. Alexandria: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Maslowski, R. (2001). *School culture and school performance. An explorative study into the organizational culture of secondary schools and their effects*. Twente University Press.
- Miller R. S. (2000). *The Importance of communication skills: Perceptions of IS professionals, IS managers, and users*. (Unpublished Dissertation of Doctorate), College of Administration and Business Louisiana Tech University.
- Milley, P. (2008). On Jürgen habermas'critical theory and the political dimensions of educational administration. In E.A. Samier (Ed.) *Political approaches to educational administration and leadership* (54-72). New York: Routledge.
- Montana, P. J. C. & Charnov, B. H. (2000). *Management*. New York: Barron's Educational Series, Inc.
- Muijs D. (2004). *Doing quantitative research in education with SPSS*. London: Sage Publications.
- Murphy, H.A., Hildebrant, H.W. & Thomas, J.P. (1997). *Effective bussiness communications*. (7th ed.). Boston. Irwin McGraw-Hill.
- Pheysey, D. C. (1993). *Organizational cultures: Types and transformations*. NewYork: Taylor & Francis.
- Robbins, S.P. (2000). *Essentials of organizational behavior* (6th ed.). New Jersey: Prentice Hall.
- Robbins, S.P. (2002). *Essentials of organizational behavior* (7th ed.). New Jersey: Prentice Hall.
- Schermerhorn, J.R., Hunt, J.G., & Osborn, R.N. (2002). *Organizational behavior essentials*. (7th ed.). USA: Wiley.
- Schein, E. H. (2010). *Organizational culture and leadership* (4th ed.). John Wiley & Sons.
- Schabracq, M. J. (2007). *Changing organizational culture: The change agent's guidebook*. West Sussex, England: John Wiley & Sons.

- Schneider, B. & Barbera, K. M. (Eds.). (2014). *The oxford handbook of organizational climate and culture*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Sims, R. R. (2002). *Managing organizational behavior*. Connecticut: Quorum Books.
- Sinha, J. B. (2008). *Culture and organizational behaviour*. India: SAGE Publications.
- Sparrow, P. R. (2001). *Developing diagnostics for high performance organization cultures*. In C.A. Cooper, S. Cartwright & P.C. Earley (Eds.). *The international handbook of organizational culture and climate* (85-106). England: John Wiley & Sons.
- Schermerhorn, J.R. Jr. (1996). *Management and organizational behavior: Essentials*. New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Schermerhorn, J.R. Jr. (2001). *Management* (6th ed.). New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Schermerhorn, J. R. Jr., Hunt, J.G., Osborn, R. N. & Uhl-Bien, M. (2010). *Organizational behavior* (11th ed.). USA: John Wiley & Sons.
- Shochley-Zalabak P.S. (2006). *Fundamentals of organizational communication: Knowledge, sensitivity, skills, values* (6th ed.). Boston: Pearson Education.
- Steers, R.M. (1981). *Introduction to organizational behavior*. Santa Monica, California: Goodyear Publishing Company, Inc.
- Stroh, L.K., Northcraft, G. & Neale, M.A. (2002). *Organizational behavior: A management*. (3rd ed.). United States: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.
- Şahin, A. (2007). *İlköğretim okulu yöneticilerinin kişiler arası iletişim becerileri ve çatışma yönetimi stratejileri arasındaki ilişki*. (Yayımlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi). Antalya: Akdeniz Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü.
- Timm, P.R., Peterson, B.D. & Stevens, J.C. (1990). *People at work human relations in organizations*. (3rd ed.) St. Paul: West Publishing Company.
- Wexley, K. N., & Yukl, G. A. (1984). *Organizational behavior and personnel psychology*. RD Irwin.
- William, J. L. (2004). Good communication skills essential for your practice. *Ophthalmology Times*, 29(16), 73-74.
- Zmuda, A., Kuklis, R., & Kline, E. (2004). *Transforming schools: Creating a culture of continuous improvement*. USA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.